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Chapter I, the Introduction, gives details of the original Nepali materials on which this thesis is based, and indicates the system of dating which has been utilised in fixing an absolute chronology. Chapters II and III contain English translations of Prthvīnārāyaṇ Śāh's memoirs (Divya upadeśa) and letters. Chapter IV considers the genealogy of the Śāh kings of Nepal. The various claims which have been put forward in this connection are stated and assessed, and a final judgment attempted. Chapters V-IX inclusive follow in chronological order the career of Prthvīnārāyaṇ Śāh. His boyhood and early career (Chapter V) are followed by a detailed account of his various campaigns from the date of his becoming King of Gorkhā, 1742, to the position his forces were in before the final conquest of the Nepal Valley (Chapters VI-VIII). Chapter IX begins with the capture of the three cities in the Valley and describes Prthvīnārāyaṇ's attempts to extend his kingdom, the first to the west proving abortive, the second to the east being successful. At his death in 1775 Prthvīnārāyaṇ's kingdom extended from Gorkhā in the west to the boundaries of Sikkim and Bhutan in the east. The final chapter attempts an assessment of Prthvīnārāyaṇ as a man, a soldier and a statesman, and includes a number of measures for the maintenance and enrichment of the resources of his kingdom which he
was not fully able in his lifetime to carry out.

After the text are two appendices and two maps of Nepal. Appendix A contains the text of the letters which were translated in Chapter III. Appendix B is a bibliography. Of the two maps, one is a map of the whole of Nepal within its present boundaries. The other, a more detailed map of the central area in which Prthvīnārāyaṇ's campaigns were waged.

The maps are based on publications by Survey of India and War Office, London. Places not given in these two maps but relevant to the thesis have been inserted by me.
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</tr>
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<td>न n</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>इ i</td>
<td>ठ th</td>
<td>फ ph</td>
<td>क s kṣ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ओ o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

The primary source materials utilised in the preparation of this thesis are ascribed to Prthvīnārāyaṇ himself. As far as can be ascertained none of this material is in the hands of Prthvīnārāyaṇ himself, but there is no reason to doubt its authenticity on those grounds. The material consists of a fairly lengthy collection of notes, known here as Memoirs, and a few letters. Between them they cover the period from 1742, when Prthvīnārāyaṇ became king of Gorkhā, and 1775, the date of his death.

The secondary materials consist of a biography, Prthvīnārāyaṇ Sāhko jīvanī, a chronology of the Gorkhā kings, Gorkhāvamsāvalī, and the Nepali material included in the Hodgson Papers in the India Office Library, some of which also exists in English, Persian and Hindi versions.

The tertiary materials, which are included in the bibliography, consist of the works of various scholars on the life and history of the period.

Primary Material

1. Prthvīnārāyaṇ's Memoirs

These memoirs have been published in book form in Kāṭhmāṇḍu under the editorial title Divya upadeś. The 7th edition is dated Kāṭhmāṇḍu, 2016 (1960 A.D.). The manuscript of the text is believed to have been written
about 1800 A.D., and I have no reason to doubt the accuracy of the published version.

The text falls into two quite separate parts. The first is historical, and contains an account of the campaigns of Prthvīnārāyaṇaṇ up to the capture of Nuwākoṭ in 1744. Whether the later campaigns were similarly recorded and the record has been lost is not known. There is no evidence on the subject either in writing or in the traditional lore of the period. The second part of the text consists of a series of policy pronouncements on a variety of topics: army organisation, systems of justice, organisation of internal government, trade, currency, religion, etc. The interpretation of this part of the text as Prthvīnārāyaṇaṇ's 'advice' would seem to account for the title under which the whole document has been published, Divya upadeśā. The form of the text as we have it suggests that it was composed piecemeal, possibly by dictation, and assembled at a later date. It may be that a later ruler wished to draw upon Prthvīnārāyaṇaṇ's wisdom in the conduct of his own military strategy and internal policy.

---

1. The manuscript is held by a private family in Kāthmāndu. I have seen it, but the owner was unwilling to lend it to me or let me photograph it. Unfortunately therefore my study of the text is not based upon the best possible evidence, but from what I was able to see of it myself, and from what I have learned from Bāburām Ācārya, who has also seen the manuscript, I am reasonably confident that the published text is reliable.
2. PrthvInārāyaṇa’s letters

Seventeen letters which have been ascribed to PrthvInārāyaṇa are extant. Thirteen of them have appeared in three publications, Sāmśkṛtasaṃdēsa, Itiḥāsaprakāś, and Aitiḥāsikaprasamgraha. Two unpublished letters have been studied in photograph. These thirteen are probably in the form in which PrthvInārāyaṇa composed them. Two others, published by Imānsiṣha Gomjong, have been modernised, and are consequently of dubious value as primary material, though some use has been made of their contents. It is rumoured in Nepal that other letters of PrthvInārāyaṇa exist in private collections; but so far they have not been made public, nor has any scholar been permitted to examine them. Some nine letters have been published in summarised form in the Itiḥāsaprakāś. It is said that the originals are lost and all that is extant of them is in the summarised form in which they have been published. Reservation must be made therefore with regard to their authenticity, though use has been made of their contents.

Secondary Material

1. PrthvInārāyaṇa Sāhko jīvanī

The text entitled PrthvInārāyaṇa Sāhko jīvanī is held in Viṣarpustakālaya (Darbar Library) in Kāṭhmānḍu and was published in 1963 A.D. It is a

1. Kindly supplied by Bāburām Ācārya.
biography which contains a detailed account of the initial phase of Prthvīnārāyaṇ's early career (1742-46). It starts from his journey to Banaras, which took place possibly in 1743, after the failure of his first campaign against Nuwākoṭ in 1742, and ends with the second campaign, in 1744, leading to its successful occupation. The biography does not mention the date of any of the incidents mentioned. It is marred in places by exaggeration. It varies to some extent from other Nepalese accounts of the same period. Nevertheless it gives a great deal of information and has been very useful in supplementing other accounts which though they supply some dates are by contrast very skeletal.

2. Gorkhāvamsāvalī

This is a chronology of the Śāh family of Gorkhā. It covers only the early career of Prthvīnārāyaṇ. The narrative begins with the foundation of the principality of Gorkhā by Dravya Śāh, an ancestor of Prthvīnārāyaṇ, in 1559. This is the only date that the Vamsāvalī contains. The narrative ends with the death of Narbhūpāl Śāh, the father of Prthvīnārāyaṇ. His death took place in 1742, though this date is not given in the Vamsāvalī. It was published at Kāśī (Banaras) in 2009 V.S. (1952 A.D.).

3. Hodgson Papers

The Hodgson Papers in the India Office Library contains a great wealth of material on the persons and the period covered by this thesis. They
can be both conveniently classified as follows:

(i) A vamsāvalī which is without title, though Hodgson calls it Gorkhavamsāvalī. It covers the same period as the Gorkhavamsāvalī noted in 2 above but differs in certain significant ways. The first section, the rise to power and life of Dravya Śāh, is in Hindi. The remainder is in Nepali. This vamsāvalī differs principally in that it contains the dates of the reigns of the Śāh kings and of the principal events. Certain episodes in the narrative are described here in greater detail, and certain incidents not mentioned in other accounts are included here.

(ii) A series of notes in short sentences or headings which cover the life of Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ Śāh and continue up to 1814. Some of this material in a slightly different form seems to be held privately in Nepal as part of it has been published in Itihāsprakāś, though the source of the published materials is not entered. These notes contain detailed dates and have been of considerable help in ascertaining the chronology of events. They also mention the names of individuals who took part in various campaigns of Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ. These notes are not compiled by a single individual. They are probably an assembly of notes compiled by various families who took part in the campaigns. One note states that material has been

1. HP, vol.51, fos.5-12, 16-107.
2. HP, vol.74, fo.96.
obtained from the grandsons of Kulända Đhakāl, the astrologer of Prthvīnārāyaṇ Sah. These notes are therefore contemporary evidence and for that reason they are of great value.

(iii) A short continuous narrative covering two of the campaigns of Prthvīnārāyaṇ. These campaigns are dated and contain detail of individuals, places, etc., which has not been found elsewhere. This is particularly valuable in tracing the story of the disaffection of Prthvīnārāyaṇ's brother Šūrapratāp Sah.

(iv) A short manuscript consisting of two folios only which contains an account of certain minor expeditions not noted elsewhere. This manuscript contains no dates, but it mentions individuals and the rewards given to them for the part they played in the expeditions.

(v) Casual notes

These make reference to certain families, Fāre, Basnet, Panta, Thāpā, Arjyāl, etc., who took part in the campaigns. Reference is also found to the Malla kings and events and conditions in the Nepal Valley.

(vi) There are two vamsāvalīs, the text of which are respectively almost identical with those associated with the names of Kirkpatrick and Wright. These vamsāvalīs contain some dates but there is no systematic dating of the material.

1. HP, vol. 56, fos. 40-42.
2. Ibid., vol. 52, fos. 180-81.
3. Ibid., vol. 51, fos. 221-22.
4. Ibid., vol. 74, fos. 97-103; also vol. 60, fos. 169-70.
5. Ibid., vol. 52, fos. 88-89, 103; vol. 54, fos. 167; vol. 55, fos. 7-9, 23, etc.
6. Ibid., vol. 50, fos. 1 ff; vol. 52, fos. 7-46; vol. 55, fos. 6, 30ff.
(vii) Other notes make reference to coins of the Malla and Sāh kings, to temple inscriptions, royal grants, etc. These entries have been of value in establishing the chronology. References are also made to certain rites, dates of birth, etc.

(viii) Other notes describe routes from places to other places, distances, revenue of villages, population figures, etc. This sporadic material has been difficult to handle but it has been of considerable value.

4. Chronology

The problem throughout has been to fix with accuracy the dates of the actions taken by Pṛthvīnārāyaṇaḥ Sah. It was noted in the description in the primary and secondary material given above that in certain cases dates have not been given at all. In others they are spasmodic, and in others incomplete. It has nevertheless been possible by an examination of all the material in parallel to ascertain the order in which the events took place, and to assign to most of them a precise date. This has been possible because certain dates are given in full, i.e. they contain the year in Śaka or Vikram eras, in some cases both the month, the tithi (the day of the lunar fortnight) or gate (the day of the solar month) and the day of the week. These dates after verification have been used as the landmarks of the chronology. Other dates such as those in the letters of Pṛthvīnārāyaṇaḥ which do not insert the year, it has been possible to calculate by working out the concurrences of the day of the
week, the tithi, etc. These dates once established were inserted in the chronology. Other dates found to be accurate by reference to the landmarks already established were also inserted. These together gave me the main chronological framework against which it was possible to work out with reasonable accuracy the date of undated events and to correct inaccuracies and eliminate variant datings.

In making the mathematical calculations necessary to establish the dates according to the Saka or Vikram eras and to translate them into the dates of the Christian era, I have been guided by a work of Sewell and Dikshit, and Pillai. I found that the method adopted by Pillai was most useful in my own calculations. A check was also made of the system operated by Petech but this proved less satisfactory than Pillai's.


CHAPTER II

TRANSLATION OF DIVYA UPADEŚ

Obeisance to Gañesa. May the goddess Kālikā help (us).
May the three times glorious Siva and Gorañāth help (us).
May the five times glorious Prithinārāyaṇ help (us). A speech of the most
glorious grand monarch before spiritual and religious priests, members
of the traditional families, relatives, councillors and his personal
male attendant Surathisīm Rānā and all those whom people everywhere
regard as wise elders, during his last visit to Nuhākoṭ after the
conquest of Nepal of the three cities and the kingdom of the Lord of
the Hindus (Hindupati).

People say, "The old die but their speech lives on". When
you have been told this, you will tell your descendants; your descendants
will tell our descendants and thereby they will continue to rule over
this kingdom and preserve its integrity.

Ours are three mothers. We were born of the three
marriages; we were the reincarnation of the five Pāṇḍuvās. I was
married in Makuvānpur. The bride was not handed over and so we went
to Makuvānpur with a view to bringing the bride back and seeing Nepal
as well. After our arrival we made a demand on Dikbanda Sen namely that
Quarrel with Digbandhan Sen, Prince of Makwanpur: we would return with the bride provided he gave us the one-tusked elephant and the Navalāgī diamond necklace, and we threatened him that if he were unwilling to agree we would take them away even by force of arms. We proceeded along the bank of the Rāpti river and having covered ourselves with syās'us lest the kings of Nepal should recognise us and consequently capture us. There were in my company the astrologers Bhānu and Kulānanda and other prominent members of the traditional families. After reaching Candragiri I enquired which territory was Nepal. Thereupon they pointed out to me Bhādgāu, Pāṭan and Kāṭhmāḍāu respectively. At the very moment when I was musing on the idea that it would suit me to become king of these three cities, both the astrologers told me that my desire and ambition would be fulfilled. I was surprised. I asked them how they could know what I was thinking and speak to me about it. They replied that as soon as my glance had fallen upon Nepal I began to finger my moustache which was just as good as saying I wanted to become king of Nepal and that was why they had said so. I asked them whether this would come to pass. They said that I had shown great respect to cows, Brahmāns, ascetics, fakirs, gods and that as they (astrologers) had also the power to grant the boon of Sarsoti, I should certainly become the king of Nepal. We travelled day and night through the great pass of Thāmkoṭ and crossed...
the ford at Kallhāri and went up to Dhādin. I ordered the astrologers to write letters to my three brave military officers whom I had stationed on the Cepya embankment under cover of Liglig. They asked me their names. I wrote instructions to Raṇajit Basnyāt, Mānsi Rokāhā and Birbhadra Fāṭhak instructing them to rush to Māidhi as quickly as possible. They came as ordered and I had secret consultations with them. I wanted to know what they would say when I told them that I had challenged Dikbanda Sen and having seen Nepal had a desire to invade it. They agreed with my wish to invade Nepal and gave me their advice. I asked them what the position would be if someone came to deprive me of my sovereignty while I was depriving another king of his. They replied to me that if the BāIS and Čaubisi frightened my elephants and attacked, they (the military officers) would make the Cepya river flow with blood. We then rose from our secret consultations and went to Gorsā. On arriving there I met my maternal uncle who had been to visit Goraṇāth. The meeting took place after he had been there. He had come to Gorsā after his visits to Nilkaṇṭha and Pasupati by way of Deughāt. I told him I had returned from Makuvānpur and having seen Nepal wished to invade it. I asked for his instructions in regard to the course of action to be taken so as to achieve success in my attempt. He said that he too had omens of revelation during the Paṅcarātri and in his opinion it seemed that as we were
the reincarnation of the Pāṇḍuvās Nepāl would not be overthrown without another Kurukṣetra. He further pointed out that Lamjūn was comparable to an eagle, Gorṣā to a snake, Nepāl to a frog, and so first an eagle had to be kept at bay so as to give time for the snake to eat the frog. I told him I had recruited my soldiery from four castes and wanted to know which to employ in order to achieve a speedy success. He asked me which castes they were. I told him that the four castes were Bāhun, Śas, Magar and Ṭhakuri and asked which I should employ so as to ensure the success of my project. He said that to employ the Bāhun was like using an ox for conveyance and so a sin, that to employ the Ṭhakuri was like using a lion for the same purpose and would betray me in the long run, that to employ the Magar was like using a mountain pony which would cause delay, but that to employ the Śas was like using an Arab or Turkish horse, and that therefore to his mind the employment of the Śas would be expedient. He left after giving me instructions pertaining to various other matters. I followed those and accordingly went to Ripumardan Sāh, King of Lamjūn. Our meeting took place at the ford across the Cepe river. Kālu Pāde took certain important actions which I was contemplating with a view to drawing up a treaty of friendship in respect of foreign and home affairs. A treaty was drawn up on a sound basis. Though surprised I was none the less pleased with him. It is laid down in the sacred books that a person with whom subjects are pleased should be made a minister. I
wanted to see for myself the reactions of my subject. I found out that

Appointment of
Kālu Fāde
as a minister

they too liked him. They pointed out to me that they
would find a protector in him if he were appointed a
minister. I then tried to find out what the Bàisi
and Cāubisi would say. I found out that they also liked Kālu Fāde. They
suggested that if he were appointed minister, he would certainly maintain
cordial foreign relations and could be trusted to conduct business per­
taining to home affairs. I had been on the point of appointing Birāj
Bakheti as minister. But it was clear that Kālu Fāde possessed superior
intelligence. That is why ministership was conferred upon him. Then I

Accomplishment of union
between the Fāres and Basnets
for the invasion of Nepal

wished to bring about a union between
the Pādes and Basnyāts. I proposed to
Kālu Fāde the marriage of his daughter
with Kehersināha Basnyāt, son of Sibrām Basnyāt, and had it brought about
also. Thus I effected a union between the Pādes and the Basnyāts. So
when I had made the Pādes my shield and the Basnyāts my sword I under­
took the invasion of Nepal.

I stationed Rāṇajit Basnyāt, Mānsināha Rokāhā, Birbhadra
Pāṭhak in the Gauṭānko birāi under cover of Liglig. I told them that

Propitiation of the
Goddess of Sallyānkoṭ
and her blessing

people had told me that the goddess of Sallyānkoṭ
possessed a marvellous power of revealing
herself and that I too would go to visit her
on an auspicious day. I despatched them and accordingly set out on an
auspicious day. I encamped in a thatched hut which had been built for
me in a field. I asked the members of the traditional families of Sallyān
and its military chiefs and commandants whether I should be permitted to
visit the goddess. They replied to me that in so far as visiting the
inner sanctuary was concerned only priests and attendants were entitled
to do so. Saying so they left it to my discretion. I enquired whether I
could go as far as the door. To this they replied in the affirmative. I
went to the door every morning and evening and there I offered prayers,
told my beads and performed worship. One night I had a dream. It was a
girl of seven or eight years. She carried two swords, one in each hand,
and veiling her face with a yellow kerchief she approached me. I asked
her whose daughter she was. She replied that she was the daughter of
the Rānā priest. She took out from the inner fold of her garment some-
thing which was red and as lustrous as a mirror. Holding it to my mouth
she asked me to swallow it. She told me that the desire of my heart had
been granted. She had a request to make and wanted me to promise that
it would be granted before I went. So saying she left me but she had
scarcely gone two steps when I awoke. I sent for Bhānu, the astrologer,
Kulananda, the astrologer, and the Rānā priest. I asked them what my
dream meant. The astrologers and also the priest said that it was the
goddess who had revealed herself to me. Immediately I promised to offer
to the goddess the income from Borlām Ghāṭ and the tableland adjoining
the Ghāṭ for the purpose of daily worship and things needed for it, such
as incense, lamps, banners, sweets and fruits and besides seven buffaloes and seven goats as well. Deeming that moment auspicious I left straightway and travelling night and day encamped at the resting place on the Simalcūr ridge, which was in the form of a square. Actually my whole heart was set on Nuḥākoṭ. I began to cut an aqueduct channel at Śincyāt on the pretext of cultivating land.

Desire for the conquest of Nuwākoṭ: I went regularly to the shrine of Indrāyeni at the confluence of the Betrabati for prayer and worship, and crossed it by boat. In reality I meditated on the Goddess of Sallyānkoṭ and Indrāyani Bhairabī. The Mahāmāṇḍal is, so to say, the co-wife of Nuhākoṭ. There was a Gyāmī Rānā at the Mahāmāṇḍal. I sent him a message to say that he was the Gyāmī of us all, and urged him to leave the Mahāmāṇḍal and come to me. He refused saying that he was indeed mine, but that as he had taken the salt of Jayapragāś Malla he meant to be loyal to him to the last. One day I was holding court. A feeling of sleepiness came over me and in the course of it I found myself sitting in the shrine of Indrāyani. I heard somebody say that the seventh day from today was highly auspicious and that an expedition on that auspicious day would result in the conquest of Nuhākoṭ. I asked my astrologers to look into the almanac. After studying it they humbly said to me that daybreak on Saturday week was a highly auspicious moment. At that auspicious moment we climbed up...
through the Mahāmaṇḍal. Fighting took place. The way which became clear
by the loyal strength of our men .... my brother Dalmardan Sāh who though
he was only twelve years old nevertheless accomplished first decapitation.
It was he who decapitated the Rānā. The conquest of Nuhākoṭ was accom-
plished. We held a great celebration. We made check-posts at Kakani and
Sibapuri and consolidated our positions there. Parāsurām Thāpā gave me
assistance and suggested that I should attack Nepāl. (But later) he sent word to his younger brother to
hand over the money received from the King [Jayaprakāś Malla] and
incite the Baīsi and Čaubisi to attack me in the rear. I came to know
of this and enquired of his whereabouts. I heard that he was living in
a lodging house in the market of Poṣrā. I took
advice as to who would be able to go and kill him.
Nobody was willing to make a definite suggestion.
I thought to myself that Jhāgal Gurum would be able to do this. So I
called him and gave him my instructions. I gave him the waist-sword
which I wore. He went and when he had arrived he dressed up like a
mendicant musician. He carried a fishing-rod in his hand and a small
fiddle in his arm and carried with him sahar fish weighing ten to twenty
pounds. He found his opportunity when all the rest of his army were
eating their food. He slew him and came
away. I ensured the safety of my rear
and sent spies to Nepāl. I won over the
people to the east and west and then captured Nepāl.
This kingdom is like a yam sandwiched between two stones. Maintain very friendly relations with the Chinese emperor. Also maintain friendly relations with the emperor of the sea of the south. But he is very shrewd. He has been keeping Hindusthānā under his control and is now in the plains. He will come in search of forts because it may be difficult for him if Hindusthānā becomes united. Keep forts ready in strategical places on the frontier. Put road blocks on the different routes. One day (his) army will come (to attack).

Do not be aggressive. Rather allow it to enter. There will be heavy fighting in the lower foothills. Treasure enough for five to seven generations will also be got. Our boundary will also extend as far as the holy Ganges. If (the enemy) is not strong enough to fight he will resort to flattery and various quarrels and deceits. This kingdom of Nepāl is a fort. If he gains possession of this fort he is sure to subdue all the four emperors. Nepāl is a fortress made by God. There is no question about that. Strengthen the forts at these seven places also: Sibapurī, Phulcok, Candrāgiri, Mahādeu Poṣari, Fālum, Dāpcā and Kāhulyā. In each fort place your artillery and site it according to range so that it commands the road. Wherever there is a pass construct an iron gate in it and at each gate place one cannon and site it so that it commands the road and station soldiers at each of the gates. When this is done such elements as spies, propagandists, absconders, saboteurs, illegal entrants, trouble-mongers, criminals will be powerless to do
harm. Even if all the four emperors invade none of them will have any effect at all.

I have seen the social code drawn up by King Rām Sāh. I have also seen the social code drawn up by King Jayethiti Malla. I have also seen the social code drawn up by King Mahindra Malla. I had a desire that should God grant I also would draw up a code on similar lines for the twelve thousand (houses). I had a desire to close their routes in the east and west and bring the route through Nepal into operation and prescribe a code for the peculiar duties to be performed by the various castes themselves. This region of the three cities I find to be a cold stone. There is much outward show but nothing else. One who takes water from a well lacks in intelligence and is not brave either. There is outward show and nothing else. I had a desire to construct a palace in Dahacok and build all around it houses for the traditional families and for the spiritual and religious priests, relatives, councillors, military chiefs, commandants and having done that to make my own palace separate. I had a desire to go to the three cities for luxury and recreation only.
Do not permit Indian traders to go beyond Goḍ Prasāh. If they come to our country they will definitely make our subjects paupers.

Ban to be imposed on Indian traders to prevent their entering the Hills when they come to our country they will definitely make our subjects paupers.

When We conquered the three cities, the Kirāyat yielding an income of nine lakhs (of rupees) and the kingdom of the Hindupati Our clothing consisted of Cyāga and Pāgā cloth. Impose a prohibition on the wearing of Indian cloth. Show samples of Indian cloth to those who know how to weave and instruct them so that they can weave such cloth themselves. The result of this will be that money will not flow into a foreign country. Take indigenous commodities, medicinal roots and herbs to foreign countries and collect foreign currency. Maintain a steady flow of foreign currency into the country. If the subjects are well off the palace will be strong. What is called the treasure of the king is his subjects. Do not farm out the revenue.

Collection of revenue by the Government itself is a function of the government. So set up government offices and audit their accounts annually. Do not permit either soldiers of note or relatives and councillors to amass wealth. Give each individual enough to maintain his personal prestige. You may ask the reason thereof. It is because one who is rich will be unwilling to take up arms and kill or be killed. If this happens enemies will become powerful. If the soldiers, my own relatives and councillors cannot
afford amenities of life, my sword will resound in all four corners of the kingdom. If they be wholly given up to the amenities of life! .... This is not a country that I have acquired without great difficulty and hardship. It is a garden of all the castes. Everyone should know that.

Our garden will be a genuine Hindu kingdom for the four castes, whether high or low, and for the thirty-six communities. They must not abandon their caste observances. They must be loyal to the salt of their lord. Do not deprive the descendants of Kālu, the Kavardār, of Kavardārship. Do not remove the descendants of Sivaraṃ Basnyāt from their responsibilities for foreign affairs in the south. Do not remove from the descendants of Kālu Pāde their responsibilities for foreign relations with Bhoot. Let the Pādes, Basnyāts, Panthas, relatives, councillors and Magars enjoy authority in rotation. These are my loyal servants, true to my salt and bound by obligations to me. Do not kill them yourself even if they commit crimes worthy of death. Rather invest them with authority and despatch them to battle. If they come back alive, it is well and good. If they die, it is better that someone else should have killed them than that you yourself should kill them. That is why the king should not kill his servant at home. He should pass sentence with complete justice. He should not allow injustice in the
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Bribery to be completely eradicated; those who flout justice are those who both bribe and take bribes. There is no sin if these two types of men are deprived of their property and lives. These are arch-enemies of the king.

The essential thing required by a king is soldiers. Provide them with home and land. They will manure and irrigate it. In this way they will own both shares for themselves. Then their families will have complete security. The soldiers will also be in high spirits whether they be in the capital or at the front. While screening men in the services form a company of hundred guns. As Subedārs appoint men who have won reputation in four or five battles and have been examined by yourself. Subedārs will also appoint as senior officers seven men who have had experiences in two or three battles. The seven senior officers will choose as non-commissioned officers sixteen men who have fought in battles with them and appoint them to their rank. The sixteen non-commissioned officers will also choose soldiers who have fought with them and enrol them in their units. In their respective units they will enrol men of these four tribes only: Sas, Magar, Gurum and Thakuri. One unit should not consist of men of only one tribe. Life will become very hard when fighting takes place. Even the seat of Indra is shaken if one has thousands of bows, thousands of flint-lock guns, thousands of scimitars, thousands of cannon. Both those who fight in battles and those who render assistance are equal.
Do not discriminate between them while distributing offices and freehold land. If a man dies give a pension to his son until he is capable of handling a scimitar himself. As soon as he is able to handle a scimitar, promote him to some office. If the king is considerate, soldiers also from different countries will come in hope of reward. If this happens soldiers skilled in swordsmanship will be available. A king's real wealth is his soldiers and subjects. The king should be clever, and he will then keep the soldiers and subjects under his control. So revolt and intrigue will not take place. As regards the soldiers, let him keep them in training. Properly trained soldiers are not likely to be suborned by anybody. Thus his purpose is accomplished. When the Guruśs and Magars are away on service, test relatives, councillors, military chiefs, commandants, traditional families to ensure their loyalty and keep those who are old hands with you and in strategical places. Ban the entry of the Śas and Bāhuns of the east and west into the palace. You may ask the reason. This is because outsiders create disorder in the palace. Let the king keep all authority in his own hands. I have promoted the Umrāvas of the three Thums to high executive authority and have confirmed them in it. I have given them drums and standards as their insignia. I have laid down that, they shall each of them receive in perpetuity an income of 240, because wherever they have served on the battle fronts at Sallyān, Liglig and Dhādim, they have been successful
Old servants to be tested and this glorious result has been achieved. Test your old servants of our house, keep them at your beck and call, make adequate arrangements for their duties and emoluments and by so doing keep your house strong. If the king is clever, let him

Soldiers and subjects to be kept under control keep his soldiers and subjects under his control. Do not let them be led into disloyalty by anyone's favour or obligation to anyone. Keep them loyal to their salt.

Pure coinage is pure. In the Court appoint a Thakuri to the post of Diśṭhā after trying him. Try a Magar and appoint him as Bicāri. Keep one Paṇḍīt in each Court and conduct its business in accordance with the customary law and sāstras. Do not keep the Court money in the palace. Disburse it as gifts and food

Ways of disbursing Court money for mendicants, spiritual devotees, ascetics, hermits, Sannyāsīs and Brāhmaṇs. Disburse the remaining sum as gifts in the form of dhotis and scarves. If this happens, the sin which attaches to wrong judgment will not apply. If

Exploitation of mines a mine is discovered in a place where there is a village, move the village to some other place and exploit the mine. If there are houses on arable lands, move the houses to some other place. Dig canals, prepare the land and produce crops.
Once he [Raṇajitsimha Malla of Bhātgāū] rendered me assistance. He sent for me but later on he betrayed me. After that with great difficulty I ensured safety of my rear and besieged Nepal. He called naked ascetics from the south to help Jayaprakāś Malla. I did not let them enter Nepal but slaughtered them inside the seven villages. Nabāf Kāsmīrī Śān invaded Makuvānpur. I defeated his army with six score swordsmen, routed him and came back after driving him beyond our boundary. Hāḍī Sāheb inflicted defeat of Nawab Mir Kasim of Bengal: I defeated his army with six score swordsmen, routed him and came back after driving him beyond our boundary. Hāḍī Sāheb invaded Siduli Fort with three or four platoons. There I defeated him, captured some flint-lock guns and returned. Three Muslims from Laṣanāl had come to Nuwākoṭ with a great desire to live under my protection and to be taken into my service. I found that these Muslims knew how to operate these guns. I appointed these three men, Ses Jarbar, Mama Taki Bhēgārsīṁ as Ajīṭans. Thus I had my soldiers trained as riflemen.

According to the [history] books of Nepal, it appears that it was to be under the suzerainty of the Turks, Magars and Mughals. It has already been under the Turks. I am the king of the land of the Magars. In order to forestall the sin of its becoming the land of the Mughals I disbanded half of the soldiers of the Thums and formed a Company of riflemen from the other half.
Soldiery composed of riflemen and swordsmen

Half were trained as swordsmen and half as flint-lock gunners. A Company of a hundred guns is very mobile. In consequence a Company of a hundred guns is the equal of one thousand men. Station one Company at each fort and divide them among the Garsās and keep their granaries full.

I have a doubt of one thing. It is this. The Indian territory is close by. There are boy dancers and prostitutes. (People) may be forgetful of their duties in rooms full of paintings and where there are music, drums and Sitārs. There are great temptations in music. Wealth also is spent lavishly. It is they who carry away secrets of the country also. Consequently enemies will intrigue. Let none indulge in musical exercises.

Let none permit the movement of these people into the Hills. Well, you may call one or two for the Phāgu, but send them away quickly. Thus they will not know secrets of the country. For luxury and recreation one may have and see the dances of the Newārs of Nepāl of the three cities. These dances are sanctioned in the sacred texts. What is given to them will stay in the country. If this happens the country will remain [secure].
The Hindus commence every undertaking, whether religious or secular, with an invocation to Ganesa, the god of wisdom and obstacles, and the son of Siva and Parvatī. Ganesa has the power to remove obstacles and is hence invoked at the commencement of all sorts of compositions with the usual formula svasti śrī Ganesāya namaḥ.

Otherwise Kālī, a name of Durgā, the goddess of terrific power. Durgā, the daughter of Himavat and wife of Siva, is also called Umā, Parvatī, etc., and is the mother of Kārttikeya and Ganesa.

Erroneously written for Śiva, the god who has the power of destroying and reproducing. He constitutes the third god of the Hindu Trinity, the other two being Brahmā, the creator, and Viṣṇu, the preserver. In Nepali orthography the dental sibilant ś is often substituted for the palatal sibilant ś.

Written for Gorakhnāth, the legendary eponymous deity of Gorkhā (vide GVY, pp.41 ff). In Nepali orthography the cerebral sibilant ś was usually substituted for the voiceless aspirated velar kh.

There are evidences to believe that the Śah kings of Gorkhā were primarily devotees of Śiva (vide IP, vol.I,p.40, col.1; GVY, pp.71-72), but being Hindus they nevertheless showed their devotion to the Brahmanical Pantheon, and also to local deities, to mendicants of different orders and to indigenous faiths. It is however curious that there is no mention of Viṣṇu of whom the kings of Nepal were supposed to be an incarnation.

Hindu names are usually preceded by śrī used as an honorific prefix. It is repeated to denote higher veneration or dignity. The word has a wider connotation implying prosperity, welfare, good fortune, auspiciousness, wealth, power, majesty, glory, splendour, beauty, etc. The names of the Malla kings of the Karnālī region appear with one śrī only which however was used with five times in the names of the kings of this region from the eighteenth century (IP, vol.II, pt.i,pp.149 ff). The names of the Malla kings of the Nepal Valley appeared with two śrīs. The first numismatic evidence of 1754 shows Pṛṭhivinārāyaṇ's name prefixed by two śrīs. It was preceded by three śrīs in an inscription of 1763 (IP, vol.I, p.48,col.1) and five śrīs in an inscription of 1765 (ibid.,p.38,col.1). In an inscription at Palāncok āś 1768 Pṛṭhivinārāyaṇ's name appears with two śrīs, presumably to conform to the practice of the Malla kings of the Nepal Valley. In all Pṛṭhivinārāyaṇ's letters his name appears with three śrīs excepting in one where it has five (videLĀV). The use of five śrīs (śrī 5) for the names of the Śah kings and their queens, queen mothers, king's brothers and sons was adopted when Janga Bahādur, the Rāṇā Prime Minister (1846-77) was designated śrī 3 in 1856. The name of the royal spiritual priest (Barā Gurujyū) appeared with six śrīs as is also the practice when addressing one's parents in letters.
6. Erroneously written for Pṛthvīnārāyaṇa.

7. The speech begins from the second paragraph. The first paragraph is a scribal introduction.

8. The use of eight śris at this point (śri śri śri 5) cannot be accounted for. Presumably it was an error: either the scribe intended to write three śris or five śris.

9. These traditional families (? 24, IP, vol.1.p.126, col.1) were collectively called Thar Ghar ('clan and house'). It was a generic term used for the heads and senior members of those families who were mostly associated with the governance of the state of Gorkhā. Although this term could mean all the thirty-six communities of Gorkhā it was also used to denote six leading families of the state. Nārāyaṇaṇā Arjyaḷ, Gaṅeś Pāṛe, Sarveśvar Khanāl, Bhagīrath Pantha (modern Panta), Kēsava Bohā and Gaṅgāṛām Rānā, who were members of these families, had rendered signal assistance to DravyaŚāh in conquering Gorkhā in 1559. Of these the first four were Brahmins and the last two Khas and Magar respectively. These families were called Cha Thar ('six clans') to distinguish them from the rest of the Thar Ghar. It was Rām Śāh, King of Gorkhā (1609-36), who gave the designation of Cha Thar to these six families, and decreed that so long the Śāh dynasty ruled Gorkhā the members of this body would be employed in the service of the state and would be looked after by the kings provided they did not act against the throne or engage themselves in subversive activities. They were to see that the Cātariyās (collateral members of the royal family) and Sardārs (military commanders) did not commit injustice and act against traditional usage in such a way as to cause harm to the throne and subject. They were thus to render their service with unswerving loyalty to the throne and for the welfare of the people. On account of their conspicuous service for generations and because of the high esteem in which they were held, leading members of these families, whether in service or not, began to exert their influence upon the Court, and in time kings felt they could ill afford to act against their advice. Though the kings were sole executive authorities, they had to act in accordance with the advice of the members of this body and not according to their personal policy or whims, so much so that if this influential body saw that the sovereignty or security of the country was at stake, it could even dictate to a king, as it was bound not to the king in person, but to him as an institution, i.e to the throne (GVY, p.33; W. Kirkpatrick: An account of the kingdom of Nepal, pp.123-26).

10. Probably the same Surattasimha Rānā, a Kapardār (keeper of the royal wardrobe and jewelry and manager of the royal kitchen) during the time of Pratāpṣimha Śāh, King of Nepal (1775-77), as mentioned in the Hodgson Papers (hereafter abbreviated HP), vol.51,fo.91.

11. Misspelt for Nuwakoṭ. There are two famous Nuwakoṭas in Nepal. This under reference is the eastern, 20 miles north-west of Kāthmāndu, situated
on a ridge towards the south-west extension of the Dhaibung mountain. Prthvīnārāyaṇaḥ captured it in 1744 (vide p.166) as a first step to entering the Nepal Valley. His last visit to Nuwākoṭ perhaps took place in 1774 (Divyā upadeśa, hereafter abbreviated DU, Text, p.1,n.7. References to the translation are mentioned as DU, Tr.).

12. These are Kāthmāṇḍu (Kāntipur, Kāthmāṇḍā in Nepali), Bhātgaū or Bhādgāū (Bhaktapur) and Pāṭān ( Lalitpattan or Lalitpur), all these which once formed one kingdom of the Bais Mallas. It was from ancient times called Nepal. At the turn of the fourteenth century it began to disintegrate and at the time of Yakṣa Malla it was divided in 1482 amongst his sons, the division subsequently leading to the formation of the three principalities with their seats in the three cities referred to. Though the kingdom was divided the region comprising the three cities continued to be called Nepal or Nepal of the three cities, and being situated in a valley it was also called Nepal Valley. The valley in modern times is called Kāthmāṇḍu Valley.

13. The Sen kings of Mākwānpur were so styled after Harihar Sen, who flourished probably in the last quarter of the sixteenth century (Śūryavikrama Jñāvalī: Prthvīnārāyaṇa Śāh, pp.130,131; also GVY, p.79). The references here is to the Sen rulers of Caudāṇḍī and Morang who belonged to the collateral branches of the Sen house and they also used Hindupati as part of their titles. Prthvīnārāyaṇaḥ conquered Caudāṇḍī and Morang in 1773 and 1774 respectively.

14. Prthvīnārāyaṇaḥ had four step-mothers. The first was issueless and from the other three seven sons in all were born of whom two died in their childhood (vide pp.129-30 ). So the brothers are extolled as the reincarnation of the five Pāṇḍuvās (misspelt for Pāṇḍava of Mahābhārata fame). He however does not mention the step-brothers born of his father's concubines, of whom at least one Rudrī Śāhī (otherwise Ranaṛudra Śāhī), who was also the eldest amongst all the legitimate and illegitimate brothers, was a person of importance.

Another spelling Pāṇḍuva is also met with (DU,p.5,line 12).

15. Misspelt for Mākwānpur. The territory of this state lay in the plains extending from the Citaun forest up to the western bank of the Kosi river, and bordering upon the Champaran, Muzaffarpur, Darbhanga and Purnea districts of Bihar. In the north the boundary of Mākwānpur was contiguous with those of Pāṭān and Bhātgaū (vide also S.C. Sarkar, 'Some interesting documents', Bengal past and present, vol.XLIII, pt.1, January-June 1932, p.49). Prthvīnārāyaṇaḥ was married to Indrakumārī, Princess of Mākwānpur, probably in 1736/37. He conquered this state in 1762.

16. It was perhaps according to the custom of Mākwānpur that the bride was not sent with Prthvīnārāyaṇaḥ soon after marriage, and that he had to come again after one year to perform the dvirāgaman ('second coming') ceremony. This custom is prevalent in the Tarai society even now.
17. Misspelt for Digbandhan, Prince of Makwanpur. He was younger than Indrakumari (HP, vol. 51, fo. 102).

18. Navalākī does not necessarily mean 'worth nine lakhs'. It is traditionally used to denote a very costly thing. It was probably one of the ornaments the bride wore when she was being given away. The one-tusked elephant was perhaps used to carry Pṛthvīnarañyaṇ after the wedding ceremony when the bride was sent along with him to his camp (DU, p. 24). The elephant was regarded to have been very auspicious and the King of Makwanpur, Hemkaṇa Sen, had not given it to the Nawab of Bengal even though the latter had demanded it (GVY, p. 130).

19. One year after his marriage Pṛthvīnarañyaṇ returned to Makwanpur to bring Indrakumari. He remained there for one year. His brother-in-law, Digbandhan Sen, and Kanaksiśha Bāniyā, Minister of Makwanpur, wanted to detain him until the Princess gave birth to a son. Her parents too were in favour of postponing her departure until she was old enough to carry out all the duties prescribed by her mother-in-law, Candraprabhāvati, whom they considered an arrogant and uncultured highlander. He was weary of his enforced stay and not happy at the treatment he received. In retaliation he made demands which were hard to be complied with. Since none of these demands was complied with he used non-compliance as an excuse for returning without the bride and without damage to his prestige (vide pp. 134-38).

20. The Rāptī (modern spelling) issues from a mountain in the east of Cisāpānigarī, flows past Heṭāura (15 miles from the source), then the north-western frontier outpost of Makwanpur. The river then takes a westerly course and joins the Nārāyanī river (another name for the Sapta Gaṇḍakī river) at Benmohar. It should not be confused with another bigger river of the same name which passes through Pyūthānā (otherwise Pyūṭhān) district and flows down past Gorakhpur in India. The eastern river is called 'little Rāptī' to distinguish it from the bigger.

21. Syākhu (a synonym for ghūm) is used as protection from rain. Porters use it to cover their ḍoko, i.e. slung basket, which they carry on their backs. The syākhu is made of green Bhorlā leaves, which are large and roundish, thickly pressed between thin bamboo strips woven like a lattice. It is then folded at the middle and looks like a roof with two slanting wings.

22. Kings of Gorkhā employed astrologers in regular service. They cast the horoscopes of the royal family, selected auspicious moments for social, religious and political events, such as thread-giving ceremonies, marriage celebrations, religious festivals or performances, construction of houses, house warming ceremonies, declaring wars or making truces, and all social rites. Often they had to accompany troops sent for campaigns. These two astrologers, Bhāmu Arjyāl and Kulānanda Dhakāl, were prominent in Pṛthvīnarañyaṇ's times. Astrologers are invariably Brahmans,
either Upādhyāyas or Jāissīs. The former are Brahmans par excellence, and the latter inferior since they are descendants of an Upādhyāya widow kept as a wife by an Upādhyāya Brahman, or of an Upādhyāya girl kept by him as a wife without marriage. Previously Upādhyāyas and Jāissīs were equal in social grade. It was Prthvīnārāyaṇ who demoted Jāissīs to be lower in grade than the Upādhyāyas as a punishment for their intrigue against him. From then on Jāissīs were debared from officiating as priests (vide pp. 195-96). So by profession they generally became Jāissīs, otherwise called Jōsīs or Jōsī ( [< Sk. jyotīsa- 'astronomer']). It is not known whether Kulānanda and Bhānu were Upādhyāyas or Jāissīs. But since they were astrologers they were called Jāissīs, the title denoting their profession rather than distinguishing their grade.

These two Jāissīs were constant companions of Prthvīnārāyaṇ. Bhānu Arjyuāl had been in the service of Gorkhā since the days of Narbūpāl Śah, Prthvīnārāyaṇ's father (GVY, p.124). During Prthvīnārāyaṇ's time he was also for some time a Treasurer (Khajāncī) (HP, vol.51,fo.78, vol.52,fo.109). Kulānanda survived Prthvīnārāyaṇ (HP, vol.51,fo.82; IF, vol.1, p.128,col.2).

23. A mountain (elevation 8,289 ft. above the sea level) forming the south-western boundary of the Kāthmāndu Valley. It is 7 miles from Kāthmāndu.

24. I.e. Bhātgāū. Omission of nasal mode was perhaps intentionally left or a scribal error.

25. I.e. Kāthmāndū. For the omission of nasal mode vide above.

26. Written incorrectly for Brahman, the usual Nepali being Bāhun (vide n.48).

27. Text, atīt < Sk. atīta-, meaning 'one who has renounced worldly interest', i.e. an ascetic. Ācārya (ed.) DJ, p.4,n.2, thinks it means 'guest' (cf. < Sk. atithi- 'one who comes without an appointment; guest').

Both, atīt, 'ascetic', and atīt, 'guest' are however held in equal reverence in Hindu society.

28. Muslim mendicants. It is interesting to note that Fakirs were sufficiently well known in Nepal at that time to have been included in this list along with Hindu ascetics.

29. I.e. Sarasvatī, the goddess of learning.

30. Modern spelling Thāṅkot, a hamlet situated near the foot of the Candragiri mountain. It is 6 miles south-west of Kāthmāndu.

31. Modern spelling Kalherī or Kallerī, a ford on the left bank of the Būrhi Gandakī river and near the confluence of this river with the Trisūlī. It is situated on a ridge and about 30 miles to the west of Kāthmāndu via Dhunībesī, and then formed Gorkhā's frontier with the territory of Pāṭan, which lay to the south of the Trisūlī.
32. Modern spelling Dhāding, a village about 12 miles north-east of Kalherī, and about 30 miles north-west of Kāätzlich. This was part of the territory of Gorkhā since the times of Rām Śāh. It is nearly equi-distant from Gorkhā and Kāätzlich.

33. Modern spelling Gepe, the river which formed Gorkhā's frontier with Lamjung. Issuing from Sirhānchok, north-west of Gorkhā, and flowing 16 miles west of it, the river later joins the Marsyangdi river at Gāighāṭ, the south-western frontier with Lamjung.

34. Modern spelling Liglig, a village then in the territory of Gorkhā. It is about 12 miles north-west of Gorkhā, and across the Darādū river.

35. Raṇajit Basnyāt (modern spelling Basnet) belonged to the Śripāli Basnet clan of the Khases. Many members of this clan were in Prthvīnārāyaṇ's service. He later became a Sardār and thereafter his descendants also became Sardārs. There was one Bīrudhvaj, his great grandson, who became a Kājī when Jāhga Bahādur Raṇā was Prime Minister of Nepal (1846-77). Nothing is known about Mānsinīha Rokāḥā (now also called Rokā or Rokāyā) and Vārbhadra Pāṭhak. The former could be either a Khas or Magar, and the latter, as the title suggests, was perhaps a Brahman.

36. Modern spelling Māidhī (also called Māidhīkoṭ because of a fort there). It was then a prominent outpost of Gorkhā, where a Dvāre (frontier guard) was stationed. It had been in the possession of Gorkhā since the time of Rām Śāh. The holy thread-giving ceremony of Prthvīnārāyaṇ was performed here (vide pp. 131-32).

37. I.e. Bāisi (wrongly written here Bāis) and Čāubīṣī, the two groups of states known in Nepalese history; the former which had in it twenty-two states lay in the region watered by the Karnālī and its tributaries, and the latter which had in it twenty-four states lay in the Sapta Gaṅdakī region. These were not federated states, although there were at times some leagues formed amongst them. Even then each was a separate independent entity. Various lists of these two groups are given: Kirkpatrick: An account of the kingdom of Nepaul, pp.284-85; Francis Hamilton: An account of the kingdom of Nepal, pp.238-39; HP, vol.11,fo.58; Syed Hasan Askari, 'A copy of Dastur-ul-Amal', Proceedings of meetings, Indian Historical Records Commission, vol.XVIII, pp.184-87; Jānavālī: Prthvīnārāyaṇ Śah, pp.16-20, Acārya (ed.) DU, pp.24-25; IP, vol.II,pt.iii, pp.586-87. Since there is no unanimity in the lists, it may be assumed that some states, particularly minor and weaker ones, were often in the course of evolution and destruction, or absorption into some others, and because of their brief existence they were missed by the writers of Vaṃsāvalīs. Thus although the numbers may have been greater or less, the terms Bāisi and Čāubīṣī remained traditional for these two groups. After becoming king of Nepal in 1769 Prthvīnārāyaṇ turned his attention to the conquest of these states, which he could not accomplish. They were annexed to Nepal during the regency of Rājendralaksṇī (1777-85) and Bahādur Śāh (1785-94).
38. They meant that they would resist the invaders with all their energies and would not allow them to cross the western boundary of Gorkha formed by the Cepe river.

39. I.e. Gorkha, the ancestral seat and capital of the Šah kings of Gorkha. It is 52 miles west of Kāthmāndu by way of Nuwakot and 46 by way of Dhāding. The palace is situated on the top of a ridge called Hanūmān-bhanjyang.

40. Prince Udyot Sen of Pālpā. Pāthvīnārāyaṇa was born from his sister Kauśalyāvatī and thus Udyot Sen was his maternal uncle.

41. The shrine of Gorakhnāth (q.v. n.4) is situated near the palace in Gorkha.

42. The shrine of Nīlkaṇṭha, a name of Śiva, at Gosākūṇḍa. It is 40 miles north of Kāthmāndu and is the source of the Trisūlī river. It was then in the territory of Kāthmāndu.

43. The shrine of Paśupati, another name of Śiva, in Kāthmāndu. It is one of the oldest and the sacred place of pilgrimage for Hindus.

44. A village near the confluence of the Kālī (Kṣaṭpā) Gandaki with the Nārāyaṇi river. It is 52 miles north-west of Kāthmāndu. Here is an image of Śiva, called Mukundēśvar, set up Mukunda Sen I, King of Pālpā, who perhaps flourished in the sixteenth century (Ācārya, 'Tanahūko Sen-vamsa', p.66). After the subdivision of Pālpā, Deugnāt remained in the territory of Tanahū. It was the winter residence for the kings of this state.

45. Wrongly written for Pañcarātra, 'a period of five days (nights)', also called Bhīṣmaṇaṇcak, the religious festivals lasting five days and nights during the dark fortnight of Kartik (some time during October/November).

46. Misspelt for Kurukṣetra, the famous site of the Mahābhārata wars that took place between the Pāṇḍavas and Kāuravas. In the wars the Pāṇḍavas were victorious.

47. I.e. Lamjung, the capital of the state of the same name. It was the strongest states in the Cāubisi. It is nearly 32 miles in the north-west of Gorkhā. There had been a traditional rivalry and feud between the two houses of Gorkhā and Lamjung since 1559 when Dravya Šah, a prince of Lamjung, established his kingdom of Gorkhā independent of his brother who was the ruler of Lamjung (vide pp. 101, 150-51).

48. These were the prominent castes of Gorkhā. The Bāhuns (Brahmans) had in earlier times migrated from various parts of India to settle in the whole length of the southern strip and in the first and second range of the mountains in the Nepal Himalaya. The Khases, once inhabitants in the Himalayan range from Kashmir to Kumāū, seem to have settled in the Kālī and Karnālī regions during the eleventh century (Giuseppe Tucci: Nepal, pp.57,60). From this region they subsequently spread further towards the east as far as Ilām, the eastern extremity of modern Nepal. The Magars,
who belong to the Tibeto-Nepalese race and are Hinduised, are one of the ancient tribal peoples (vide pp. 108-9). The Thakurs claim to be of the pure Rajput origin and regard themselves superior to the Khases and Khatri, the latter progeny of Brahman fathers and Khas mothers (vide pp. 83, 2, 89). There is no ethnical evidence to support this claim. In features the Thakurs resemble other tribes of the Mongoloid race. The superiority which they claim may have been due to the power which they acquired by establishing their principalities in the Nepal Himalaya. It is interesting to note the order in which the four castes are mentioned by Prthvînîrâyanañ. It suggests the prominence held by each in his court.

49. Being a conveyance of the Lord Śiva, an ox is regarded sacred by the Hindus and hence it is a sin to ride on its back. It is however yoked to both plough and cart to which no sin is attached.

50. It was not Sāh as mentioned by Prthvînîrâyanañ but in all probability Sāhî, the title of the royal house of Lamjung, a suggestion which is supported by the title Sāhî used by the descendants of this house even today (vide HP, vol. 51, fo. 94, where Sāhî is written for Vārmardan, the son of Ripumardan; also IP, vol. I, pp. 67-68). Prthvînîrâyanañ had by this time adopted Sāh as his title (vide p. 82), and because of the fact that both the houses of Gorkhā and Lamjung derived from a common stock, he used it probably for the King of Lamjung as well.

51. I.e. Kālu Pāre, a Khatri. He was sixth in line from Gañēs Pāre, one of the close associates of Dravya Sāh, and of the illustrious family included in the Cha Thar (q.v. n.9). Kālu Pāre died in the course of the first invasion of Kīrtipur by Prthvînîrâyanañ in 1757 (vide p. 210). From two Pāres, Tulārām and Kālu, evolved two Pāre families; the former, a legitimate issue, was of a fair complexion and so his line of family is called Gora ('fair') Pāre; the latter being born of a Magar mother, and hence illegitimate, was of a dark complexion. Vānīśīdhar was his real name. He was however nicknamed Kālu ('blackie') and thus his line of family became known as Kāla ('black') Pāre.

52. The treaty for which Kālu Pāre is credited provided for an agreement between Gorkhā and Lamjung to the effect that either side could increase its territory without any interference from the other and if required either side would send troops to the assistance of the other. It also laid down that Gorkhā and Lamjung were to extend their respective territories, the former as far as Sindhu in the east and the latter as far as Arghāū in the territory of Kāskī in the west (vide pp. 153-54).

53. Ācārya (ed.): DU, p. 25, has quoted a few of these sacred books: Manusmṛti, 7.54; Kāmandakīya Nītisāra, 4.25; Mahābhārata: Sāntiparva, 85.11.

54. For the appointment of Kālu Pāre to ministership vide pp. 154-56. Virāj Bakhetī was later a Najīkī (aide-de-camp) of Prthvînîrâyanañ (IP, vol. 1, p. 125, col. 2).
55. The Basnyātās (modern spelling Basnet) became conspicuous in the time of Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ, the most prominent among them being Śivarāmaśīha and his sons. Śivarāmaśīha was the first Basnet to hold a high rank. He became a Sardār (military commander). He died in Sāgaḍok in the course of the second invasion of Cāgu in 1755. His second son Keharsimha (written here Kehersimha), who rose to be a Kajī, took part in a number of campaigns undertaken by Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ. He was killed in action in Satahū in 1771 in the course of campaigns against the Cāubīs. Śivarāmaśīha’s third son Abhimānaśīha became a Sardār. He was mainly credited with the conquests of the east, Cāudāṇḍi and Morang. Śivarāmaśīha’s fourth and the youngest son Dhāukalasimha (1746–1802) was a counsellor in Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ’s time.

56. It is curious that Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ does not give credit to other tribes the members of which played equally gallant roles in the success of his campaigns leading to the conquest of Makwānpur in 1762, of the Nepal Valley in 1769, and of Cāudāṇḍi and Morang in 1773 and 1774 respectively. No doubt the Pāres and Basnets, particularly Kālu Pāre and Śivarāmaśīha Basnet and their sons, played conspicuous roles in the realization of his ambition. In Nepalese accounts we have a galaxy of men such as Vaṁśarāj, Dāmodar, Raṇasūr (sons of Kālu Pāre); Nāharsiṃha, Keharsiṃha, Abhimānaśīha, Dhāukalasimha (sons of Śivarāmaśīha Basnet); Raṇakesar, Gajkesar, Karvīr, Raṇajaṅga, Raṇadal (sons of Dāmodar Pāre); Jaharsiṃha, Kīrtisiṃha, Bakhtavārasiṃha (sons of Keharsiṃha Basnet), etc., who served Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ and his successors in various capacities to build modern Nepal. Janga Bahadur, the Rāṇa Prime Minister, eliminated members of these families from the high offices traditionally conferred upon them.

57. This was a region which comprised the villages of Goplang, Bhusundī, Choprāk, Appīpal Bhanjyang, Mīrkoṭ, Gālkure, etc. It lay between the Cepe and Dārāṇḍi rivers, surrounding the fort of Liglig, and north-west of Gorkhā (Ācārya, ed.:DU, p.26). The meaning of the phrase is not certain. Ācārya in a letter informs me that kings used to give a birā of betel leaves to officers entrusted with some specified duties and that the acceptance of the birā implied an oath of allegiance. Birā is a folded betel leaf dressed inside with aromatic spices, and in some cases dressed outside either with thin silver or gold plate. So gautāṅko birā means, Ācārya says, the region where such officers were posted. Since there was a constant danger of being attacked unawares in that quarter by the troops from Lamjung, Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ had to post his officers to these strategical villages to ward off any sporadic attacks. Ācārya is inclined to interpret birā in this way, considering Gorkhā’s vulnerability from the side of Lamjung. But an Abstract Noun (birā) is not possible from a Noun (birā) in Nepali grammar which permits such a formation from a Verb only. So birāi, an Abstract Noun (as is clear from the formative suffix -āi), is derivable from /birāmuu/, a Verb, meaning ‘to commit a mistake; to make land fit for agriculture’, and hence gautāṅko birāi means ‘pasture-land made arable’ (cf. ġautāṅ <*goṭṭhān < Sk. gosṭhāna- ‘pasture-
land', for which modern Nepali has gocar; and birāi, 'arableness, arability'). Perhaps the region, originally a pasture-land, was turned to cultivation and peopled by men in charge of the defensive strategies stationed there.

58. I.e. Sallyān Fort. It is 8 miles east of Gorkhā. In Sallyān there is a tableland which is cultivated during the rains. This kind of tableland is called Ħār in Nepali. On account of the tableland Sallyān has another name Sallyān Ħār.

59. Rānā is a sept of Magars. In some temples of Sallyān, Nuwākoṭ (eastern), Kāthmāndu, Banepā, etc. there are even now non-Brahman priests in Hindu temples: e.g. Magars, Nevārs and gṛhastha Sannyāsīs, i.e. descendants of the celebrated ascetics who broke their vows and returned to domestic life.

60. Modern spelling Borlāṅg Ghāṭ, a place about 6 miles east of Gorkhā.

61. A ridge on the western bank of the Trīśūlī.

62. I.e. Khincet, on the western bank of the Trīśūlī.

63. I.e. Vetravatī, a river which after flowing parallel and to the south of the Trīśūlī merges with it at the place of the same name (Vetravatī) about 6 miles north of Nuwākoṭ. The valley of the confluence, which in Nepali is called beni, is also called Vetravatī. At the confluence there is a shrine of the goddess Indrānī (written here Indrayeni), a name of Durgā. Indrānī is reckoned as one of the eight mothers (mātghā) or divine energies (Monier-Williams: Sanskrit-English Dictionary).

64. Shrine of the goddess Indrānī Bhairavī (written here Indrayani Bhairabī). Bhairavī is a particular form of Durgā.

65. Mahāmaṇḍal (misspelt here) is the highest peak of Nuwākoṭ, 2 miles north-east of it, on which there was a fort of the Malla kings of Kāthmāndu, but now desolate. Speaking of it as a co-wife of Nuwākoṭ, Pṛthvī- nārāyaṇ meant two equally important components of Nuwākoṭ: the fort and the peak.

66. Gyāmī (also Gyangmī) is a branch of the Rānā Magars to which Jayanta Rānā, the person referred to here simply as Gyāmi Rānā, belonged. Narbhpāl Sāh had in 1737 sent troops under his command to invade Nuwākoṭ. But it met with serious reverses which were solely attributed to the incompetence of the Magars. In the purge Jayanta Rānā was dismissed. Subsequent to his dismissal he joint Jayapraṅkāś Malla, King of Kāthmāndu (1735-68), who stationed him at Nuwākoṭ as its officer in charge. Realizing him to be dangerous, since he had inside information about his troops, Pṛthvī- nārāyaṇ invited him to come again to his service, but he flatly refused.

68. I.e. Saturday, 16 September 1744. (vide p. 165).

69. The sentence in the text is incomplete and hence difficult to interpret.

70. Ācārya (ed.): DU, p. 10, n. 4, interprets the jethī tarbār as meaning 'sword used to kill a commander'. It is not clear however what he means by this in this connection. According to Nepalese tradition members of the royal family have to undergo a certain type of initiation. This involves the decapitation of a goat or a buffalo in one stroke. The ceremony is usually part of the Navarātra festivals. If the decapitation is successful some honour is conferred upon the young prince by the monarch. Evidence from other source (Prthvīnārāyaṇa Sāṅko Ājati, p. 42) suggests that Dalmardan went into the action described in the text without his brother's knowledge and achieved distinction by decapitating Śāṅkhamāni Rānā. My own view is that in reward for this deed of bravery the sword with which Dalmardan performed the act was thereupon honoured with the title jethī tarbār, as though the beheading of the distinguished foe in the battle were the equivalent of the usual sacrificial rite.

71. The person Dalmardan decapitated was Jayanta Rānā's son Śāṅkhamāni Rānā. (vide p. 166).

72. In 1744 (vide p. 166). Prthvīnārāyaṇa however does not mention his first unsuccessful invasion of Nuwākot which took place in 1742 (vide pp. 144-45).

73. I.e. Kakanī and Śivapurī. These two places controlled the Nepal Valley from the northern perimeter. Kakanī, a hamlet which derived its name from a mountain of the same name (elevation 7,000 ft.), is 10 miles north-west of Kāthmāndū. The highway to Nuwākot passes through it. Śivapurī, which Prthvīnārāyaṇa occupied in 1759 (vide p. 217), is a mountain to the north of the Nepal Valley, from the northern slope of which issues the Bāgmatī river and from the southern the Viṣṇumatī. Both these rivers flow through the Valley. It is the highest peak in the mountain perimeter which encircles the Valley. Both these mountains rise from the eastern bank of the Trisūlī river, and are joined by lower ranges to Mañicūḍa mountain and Mahādeva Pokhāri in the north-east of the Valley.

74. I.e. Paraśurāma Thāpā, the minister of Raṇajitsimha Malla, King of Bhatgāū (1722-69). For some time a close ally of Prthvīnārāyaṇa, Paraśurāma later dissociated himself from him (vide pp. 175-76, 178, 198-200).

75. Nothing further is known about this person.

76. The money referred to here is called lāṣ bīṣi ('one lakh and twenty') traditionally used to denote an amount sent by a king to another king as a financial aid in military operation against a common enemy. The common enemy for both Jayapraķas Malla and the Čāubīsī kingships was Gorkhā (vide also Prthvīnārāyaṇa Sāṅko Ājati, p. 28).
77. I.e. Pokhra, the place situated on the western bank of the Seti Gapjakí river (also called Pátálgángá). This place is celebrated for its lakes. It is about 30 miles west of Gorkhá, and was then in the territory of Káskí, one of the Cáubisí kingships. 

78. I.e. Jhagal Gurung. Nothing further is known about this person.

79. A very thin sword tied around the waist and thus carried without being noticed. The word given in the text is kotášán (modern spelling kotákhan) which is a compound of kot, 'weapon', and khân, 'store'. Only the highly skilled craftsmen could make it and veteran swordsmen could wield it with dexterity. On account of its rarity and being regarded as a prized weapon it verily epitomised all the weapons then in use. This weapon is no longer in use.

80. A kind of fish allied to carp. Since Pokhra was then a flourishing market-place, it is quite probable that Jhagal Gurung carried the fish, apparently a delicacy for the hill-people, pretending to sell it and thus keeping his identity and mission secret.


82. Vide Letters nos. 2, 3, 5, 9; also IP, vol. II, pt. iii, p. 463 (Letters nos. 2, 6).

83. The narrative ends here and what follows was perhaps written later as it relates not to campaigns but to Prthvínaráyan's policy. The following sections deal with his defensive strategy, administrative and judicial measures, economic policy, military reorganization, etc. Obviously there is a big lacuna which shows either the text abruptly ends here with the conquest of the Nepal Valley or the scribe omitted the details dealing with the remaining campaigns. The memoirs are not a coherent whole which hence show that they embody what Prthvínaráyan may have spoken piecemeal from time to time and that the fragments were pieced together after his death. The extant text mentioned at the end of the printed text is said to have been written in about 1800 A.D.

84. Prthvínaráyan uses this simile to point out the delicate position of Nepal like that of a yam which in mountain grows and thrives precariously in a small crevice between two blocks of stones.

85. Prthvínaráyan was very sharp to realize the hegemony which China exercised over Tibet, the country north of Nepal.

86. I.e. the Government of the English East India Company which then controlled the Indian Ocean, and had acquired a great political and military power in the subcontinent. Prthvínaráyan was always suspicious of the East India Company because of their assistance to Jayaprakáś against him in 1767 (vide pp. 254 ff).

87. I.e. Hindusthán (India), so called because of its being the land of the Hindus ( < Hindu + sthána- , 'the place of the Hindus').
88. Text, Cure, the foothills of the Sivalik range, which run through the Tarai strip of Nepal.

89. For the Hindus any river is regarded as the Ganges and hence holy. Here the Ganges could be the celebrated Ganges. Even during the Prime Ministership of Bhimsen Thapa (1804-37) the Nepalese dreamt of extending their frontier to the Ganges (Acarya (ed.): Purana kavi ra kavitā, p.106, verse 20).

90. Perhaps the Government of the English East India Company, the Moghul Emperor of Delhi, the Emperor of China and the Czar of Russia. It is however doubtful if Prthvinārāyaṇ realized the power of the Czar.

91. These places, some of which were in the outskirts of the Nepal Valley and some farther from it, controlled the highways to it and were hence strategically important. So Prthvinārāyaṇ intended to fortify them and make them military stations. For Śivapurī vide n.73. Phulcok mountain (elevation 9,050 ft.), the southern boundary of the Valley, is 10 miles south of Kāthmāndū. For Candragiri vide n.23. Mahādeva Pokhari, a ridge (elevation 7,133 ft.) in the north-east of the Valley, forms its boundary in that quarter. It derives its name from a tank (pokhari) situated on the crest. An intermediate range of hills joins it to Manicūḍa mountain in the north-east of the Valley, and a spur, Rānīcok, joins it to Phulcok mountain. Pālung, a ridge (elevation 8,490 ft.) having the hamlet of the same name, is 35 miles south-west of Kāthmāndū. Through this passes the Trisūlī river. Dāpcā is a strategic ridge on the highway to the eastern Nepal, in the east of which passes the Sun Kosī river. Kāhulyā (modern spelling Kāhule), a peak (elevation 9,000 ft.) of the Bhīrbandī mountain, is 17 miles to the north-west of Kāthmāndū. It stretches in the east to be joined with Kakanī mountain. Over the pass between these two mountains runs the highway to Nuwākoṭ. On Kāhule a fort stood formerly. It was the first place to be occupied by Prthvinārāyaṇ when he advanced towards the Valley after the occupation of Nuwākoṭ (Kirk-patrick, op.cit., p.140).

92. He seems to be the first king of the Bāisī and Čaubisī to have introduced a code for social and administrative reforms. This code is known as Rām Śahko thiti (q.v. G.VY, pp.25-33, 39-40). By this he introduced administrative and judicial systems, pañcāvat (village- or local councils), weights and measures, court manners, rates of interest, etc. This also laid rules for preserving forests and trees, boundary demarcations, allotment of pasture-land and its preservation, trial of witches, etc. These reforms made Gorkhā famous, whence the proverbial saying: bidyā harāe Kāśī jānū nivā harāe Gorkhā jānū ('if learning vanishes one should go to Kāśī and if administration of justice is absent one should go to Gorkhā').

93. Written for Jaya Sthiti Malla, King of Nepal (fourteenth century) who is chiefly famous for his social reforms, particularly the reorganization of Newār society according to the Hindu caste system and duties
to be performed by each caste. For his reforms vide Jñavālī: Nepal upatyakāko madhyakāḷīn itihās, pp.80-84; also HP, vol.50, fo.40, vol.60, fos. 171-72.

94. I.e. Mahendra Malla, King of Kāṭhmāṇḍu (sixteenth century). By his social code he banned gambling, established courts of law in each tola (residential area) and village, enforced economic measures to build up the country's economy. He was particular to see that his subjects took their meals at fixed hours and did not starve. His code is printed in the text of DU, pp.22-23.

95. Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ however did not draw up the code he intended to prescribe, although some measures which he introduced show that he had begun to do so. His successors Raṇa Bahādur Šāh (1777-1804) and Rājendravikram Šāh (1816-46) did prescribe their codes which however were largely based on Rām Šāh's code (vide HP, vol.60, fos.159-64, vol.59, fos.62-65).

96. During Rām Šāh's time Gorkha had 12,000 houses, i.e. to say family units and so governance of a country was traditionally known as governance of 12,000 irrespective of the number of houses (Ācārya (ed.):DU, p.27).

97. By the eastern route is meant perhaps the Morang route through which Gosaīns (Hindu mendicants) carried on their trade with Tibet. The western route was perhaps the trade route to Tibet via Mustāṅg (vide p.321). Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ intended to close these routes through which traders of India carried on trade with Tibet and the provinces of Bengal and Bihar to the detriment of Nepal. So he intended to open the commercial route through the Kāṭhmāṇḍu Valley only in order to have a check on unauthorized traders and on smuggled goods as well.

98. Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ fully understood the roles of caste and their peculiar characteristics (Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ Śāko jīvani, p.30). Some Brahmins in his service who besides being gallant fighters were equally prudent in diplomatic manoeuvres. Khases who were by far the largest majority served him loyally in various capacities. Magars too showed their capabilities comparable with those of Brahmins and Khases. Ṭhakurs and Gurungs were the minorities, although his brothers and some others, all of whom were Ṭhakurs, were none the less associated with his campaigns. Having become the master of the new regions comprising the states of Makwānpur, the Nepal Valley, Caudāṇḍī and Morang, where tribes and castes other than those of Gorkhā dwelt, Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ may have thought it necessary to prescribe a code for the peculiar duties to be performed by all these various castes and tribes of the Tarai and the Hills where various institutions prevailed, as he was concerned with the reorganization of the whole society.

99. Stone was metaphorically used to imply 'kingdom' in the jargon of Gorkhā, suggesting thereby all virtues: solidity, compactness, strength, integrity, etc., associated with stone. For decades the people of the
Nepal Valley were divided amongst themselves. They were prone to violent bickerings, too easily provoked to drift. These were largely responsible for the collapse of their kingdoms. By the time Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ conquered them they were completely tired and despondent. So he found them cold in every respect: they lacked the enthusiasm, military acumen and adventurous spirit, enterprise and zeal for which they were once famous.

100. The Newārs of the Nepal Valley were an artistic people and hence used to finery which to Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ appeared outward show and nothing else.

101. The people of the Nepal Valley mostly drank water from wells which were not hygienic and so they suffered from diseases. Their poor physical state made them mentally unhealthy. Pratāp Malla, King of Kāṭhmāñḍu (1641-75) had constructed some panālis (artificial reservoirs fed by water running in from a canal) (T.W. Clark, 'The Rāṇī Pokhri Inscription, Kāṭhmāñḍu', Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, vol.XX, 1957, pp.175-76). But they were inadequate.

102. A ridge (elevation 6,000 ft.) to the west of Thānkoṭ and seven miles from Kāṭhmāñḍu. It controlled routes to Tanaḥū and the Nepal Valley, from that quarter. Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ laid special emphasis on strategy and since he had still to deal with the Çaubīś, and danger from Tanaḥū persisted, he selected Dahacok for his headquarters. Moreover, being situated on a higher altitude than that of the Nepal Valley and hence of a salubrious climate, the place was considered fit to live in. But it was a rugged ridge and remained to be developed, which in the context of his subsequent campaigns he had no time to do. On the contrary he found Kāṭhmāñḍu a ready-made seat worthy of being a capital as it was endowed with a cultural heritage and provided all the facilities that made it a worthy capital. A Nepalese account has a very interesting reference to his choice of seat after the conquest of the Nepal Valley. He found that Pāṭāṇ had a tradition of being a constant source of troubles to its kings, Bhāṭgāū was a place where subjects were oppressed, and Kāṭhmāñḍu always gave troubles to the ministers. Therefore he preferred Kāṭhmāñḍu to the other two since it had no tradition of oppressing its kings and people (IP, vol.I, p.128, col.1).

103. The word des here clearly means India, though Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ uses the same word in other contexts with different meaning, e.g. foreign country (DU, p.13, lines 11,13), his own country (ibid., lines 16,18), foreign country (ibid., p.14, line 1).

104. Misspelt for Garh Parsā (Parsā Fort). It is about 62 miles south of Kāṭhmāñḍu in the Tarai district of Parsā which owes its name to the shrine of Pārasnāth (a name of Śiva) (Ācārya, 'Bhagvān Pārasnāth', Sāradā, year 14, no.12 (2005 V.S. = 1949 A.D.). During Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ's time it controlled the highway leading to the Nepal Valley through Makwānpur. His son and successor Pratāpsiśāh Šāh used to reside here during the
winter (Hamilton, op.cit., p.196). Kinloch occupied it during his retreat from Hariparpur and it was held by the British for two years after which it was handed back to the Nepal Government (vide p. 279, n.1). It was not considered strategically important after 1814 and has since been abandoned. The remains of the fort may be seen even now. The traditional route was finally abandoned when the Rana Prime Minister Candradzamsher constructed in 1927 another easier route, partly by railway and partly by track, from Birganj to the Kathmandu Valley.

105. I.e. Kirāt, the land of the Kirāti (in pedantic speech Kirātav) tribesmen of the Rāi and Limbā septs. The land stretches from the Sun Kosi to the Tamar rivers in the east. This was conquered by Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ in 1774 shortly before his death (vide pp. 299 ff).

106. The number could not mean population or the houses. It is quite likely the amount of the revenue it yielded per year (vide Papers respecting the Nepaul War, p.36). In HP, vol. 60, fo. 248 (reverse) Naulakha Kirāt is mentioned as a synonym of Majh Kirāt (central Kirāt, i.e. the region between the Sun Kosi and Arun rivers).

107. The two varieties of indigenous handmade cloth. Cyāgā is white and for men, whereas Pāgā, which is coloured, is for women (Ācārya (ed.): DU, p. 28).

108. Indian cloth, especially broadcloth, was then much in demand in Nepal and Tibet. Besides making Nepal over-dependent on India it caused a financial drainage of the country's resources also. Therefore Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ intended to make it in his own country.

109. Quite possibly Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ was inspired by measures similar to those of Mahendra Malla (q.v. n.94) who had made clear to his subjects the importance of weaving cloth in the country, of selling the country's products outside in order to increase the wealth and status of the people and the country, of going to other states and returning after secretly acquiring knowledge and proficiency of new and improved methods and techniques of handicrafts, and be prepared to die rather than divulge the country's secrets if arrested.

110. It was the system of the Śah kings of Nepal to farm out revenue, especially of the Tarai districts, a practice which continued as late as 1846. Even after that contracts for mineral products, export of skin and hides, customs duties of export and import were given to the highest bidders, generally for five years, a system which continued throughout the Rāṇa rule (1846-51). Since 1951 customs duties are realized by the Government itself though contracts for some mineral products, and for the export of skin and hides are given to contractors. Even today contracts Contractors of skin and hides are invariably Muslims of India.

111. Officers in charge of the collection of revenue were required to submit annually statements of accounts. The king or officers after auditing the accounts gave clearance certificates to the persons concerned.
112. Perhaps Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ realized the nefarious roles of the numerous cantankerous ministers of Pātan who were steeped in building up their own power and wealth at the cost of their own state, a practice which facilitated Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ's conquest of the state.

113. The sentence in the text is incomplete.

114. The use of berna (varna), 'community' is wrongly made for the caste, and that of jāt (jāti), 'caste', for community. In Hindu society there are four varnas (Brahman, Kṣatriya, Vaiśya and Śūdra) and the number of jātis (castes) varies from place to place. There are now in Nepal more than thirty-six castes.

115. The post of Kapardār (keeper of the royal wardrobe and jewelry and manager of the royal kitchen) was introduced by Rām Sān who laid down that the Magars of the Āle, Thāpā and Rānā clans should be appointed to this post in rotation (GVY, p.33). The person referred to here is Kālu Khārkā, who was mentioned for the last time in the invasion of Bhātgaū in 1769 (HP, vol.51, fo.221). He was father of Ravisimha Khārkā who was alive when B.H. Hodgson was British Resident in Kathmāndu (HP, vol.74, fo.101).

116. There is no documentary evidence of the descendants of Śivarāmśimha Basnet and Kālu Pāre being given the responsibilities as mentioned here either during Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ's own times or those of his successors. By Kālu Pāre Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ may also have meant another Kālu Pāre, a Brahman, and not the celebrated one (q.v. n.51). Kālu Pāre, the Brahman, is mentioned as having established cordial foreign relations with as many as twenty-two rulers (IP, vol.1, p.125, col.2; HP, vol.51, fo.73). He was alive as late as 1774 and was mentioned in a letter by Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ (Letter no. 13, p.72).

The word Bhoṣ is used by Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ in two contexts. Here it means Tibet. In other contexts it means the region in his country, which is situated in higher altitudes of the Himalaya where peoples of Tibetan origin migrated from Tibet to settle. The places which are known as Bhoṣ are Chākṛā Bhoṣ, Mustāṅg Bhoṣ, Maṅāṅg Bhoṣ, Lārke Bhoṣ, Rui Bhoṣ, etc. These are in central Nepal and west of Rasuṅ beyond which the regions inhabited by the people of Tibetan origin are not called Bhoṣ, e.g. Helmu, Solu, Khumbu, Pharak, etc.

117. For the Pāṛe (modern spelling Pāre or Pāṇḍe or Pāṇḍeyā), Basnyāt (modern spelling Basnet) and Magar vide notes 51, 55 and 48 respectively. The Panthas (modern Panta) are either Brahmans or Khaṭṛī Chetṛīs (the latter if the progeny of Pantha Brahmans from their Khas wives). By Panthas Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ perhaps meant descendants of Maheśvar Panta and Bali Panta (vide p.145).

118. The appointment of officers in rotation seems a characteristic feature of the Sāh kings of Gorkhā. It continued when they became rulers of Nepal, but the appointments were made only for one year after
which they were screened. The screening took place once every year. It was called pajani, meaning 'selection, choice'.

119. Prthvînârâyana was quick to realize the importance of military strength unlike Râm Sâh who stated that the main strength of the king was his treasury (GVY, p.17).

120. In Nepal farmers of the land employed by landlords to produce crops have to pay a specified share to the landlords and keep the customary one for themselves. Therefore those who till their own land and produce crops would be in a position to keep both the shares for themselves.

121. A title of office borrowed from the administrative system of the Moghuls. Subedârs were governors of provinces. Prthvînârâyana used this title for the commander of a Company.

122. It is not known whether seven was the total number of senior officers of one rank or of different ranks in the descending order of seniority. The text has Pagari (lex., 'turban') which implies that they were commissioned officers distinguished by their turban which had probably the badge denoting their respective ranks. As late as 1835-37 Pagari meant higher ranks, e.g. commissioned officers. Army lists of this period (vide HP, vol.71, fos.29-32) distinguish between Pagari and Huddâ, two groups of ranks. In the former there were excepting in Leţar (? Artillery) Company, Kaptân (Captain), Kummedân (? Commandant), Subedâr, Kharâdâr (otherwise Khardâr), Mejâr (Major) Ajîțan (Adjutant), Kotyâ (otherwise Kote) and Jamâdâr. The Leţar had two more, Vicârî in place of Mejâr who was above Jamâdâr, and Vaidya (Physician) below Kotyâ. Acârya (ed.): DU, p.29, thinks that the seven ranks mentioned in the text are in this order: Jamâdâr, Sârjâng (Sergeant), Nisân (Ensign), Ajîțan (Adjutant), Bhât (Minstrel), Purâhît (Priest) and Bajânâikyâ (Bandmaster). But in the Nepalese accounts of Prthvînārayaṇa's time we find references only to Umrâva, Sardâr, Ajîțan, Mîr, Bhât, Nagarcî (Drummer), Bânâdâr (Musician), Huddâ and Sipâhî.

123. It is also not known whether sixteen was the total number of the junior officers or the number of the officers of different ranks. The text has Huddâ which means corporal senior to the private. In all probability the Huddâs were non-commissioned officers, for in HP, vol.71, fos. 71-77, Huddâ meant junior officers below Jamâdâr, i.e. Havaldâr, Amâldâr, Khalâsîs(coolies), Pîpâs(Tent-makers) and Sepoys.

124. I.e. Gurung, another tribal people of Nepal. Like the Magars the Gurungs are also Tibeto-Nepalese (vide p. 110). They had also their principalities or chieftainships which were gradually conquered by the kings of Gorkhâ, and also probably by those of Lamjung and Kâskî. Earlier in Prthvînârayaṇa's army we do not find them holding any prominent ranks. That is why perhaps he did not mention them along with the Bâhun, Khas, Magar and Thakuri soldiers (vide n.48). Perhaps later on they
proved their martial qualities and were taken in military service. Still they were a minority. There was one Jhāgal Gurung who was Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ's trusted servant (vide n.78).

125. Lord of Heaven.

126. The statement is a picturesque exaggeration.

127. By this system the Śāh kings made the descendants of deceased soldiers traditionally obliged and loyal to them. Moreover, this system provided them with valiant fighters who kept the glorious tradition of their illustrious forefathers.

128. Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ knew how to appease soldiers and keep them loyal to him. That is why foreigners too came to be taken in his military service. There were three Muslims from Lucknow whom he had appointed as Adjutants and through them he had got his soldiers trained as riflemen (n. 143). Apart from them there were two Frenchmen who were in charge of casting cannon (vide p.310).

129. Khases and Brahmans had by this time settled throughout the whole of the mid-Himalayan and lower Himalayan regions in Nepal. They were in the higher ranking services of many principalities outside Gorkhā. We find them in the services of the Malla kings of the Nepal Valley, in the kingdoms of Makwanpur, Gāudāṇḍī and Vijayapur (Morang). Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ may have doubted the loyalty of these outsiders as they were unlike those of Gorkhā who ever remained loyal to him. It is quite possible that accomplices of his brothers, who towards the end of his career began to intrigue against him, may have been Khases and Brahmans from outside Gorkhā. He always guarded himself against the intrigues of Brahmans, cunning of Khases and the inscrutability of Magars. He believed them to be prone to their respective inherent characteristics and consequently rendered them incapable of doing any harm to him (Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ Śāko jīvanī, p.30).

130. Lex., 'top of a hillock', regional subdivision made for strategical and administrative purposes. Rām Śāh had divided Gorkhā into seven Thums and stationed one Dvāre (lex., 'gate-keeper'), i.e. frontier guard, or Umrāva (Commandant) at each (GVY, pp.48-49). The three Thums mentioned here are Liglig, Sallyān and Dhāding, which, as it appears from the text, were made stronger by Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ (DU, p.17, line 18). This he had to do as a part of his strategy to guard Gorkhā's frontiers. Liglig guarded it from the invasion of Lamjung from the north-west, Sallyān guarded it from the invasion of Nuwākoṭ (the territory under Kāthmāṇḍu) from the east, and Dhāding guarded it from the invasion of Tanahā and Pāṭan in the south-west and south. Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ however does not mention other strategical outposts in the north, a fact which shows there was little danger from Tibet even in the initial phase of his campaigns though in view of the good relations then existing between Tibet and the Nepal Valley there must have always been a possibility of an invasion of Tibet by way of Kukurghāṭ, Gorkhā's frontier with Tibet near Kerung.
131. Probably the land, either producing 240 muris or measuring 240 ropanis. In the Hills the land is measured in terms of the gross annual produce of crops. 1 ropani = 4 muris, 1 muri = 72 sq.yds. 1 ropani of land produces about 800 lbs. of crops in one year. In Pṛthvīnāraṇya's time emoluments of servants of the state were mostly paid in kind or in land. Army officers or commandants were given land called khuvā (lex., 'milk condensed in a lump', a prized Nepali delicacy) in accordance with their emoluments called Ḫāngī (< Persian khāngī, 'pertaining to domestic affairs'). The holding of the land varied according to the status or rank of the individuals. A part of the produce or revenue of the land (which was also paid in kind) was utilised for their own emoluments and the rest was utilised as the emoluments for the soldiers or other employees serving under them. The land given to such officers or commandants no longer remained under their names when dismissed or dead. The king, however, under his discretion could grant the land to such officers whether in or out of service, or to their descendants to enjoy it/perpetuity as their own private property. The khuvā then was called bīrtā (freehold land).

132. According to a treaty made by Mahendra Malla, King of Kāṭhmāṇḍū (sixteenth century), kings of this state began to supply Tibet with their mohars (silver coins) against the silver bullion brought in by Tibetan merchants. 12% commission was charged for this transaction. Kāṭhmāṇḍū made a great deal of profit out of this transaction. The privilege, rather monopoly, of supplying coins to Tibet was also subsequently shared by Bhātgāu towards the end of the seventeenth century. These coins were called Mahendramallīs after Mahendra Malla who had first coined mohars. But the coins of the later kings of Kāṭhmāṇḍū and Bhātgāu, Jayaprakāś Malla (regnal years 1735-68) and Ranajitśīṁha Malla (regnal years 1722-69), became debased. When Pṛthvīnāraṇya conquered Kāṭhmāṇḍū in 1768 a large number of such Mahendramallīs were current in Tibet. He was against coining debased coins. But the pure coinage supplied to Tibet would have been at par with the earlier debased coins. Hence he put an end to this practice of issuing debased coins. He also withdrew from circulation all the debased Mahendramallīs then current in his country. Disputes arose with Tibet regarding the supply of coins. The Tibetans even threatened a war in 1768 (Kirkpatrick, op.cit., pp.211-12, 339-40; also 217; E.H. Walsh, 'The coinage of Nepal', Journal of Royal Asiatic Society, 1908, pp.684-85, 691-92). The deadlock continued even after the death of Pṛthvīnāraṇya, which ultimately led to Nepal–China Wars (1791-92).

During those days a coin if pure, irrespective of its origin, was freely accepted as a medium of commercial transactions, its value being determined by the weight of the metal it contained. Pṛthvīnāraṇya realized the importance of a pure coinage and emphasised the necessity for it. By so doing he had not only meant to maintain Nepal's traditional commercial transaction with Tibet but with other neighbouring countries as well. Even in India the absence of a standard
54

coinage until 1771 caused much inconvenience to trade and it gave an occasion to money-changers for undue exploitation by charging discount. A regulation, issued in 1771 by the President and Governor of the Calcutta Council of the English East India Company, standardised the coinage by making sicca money standard in the Company's territories. This coinage also determined the value of other coinage also. The new coinage was issued in September 1771 (Fort William - India House Correspondence, vol. VI, Intr. lvii-lviii).

133. A judicial court.

134. Chief officer of a judicial court, usually spelt Diṣṭṭhā.

135. Assistant to the chief officer of a judicial court, usually spelt Vicārī.

136. I.e. Paṇḍit, called Dharmādhikār, who expounded the Dharmaśāstras and interpreted the customary law.

137. The list shows Prthvīnārāyaṇa's devotion to the mendicants of all sects and creeds (vide also notes 27, 28).

138. Dhotī is a cloth which is tied at the waist and falls down the knees. According to the traditional custom, when given as a gift it must be accompanied by a scarf which is hung on the left shoulder. While performing worship or religious rites a scarf must invariably be hung on one's shoulder. Hence Prthvīnārāyaṇa mentions both together.

139. The name of Raṇajitśimha Mallā does not appear in the text. But from the context it is clear that Prthvīnārāyaṇa refers to him. At first an ally of Prthvīnārāyaṇa, Raṇajitśimha later on turned hostile to him realizing his intention of conquering the Nepal Valley. It was not Raṇajitśimha but Jayaprakāś who had sent for some naked mendicants to drive away Prthvīnārāyaṇ from the Valley, though from what Prthvīnārāyaṇ says it is probable that Raṇajitśimha had helped Jayaprakāś in their procurement and by allowing them to pass through his territories. But they were slaughtered to a man in the Banepā Valley (vide pp. 234-35).

140. The reference here is to the expedition sent by Nawab Mir Kasim of Bengal against Nepal in 1762/63 (vide pp. 227-30).

141. For the possible person vide p. 269, n.1.

142. Misspelt for Lucknow.

143. The names of them are perhaps Sheikh Zorāwar, Mohammad Taqī and Viqār Siddīq. It is difficult however to reconstruct the third name since it ends in -siḥā [?] siṁha], a title not used in Muslim names. Viqar Siddiq could have been vulgarised as Bheṣārṣīm. Sheikh Zorāwar died in the course of the first unsuccessful invasion of Kīrtipur in 1757 (HP, vol. 51, fo. 104).

144. I.e. Adjutants.

145. Text, Tillaṅgā, a name conventionally used for rifleman. The British officers of the East India Company trained their riflemen first of all
in Telangānā in South India. Hence they were called Tilaṅgā by the Indians. The word was also used by Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ for the riflemen (Ācārya (ed.): DU, p. 30).

146. From the statement of Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ it appears that there were some history books of Nepal which had stated that the country would be under the suzerainty of the Turks, Magars and Moghals. But the books are not known now.

147. The Muslim rulers, Babar and his descendants, who ruled India.

148. The reference is to Shamsuddin Iliyas Shah who had invaded the Nepal Valley in 1350 and returned after destroying some temples and images of gods and goddesses (Jñavālī: Nepal upatyakāko madhyakālīn itihās, pp. 68-72). The Turks were the first invaders of Bengal and so all the subsequent Muslim invaders, whether Afghans or Pathans, were called Turks by the people of north India. Shamsuddin Iliyas Shah was ruler of Bengal from 1345 to 1357.

149. Magars were once masters of a number of places in the Sapta Gaṇḍakī region. Considering their martial qualities and a number of chieftainships they held Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ does not doubt the statement made in the history books of Nepal that the country could have been under their suzerainty.

150. It may be inferred from the statement that Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ believed that he was successful in preventing Nepal from being overrun by the Moghuls by embodying Muslim soldiers in his army and utilising their training and equipment for his own purpose.

151. Garkhā is a subdivision of a district. It is bigger than a Thum (q.v. n. 130).

152. A kind of stringed musical instrument.

153. The spring festival at the approach of the vernal equinox (commonly called Holi). It is celebrated during the ten days preceding the full moon of the month of Phālguna, when people sprinkle red powder or coloured water in sport and light fires (MW).

154. Text, gaman which means 'movement'. But the meaning does not fit in. Perhaps the word was magan, meaning 'happy, free from anxiety', which by a scribal error has been written gaman.
CHAPTER III

TRANSLATION OF PRAȚHVINARAYAN ŚÅH’S LETTERS

LETTER NO. 1

This letter brings my due respects to Hari Paṇḍit.

Everything here is all right and I hope everything is well there. If that is so I shall be very happy.

Your letter has arrived. Its contents have been understood.

What you have humbly written is proper. But you have delayed a little. This is a work which is to be done quickly. Henceforth do not delay. Keep on sending news of that place as quickly as you can and as soon as you get it.

You write that you went to Kuti; and that the Tibetans

1. The letter is unpublished. The photograph of the original has been kindly supplied by Pandit Bāburām Acārya of Kālāhamū (Nepal).

2. Possibly Harideva Paṇḍit of Letter no.4 (vide p.61).

3. Modern spelling Kuti, a pass (13,009 ft.) into Tibet, called Nylam or Nilam in Tibetan language. It is roughly 90 miles in the north-east of Kālāhamū by way of Sākhu. It was occupied by Pratāp Malla, King of Kālāhamū (1641-75), and from then on formed the frontier of the kingdom of Kālāhamū with Tibet. Pṛthvīnarāyaṇ occupied it some time during 1750 (vide p.188). It remained Nepal's frontier with Tibet until 1792 when as a result of the truce concluded on the cessation of Nepal-Tibet Wars (1788-92) it was restored to Tibet. But even after this Nepal had a right to appoint headmen of the villages situated along the track between Nepal and Kuti (Perceval Landon: Nepal, vol.II,p.36). Nepal's present day frontier is at Kōdārī, nearly 27 miles south of Kuti.

4. Text, Bhoṭyā, lex., inhabitants of Bhoṭ (i.e. Tibet). For the use of the word Bhoṭ in different contexts vide p.50,n.116).
said that they were willing to sell gold but at the rate of eighteen
not sixteen; that no agreement having been arrived at you left (them)
and came to the octroi post at Khāsā where they sent word to you to
stop which accordingly you did; that you told them [the Tibetan
messengers] that the gold was to be pure unsmelted gold and you stuck
to the rate of sixteen which you had already offered. You further write
that they said eighteen and wished to adulterate it a little also; and
that saying so they have since gone to seek the approval of the Ḟhebās.
But do not buy impure gold. If they agree to give it at your previous
offer of sixteen, continue with the negotiation. We shall see what
happens. But do not accept baser gold. It will be adulterated with
powdered brass. Moreover, be on your guard while you buy it. If they
do not give at the rate of sixteen, keep your feelings to yourself. If
for pure gold they ask you to offer a quarter of a rupee more than
the rate of sixteen, continue with the negotiations. If perchance they
refuse to enter into agreement at this rate, be prepared to offer
seventeen for pure gold. If the amount of money you have will suffice
for the rate of seventeen, confine yourself to this amount and buy
gold. (....) if there is a chance of getting twelve to fifteen
thousand tolās (of gold) containing some adulteration, go ahead with
the deal even at the rate of eighteen. But do so only if there is a

1. I.e. the rate per tolā, a measure of weight (2½ tolas = 1 oz.).
2. South of Kutī and close to it. It is now in Nepal.
3. Ḟhebā, a Tibetan word meaning 'chief'.
possibility of getting twelve to fifteen thousand tolās of gold. 
(... ) you are at the extreme limit. Be very careful. Moreover, if the Tibetans get an inkling of the contents of this letter, they will increase their rate. Therefore keep this matter completely to yourself. If there is a chance of your being cheated behind your back, take the advice of your friends and send a report to me. If agreement is made, send the gold as well. Write to me with your detailed request for a specific amount of money to be sent to you for the precise amount of gold likely to be had. Send me also a detailed report about the real affairs of Tibet as a whole.

As regards the real state of affairs in this place, we have extended our boundary up to Suṣerukāṭh. The rest of the news is also heartening.

Do keep the routes closed. They are not to be left open.

All other details will be communicated to you (orally) by Narāj Basnyāt and Candrabhān Paṇḍit. I shall have approved what they will tell you. We have heard that forty to fifty muris of food grain have reached Tibet. By what route did they get there? Keep on imposing the ban (on movement of goods). This is all I need to write to the wise.

Dated Nuwākoṭ Valley, Thursday, the sixth day of the bright fortnight of Phālguṇ. May it be auspicious.

1. The locality is unidentified. It could be Khasrāṭukāṭ, a place to the east of Dhising Lā, a pass into Tibet and north-west of Mustāng.
2. No further reference is known about these persons.
3. A measure of weight equivalent to 2 maunds, about 160 lbs. (TND).
4. Possibly the letter was written after Prthvīnārāyan captured Kūtī. The day of the week corresponds with that of 28 February 1754.
LETTER NO. 2

This letter brings my blessing to the Pradhāns of the country of Dolaṣā.

Everything here is all right and I hope everything is well there. If that is so I shall be very happy. News here is good.

You all are my subjects. My territory now extends to Nāldum in the east. Come to my audience. I shall protect your property and families. If after promising you protection I do otherwise, I shall bring upon myself the scourge of Gorasmāth. If you do not come in spite of my having given you my word of honour, I shall confiscate your property.

The people of Pālhūg, Tisṭūg and Cītlāg have become loyal to us. Consequently we have been protecting them. This is all I need

2. Headmen or nobles of the Nepal Valley who were traditionally associated with ministerial duties.
3. A place in the north-eastern quarter of the Nepal Valley and then in the possession of Jayaprabāś. It was captured by Prthvīnārāyaṇ a little before the recapture of Nāldum in 1754 (vide p. 188).
4. A place on the eastern perimeter of the kingdom of Kāthmāndu. It was captured by Prthvīnārāyaṇ for the second time in 1754 (vide p. 189).
5. I.e. Gorakhnāth (q.v. p. 34, n. 4). The name is not mentioned in the letter but the space is left blank which refers to the name Śrī Gorasmāth written at the top. This was a usual practice of those days. The idea was that names of gods and goddesses, kings and queens were not written in the body of a letter but on the top, a practice which was intended to preclude any disrespect or sin which might be incurred by personal reference in the body of the letter.
6. Places on the west of the Nepal Valley, which were originally in the possession of Pāṭān. Prthvīnārāyaṇ had, as is apparent from this letter, captured them some time ago (vide p. 182).
to write to the wise.

Dated Nuwākoṭ, Wednesday, the fourth day of the dark fort-
night of Bhādra. May it be auspicious.

LETTER NO. 3

To the people of Dolaśā and its principal subjects.

I have granted you protection. If you have taken me as
your master, remain in your respective homes. If on the arrival of my
officers there, you come to terms with them, nothing will happen to
your lives and property. I am sending detailed instructions through
Tulārām Pāde. Come to terms with him quickly. May it be auspicious.

Tulārām Pāde also sends his greetings.

1. Perhaps written after the recapture of Nāldum whence the date
    corresponds with 7 August 1754.

2. Sāiskṛtaśandesa, year 1, nos. 10-12, pp. 36-37.

3. I.e. Tulārām Pāre, the celebrated Gorkhalese officer who was killed
    in 1768 as a result of an explosion in the course of the Gorkhalese
    occupation of the royal palace of Jayaprakāś, Hanūmāndhokā. (vide p. 281).

4. There is no date in this letter. It is quite likely that it was
    written after the capture of Dolakhā in 1754 (vide p. 59, n. 3).
LETTER NO. 4

This letter brings my due respects to Harideva Paṇḍit and Jamadagni Upādhyā.

News here is good.

There is with Ohābjyu Junior, and Māujamjyu, gold to the value of one thousand rupees. Ask them for it at once and send it to me.

At first the Bhoṭiyas of Khāsā and the Bhoṭiyās of Rabigu did not come to terms with the toll collector and created some disorder. Afterwards when they besieged our Nāldum, all rose up against them and drove them down into the valley below. Therefore they are miscreants as far as we are concerned. Nevertheless they are our subjects. We shall destroy them. But if we do that the Dhebās and traders of Kuti will be hostile (to us). Resolve this dilemma. If we keep such miscreants, hostility will break out again.

Find out quickly what is happening over there and send me information quickly.

1. The letter is unpublished. The photograph of the original has been kindly supplied by Paṇḍit Bāṭurām Acārya of Kaṭhmāṅḍu (Nepal).

2. No further references to these persons are known. Probably the senior addressee was Hari Pandit of Letter no.1, p.56.

3. Possibly some Tibetan traders.

4. Text, Bhoṭyā, lex. inhabitants of Bhoṭ which in the context implies northern higher Himalayan region and not Tibet (vide p.50,n.116).

5. Locality unidentified.

6. Apparently the Gorkhalese toll collector either at Khāsā or near it.
If there is any possibility of buying gold with our currency, the required amount of money is in stock here. Send a reply quickly in regard to this and we shall send the money.Whatever amount you say is at your disposal.

This is all I need to write to the wise. Whatever the bearer of this letter says to you by word of mouth will have our approval.

Dated Wednesday, the twelfth day of the dark fortnight of Bhādra. May it be auspicious.

1. Earliest coins of Prthūnārāyaṇa, struck as an imitation of the mohars (silver coins) of the Malla kings of the Nepal Valley, are of 1754 (vide IP, vol.I, p.117; Walsh, 'Coinage of Nepal', JRAS, 1908, pp.694,713). With his mohars Prthūnārāyaṇa also attempted to trade with Tibet as the Malla kings had done (vide p.53,n.132). But it is said that he was not successful (Ācārya, 'Srī Srī Jayapraķāś Malla', p.49).

2. The letter does not mention the year of its composition. But there is some evidence which helps us to fix the year. We find this letter as a supplement to Letter no.1,p.56, whose year we have fixed to be 1754 (vide p.58,n.4). Reference to Prthūnārāyaṇa's currency also suggests this year. The day of the week, Wednesday, corresponds with that of 14 August 1754 and hence the probable date of its composition.
LETTER NO. 5

This letter brings my blessing to Abhudi Pradhan.

Everything here is all right and I hope everything is well there. If that is so I shall be very happy. News here is good.

You who are known as Bhamdel are not of my country but you are friends of mine. Bring into effect my purpose today in any way possible. Those who are really of one's family are known by their deeds. Bring into effect my purpose by creating a division there. I shall accomplish my plan of acquiring kingship. I shall also confer high rank on you and make you powerful. So do as I ask bravely and fully. Send a reply quickly. This is all I need to write to the wise.

Dated Kābhryā, Wednesday, the second day of the bright fortnight of Śrāvana.

1. Aitihāsik patrasaṃgraha, p.23.
2. ? Abhyudayasimha.
4. Perhaps Abhyudayasimha Bharel was a resident of Kathmandu which then was not conquered by Prthvīnārāyaṇ and hence the addressee is mentioned a paradeśi (i.e. paradeśī), belonging to a foreign land'.
5. Kābhryā (modern spelling Kābhre) was captured by Prthvīnārāyaṇ on Śaka 1681 Māgh badi 9 Friday (= 11 January 1760) (vide p. 218). Hence in all probability the letter was written in the following Śrāvana of Śaka 1682 whence the equivalent Christian date is 13 August 1760.
LETTER NO. 6

This letter brings my regards to Rājīvalocan Paṇḍit.

Everything here is all right and I hope everything is well there. If that is so I shall be very happy. Your letter has arrived.

Its contents have been understood. News here is good.

You have sent your order for the operation to be undertaken during the next Jīvapakṣa. It is good of you to send it to me. But when we begin here our operations to take Cāgu and Sākhu, our plans there will not be prosecuted strongly. If operation is undertaken in


2. There were two Gaureśvars associated with the court of Gorkhā: 1) Gaureśvar Pāre, father of Rājīvalocan, Jagannivās, Yajñeśvar, Candracūḍa and Ramārām (GVY, pp.132,133; HP, vol.74,fo.100), and ii) Gaureśvar Panta, father of Caturbhuj and grandfather of Govinda (HP, vol.60,fo.170). The addressee of this letter is possibly the son of Gaureśvar Pāre. It is quite probable that after Gaureśvar Pāre was forced to leave Gorkhā with his family (vide p.204), Rājīvalocan went to join the service of Kāśkī. From this letter it appears that Rājīvalocan held great influence upon the King of Kāskī, Siddhinārāyaṇ Sāhī.

3. Text, citra, 'painting', which does not fit in here. Apparently it was incorrectly written for citta, 'heart, mind'.

4. The use of the high grade honorific suggests Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ's profound respect to Rājīvalocan.

5. An auspicious moment according to the conjunction of the sun and the moon (Aitihāsik patrasamgraha, ibid.).

6. The two places in the north-east of Kāthmāndū and also close to Bhātgaū. Through Sākhu passed the traditional trade route to Kutī and hence Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ's concern to capture Cāgu and Sākhu. He undertook a number of campaigns against them though without success. There is/mention in the Nepalese accounts of the dates when these two places were captured by Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ. There is however a letter written by him (Letter no.8, p.68) on Sunday, 1 March 1767, which suggests that Cāgu was already in his possession.
that quarter, we cannot remain inactive here. We shall do whatever will befall. If operations are undertaken from both quarters, they will not be prosecuted strongly at this end.

You write that you have humbly spoken to your master [King of Kāski] there that if Gorkhā is in trouble, Kāski will be without refuge. You have done well to have spoken to him who is as a younger brother (to me). This is quite proper. Gorkhā has nowhere else to go except Kāski. Kāski also has nowhere else to go except Gorkhā. Although Kāski has not accomplished the deed today, it will accomplish it tomorrow in the interest of Gorkhā. Although Gorkhā has not accomplished the deed today, it will do it tomorrow in the interest of Kāski. So to bring about an agreement between Gorkhā and Kāski will contribute to the strength (of both). Although the deed is not accomplished today, it will be accomplished tomorrow. Whether the task be great or small, I have a desire to reduce the kingdom of Lamjung so as to be of benefit to (the King) my younger brother.

You write to me asking me to intern the members of the family of the Kāji. When we did that they began to be hostile to the Kāji and hence we could not intern them. Firstly, the Kāji acted improperly against us and involved himself in a conspiracy; secondly, we did not think it proper to cause estrangement between his family

1. I.e. Lamjung.
and him and hence we let them go. You are there under the protection of (the King) my younger brother, (and because) you are there we shall send negotiators from here. Pacify the Kājī and send him here. This is all I need to write to the wise.

Dated Nuwākoṭ Valley, Saturday, the ninth day of the dark fortnight of Māgh.

LETTER NO. 7

To Bhagvati Ban and Lachiman Ban.

We have granted you protection. We have exempted you from revenue 12 ropanis of land in Bhādgāmū at Sāṃśumul and Nāgosiṭār, 800 muris of land including plots of dwelling-houses at Gokarna, and 40 ropanis of land including the monastery in Bhādgāmū town. Enjoy it and be happy. All other people will be required to pay the traditional

1. Most likely the Kājī is Pōthvīnārāyaṇ's brother Šūrapratāp Šāh (vide pp. 250-52).
2. The date works for 4 January 1766 (vide p.251).
4. Ban is one of the ten orders of the Saiva sect traditionally alleged to have been founded by Śāmkaračārya (c.788-820). The members of these orders affix their respective orders to their names as here we have Bhagvati Ban and Lachiman Ban. It is not known whether they were celebrated ascetics or householders. Probably Bhagvati Ban was the same Bhagāuti Ban mentioned in a Nepalese account (IP, vol.II,pt.ii, p.301, Letter no.529 of 30 March 1771).
5. A particular measure of area (vide p.53,n.131).
7. A place to the north of Bhātgāū and near Cāgu and Sākhu.
levies, bheti and salami. These two you will also have to pay.

Dated Nuwakot, the Capital, Friday, the tenth day of the dark fortnight of Pauṣa Samvat 1823. May it be auspicious.

LETTER NO. 8

To Bhavnīśāmkar Pāuḍyāl, Cāmu Pāuḍyāl and Biresvar Pāuḍyāl of Bisaṃṣu.

We made a deed that you would pay us the 2,000 Mahindramali which you owed to Bhājudeu Tāuḍhik Nebār of Nepal. Out of this sum 120 sikkās have been deposited in the royal treasury through Śibānanda Paṇḍit, 120 sikkās have been deposited through Biru Śaḍkā, and again

1. A present in cash offered to the god or to a senior official at the time of interview ( < bhet, 'meeting').
2. An extra levy in kind or in cash upon the usual land revenue and paid by the tiller to the landlord or the officer in charge of the land ( < Ar. salām, 'salutation').
3. Prthvīnārāyaṇ's headquarters from 1746 until 1769.
4. The date corresponds with 26 December 1766.
6. Nothing further is known about these persons who, as the names suggest, were Pāuryāl (also Pāurel) Brāhmans. They had perhaps helped Prthvīnārāyaṇ in his campaigns against the Nepal Valley.
7. I.e. Bisaṅkhu, a place to the south-east of Pāṭan. It is also known as Bisaṅkhunārāyaṇ on account of a temple of Nārāyaṇ (Viṣṇu) there.
8. I.e. Mahendramallī, the silver coins of the Malla kings of the Nepal Valley (vide p.53,n.132).
10. Name of the Indian coins of those days, e.g. Patna sikkā, Ascot sikkā, etc.
80 sikkās have been deposited through Birbhadra Upādhyā. We have now granted you immunity from paying off the balance of the 2,000 Mahindra-malis to Bhājudeu Taughīk. Henceforth none shall have any claim on that sum.

Dated Cāgu, Sunday, the first day of the bright fortnight of Phālguṇ Samvat 1823. May it be auspicious.

LETTER NO. 9

This letter brings my regards to Kārtirājanaṅanda Upādhyā. Everything here is all right and I hope everything is well there. News here is good.

You are indeed a great man. We have had always a desire to put an end to all the differences between you and ourselves. The affection of our Kāji has been of great assistance in this respect. Now get yourself on friendly terms with your senior and junior uncles and fulfil my purpose for the kingship of Kāthmađā. We have (as a mark of favour) exempted you from paying anything as pledged by you


1. Perhaps Vīrbhadra Upādhyā, the royal treasurer. The other two were also perhaps treasury officials.
2. I.e. Cāgu, omission of nasal mode was a usual feature in writings of these times.
3. The date corresponds with 1 March 1767.
4. Sāṃskṛtasandesā, year 1,no.9,pp.5–6.
5. Quite possibly a Brahman resident of Pātan (Sāṃskṛtasandesā, ibid.,p.7).
6. Perhaps Kāji Dhanavanta, the Chief Minister of Pātan, who secretly introduced Gorkhalese force into Kārtipur (vide pp.246–47).
7. The persons are not known.
and your lands at Sāṣu, Cāgu, Pāṭan, Kāṭhmāṇḍā and in the Hills are freehold and exempt from tax and besides your farm-land and your dwelling-house. Moreover, you are permitted (to perform your) priestly functions. This is all I need to say now.

Dated Kīrtipur, Wednesday, the ninth day of the dark 1 fortnight of Āśvin. May it be auspicious.

LETTER NO. 10

Royal grant of His Majesty the King

Yesterday we captured Dhandattyā Nebār, a neighbour of Rāmkṛṣṇa Upādhyā Pāḍyāl, and handed him over to Bīśvāmitra Miśra. Today Bīśvāmitra Miśra has emancipated him. Come to our country.

Reside wherever is convenient for you. In future no one shall have any claim against you on the grounds of your having lost caste and having been a slave of Bīśvāmitra Miśra.

Dated Lūṭikot, Monday, the first day of the bright fortnight 5 of Bhādra Samvat 1825. May it be auspicious.

1. Kīrtipur was captured by Prthvīnārāyaṇ on 14 March 1766 (vide p. 247, n.4) and Kāṭhmāṇḍā fell at his hands on 25 September 1768. Therefore this letter seems to have been written after the fall of Kīrtipur and before that of Kāṭhmāṇḍā. The day of the week of the letter works for that of 16 September 1767, a fact which supports our assumption.

2. Aitihāsik patrasamgraha, p.27.

3. Probably of a low caste, as is apparent from the formative suffix -yā (modern -e) used as a form of pejorative address to people of low caste or to juniors.

4. Nothing further is known about these persons.

5. Modern Bālāju. It was captured by Prthvīnārāyaṇ in 1765 (vide p. 242).

6. The date corresponds with 12 September 1768.
This letter brings my blessing to Abhimānsīňha. Everything here is all right and I hope everything is well there. If that is so I shall be very happy. News here is good.

I hear that the Jeṭhā Cautārīyā is wrangling with you because you told his wife you were sorry that he (Jeṭhā Cautārīyā) was going to be the king of the lowlands. The fact is this. An official letter of the Jeṭhā Cautārīyā was intercepted by Kahar and sent on to me. As a result of the information it contained I sent you deliberately as a secret messenger to the Jeṭhī Cautārni then at Nuwākoṭ to communicate the news that he was going to be king and report to me what they said about it. A servant must obey his master. You did not go there to tell the news on your own initiative nor did you compel or suborn him to attempt a coup. In this connection his own official letter is evidence

2. Third son of Sivarāmsīňha Basnet, a Gorkhalese commander (vide p.42, n.55).
3. I.e. Mahoddāmkīrti Śāh, Prthvīnārāyana's brother who, it appears, was at this time hostile to him. Of Prthvīnārāyana's brothers Mahoddāmkīrti and Dalmardan were Cautārīyās (q.v., p.42, n.55), the former being elder to Dalmardan was called Jeṭhā (senior) Cautārīyā and the latter Kānchā (junior) Cautārīyā (Ācārya, 'Basnyāṭ patrāvalīko āppaṇī', IP, ibid., p.101, col.1).
4. I.e. that part of the Tarai which originally belonged to the Makwānpur state.
5. Text, bijinis patra, 'a letter of business', < English business, and Sk. patra-,'letter'. Official correspondence of the English East India Company was called letters of public business. The compound refers to some official correspondence of Mahoddāmkīrti, which is unknown.
6. I.e. Keharsīňha Basnet, elder to Abhimānsīňha Basnet.
7. Feminine of Jeṭhā Cautārīyā, i.e. the wife of Mahoddāmkīrti Śāh. The modern spelling is ĪŚī Jeṭhī Cautārni.
against him. You were sent as courier as a proof to that fact. No fault therefore rests with you in the matter. It is he who is to blame. Should he come to quarrel with you, you may show him this letter with the royal seal. He will himself then confess.

If materials for Puråścaråṇa are inadequate, ask for more.

This is all I need to write to the wise.

Dated Bhādgāū, Tuesday, the twelfth day of the bright fortnight of Kārtika.

LETTER NO. 12

This letter brings my blessing to Prince Mahoddāmkīrti Sāh. Everything here is all right and I hope everything is well there. News here is good.

It is learnt that you are intending to do harm to Kahar Basnyāt. You may be deprived of your eyes if you do so. In this matter Kahar is loyal (to me). He intercepted your letter and arrested your messenger and sent them to me. That is all he has done. He has not taken any action on his initiative or committed any fault. It is you who have proved disloyal in what you have done. Since you are disloyal you had better keep quiet.

1. A preparatory or introductory rite (MW).
2. The letter seems to have been written after the conquest of Bhātgāū in 1769. The particulars work for 19 November 1771.
3. IP, op.cit.
4. Although there is no date mentioned in this letter, the contents link it with the preceding letter and hence it is apparent that it was written either before or later than 19 November 1771.
This letter brings my highest regards to His Holiness

Monk Bhagavantanāth.

We shall send Kālu Pāṃḍe from here with one senior elder and (some) members of the traditional families. He will arrive in due course. By your blessing we shall come to an agreement with Jumlā.

Your men arrived here after the Dasāi. We were on the point of sending them back. But meanwhile I fell ill and that caused delay. Later I became well again; but when we were contemplating returning them to you, Lamjung and Tanahū closed all the fords and roads against us. They did not even let a mouse to find its way through. They are closing other fords too. That is why your men have been delayed.


2. A monk of a monastery in Rānāgrām in Salyānā. He belonged to the Saiva sect traditionally alleged to have been founded by Gorakhnāth, one of the 84 Siddhas. The mendicants of this sect affix -nāth to their names and are distinguished by their pierced lobes in their ears from which hang a circular ornament. This sect seems to have been quite popular in the Nepal Himalaya. There are several monasteries of this sect in Jumlā, Gorkhā, Kāṭhmāndu, Banepā, etc. Bhagavantanāth seems to have been greatly revered by Prthvīnārāyaṇ. It was this monk who by his counsels influenced Prthvīnārāyaṇ from 1763. He became one of his most trusted political advisers (vide pp. 75-76).

3. The text has details of Prthvīnārāyaṇ’s titles.

4. I.e. Kālu Pārē, a Brahman officer and not the celebrated Kālu Pārē who was a minister of Prthvīnārāyaṇ (vide p. 41, n. 51; also p. 50, n. 116). The Brahman Kālu Pārē was a Sardār and credited with diplomatic manoeuvres (IP, ibid., p. 125, col. 2).

5. For these families vide p. 35, n. 9.

6. One of the prominent states in the Baīsī.

7. Modern spelling Dasāī, the festival lasting a fortnight from the first day of the bright fortnight of Āśvina. The first nine days are devoted to the worship of Durgā.
You have sent your blessing for the accomplishment of our expansion to the east. The blessing was respectfully accepted and in consequence we achieved the conquest of the land of the Kirātas. As a result of your blessing our boundary has extended up to the Arun river. Nearly one thousand of the enemy were killed. Some four hundred of them were carried away by the current of the river and drowned. About fourteen hundred families were arrested. On this side of the Arun the land of the Kirātas is conquered. As a mark of respect for this conquest I have sent as an offering a turban which I hope will reach you in due course.

Parvat attacked a place called Katyaṃ in the dominion of Kāski. Some 40 men of Parvat were killed. Some 32 men of Kāski were killed. Parvat has set up a military post at Pāngdur. This post at Pāngdur is still holding out. Moreover, on one front Lamjung advanced to attack Muguja. On another it advanced to attack Thāk which is in the dominion of Kāski. Kāski repulsed the troops of Lamjung from Thāk.

1. For the land of the Kirātas vide p.49, n.105.
2. Text, Vallo Kirāt, 'the region between the Dudh Kosī and the Arun rivers'. Pallo Kirāt is the region beyond the Arun river as far as the Tamar river and also called Limbuvaṇ being mostly inhabited by the Limbus, other Kirāta tribesmen.
3. One of the states in the Čaubīsī (vide p.123, n.1).
4. Locality unidentified.
5. Another state in the Čaubīsī. It lay between Parvat and Lamjung.
6. A place about 3 miles to the west of Kāski.
7. Modern Māujā, a place about 15 miles to the east of Kāski and about 25 miles to the west of Lamjung.
8. A place about 10 miles to the north-east of Kāski and about 3 miles to the north-west of Māujā.
and 80 men of Lamjung were killed. Fighting took place at Mugjā also. Lamjung repulsed the troops of Kāski. Seven men of Kāski including 1 Sāh, King of Kāski, were killed. Six or seven men of Lamjung were killed. Moreover, Kāski is threatened with invasion. Our Kājis Cautārās are marching to its with troops to Gorkhā. We shall be operating in the Rāginās area after the 4th of Māśir 5

LETTER NO. 14

This letter brings my highest regards to His Holiness Monk Bhagavantānāth.

... ... ... ... ...

Everything here is all right. As your disciple we shall be relieved to hear of welfare and happiness of your lotus-like feet.

News here is good.

Śasidhar Upādhyāya has arrived with your kind letter. He has reported the contents of the letter to me by word of mouth in full detail. We have heard it. You say that you heard of the birth of our

1. Probably Siddhinārāyaṇ Śāhī (q.v. p.64, n.2).
2. Modern Gātariyā, 'collateral member of the royal family.'
3. A place about 15 miles to the south-east of Lamjung and near the frontier with Gorkhā.
4. The letter is incomplete. From the contents it appears Prthvīnārāyaṇ was siding with Kāski which was then attacked by Parvat and Lamjung. Since there is mention of his boundary having reached as far as the Arun river, which was achieved on 26 August 1773, the letter was probably written at this time.
5. IP, op.cit.,p.152.
6. Perhaps an officer in the service of Prthvīnārāyaṇ.
grandson and were very pleased. You further say that we shall always enjoy prosperity by the grace of the Lord Gorasaṅnāth. It is the Lord Gorasaṅnāth who does and causes everything to be done. It was through his kindness that the grandson was born and at his wish he took him away. Such is the world. Everything depends on his wish. If you give us your blessing others will be born and those who are born will live long. We crave your blessing.

You advise us to shaw friendship and good will towards Jumlā and Jājarkoṭ and to cultivate friendly relations. A delegation of two experienced men have gone to Jumlā from here. From there also two men, one Mahatārā and one Buḍhāthokī, have arrived here already. They have come to suggest (to me) a treaty of unification between Gorsā and Jumlā and to take (some) gentlemen back with them. Accordingly eight or ten persons along with Bīrbhadra Pantha, son of Maheśvar Pantha, will go to Jumlā from here. They are ready now. I had thought of sending them by that way. But the Cāubīsī will not let even prominent persons pass through. Even if they let men pass through, they...
will not let them take presents with them. For this region they will go by our usual route through Bhôt. I pray you to send your men to Jumlâ from there and make Jumlâ and Jâjrkoṭ favourably disposed towards us. One more point about this. Some men will go from here to Salyânâ and Jâjrkoṭ and some gentlemen will also go to Pyûthânâ.

You kindly sent a sword for our successful invasion of the land of the Kirâtas. All the territory of the Kirâtas which lies in the midlands, the Hills and in Bhôt has been conquered by your blessing. Our boundary has now extended as far as Kankanâ river in the midlands, and the Sâbhâ and Tamor rivers in the Hills. We were not able to kill our enemies. They ran away. A number of them went to the Indian plains. Some went to Susim. Some 85 odd were killed in the forests. Moreover, negotiations for friendly relations with Susim are afoot. If a treaty is drawn up (the King of) Susim will arrest the absconders from the land of the Kirâtas and deliver them to us. If the negotiations break down then we shall be compelled to make a war on Sukhim. Maybe Sukhim will attack us. By your blessing we shall slaughter (its troops).

---

1. Implying Rui Bhôt, the northern territory of Gorkhâ.
2. Salyânâ, beside Salyânâ (modern Sallyan) and Pyûthânâ (modern Pyûthan) were the eastern states in the Bâísî, Pyûthânâ being the easternmost beyond which was the region of the Câubîsî.
3. The river which flows to the east of Ilâm.
4. One of the tributaries of the Tamar (written here Tamor).
5. I.e. Sukhim, anglicised Sikkim.
You enquire whether you should go to Dāṅga or stay in Śalyānā. We realize that although you may get more respect in Dāṅga than in Śalyānā it is better for you to remain at Śalyānā. If Śalyānā is utterly indifferent to you, that does not matter. But if they treat you with disrespect, you must leave. Moreover, I and everybody here have been offering you our respects, as...

Our men, Bīśvāmitra Upādhyāya and Gangānanda Ācārya, have gone to Sukhim. Bṛhaspati Paṇḍit has gone to Purāṇiyā. Kirīṭmālī has gone to Patna. Bāikuṇṭha Upādhyāya has gone (to the Court of) Nabāb Sujā-uddāulā. We have had men stationed at all these places for some time now. Dinānāth Upādhyāya is already on his way to Calcutta. He will reach there in a few days. Moreover, Bhīm Giri's disciple, Rāj Giri, will go to Lāsā as well. He has a business firm at Banaras but he has a business firm, a house and land here as well.

We have so far been humouring Lamjung. Bīśvesvar Upādhyāya and Śībā Chimiryā are stationed there. We have also so far been humouring Kāśkī. Our Bīrbhadra Thāpā is stationed there. Two Brahmans from Kāśkī are here. Our relations with the rest of the Čaubisi are

1. Modern spelling Dāṅg, the district between Sallyānā and Pyūṭhāna.
2. I.e. Sallyānā.
3. I.e. Purāṇi. Probably Bṛhaspati was sent to the English Suправisor.
4. English Chief at Patna.
6. President and Governor of the Calcutta Council of the East India Company.
7. After the conquest of the Nepal Valley Prāthvīnārāyaṇ expelled the Gosāi and Kashmiri Muslim traders who carried on trade with Nepal and Tibet. Bhīm Giri and Rāj Giri, who were Gosāis, seem to have been Prāthvīnārāyaṇ's favourites.
just as they were. You are well aware what they are. They will
definitely seek an opportunity to attack us to the extent of their
power. But so far they are not strong enough and so they are keeping
quiet. Details will be laid before you by Śaśidhar Upādhyāya. This
is all I need to write to the wise.

Dated Kaṭhmāṇḍū, Friday, the sixth day of the bright
fortnight of Bhādramān. May it be auspicious.

LETTER NO. 15

This letter brings my blessing to Abhimānusīma, Pārath
Bhaḍārī, Kṛtisim Śavās and Bāli Bāniṇā.

Everything here is all right and I hope everything is
well there, News here is good.

(Your) letter has arrived and its contents have been under-
stood. We have come to know of all the details you have despatched to

1. The whole land of the Kiritas, Vallo Kirit and Pallo Kirit (q.v.
p.73, n.2) was conquered by Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ by 25 September 1774. He
died in January 1775. Apparently the letter was written some time
during this period. But the date given in this letter is wrong as
according to my calculation the day of the week does not correspond
with the equivalent Christian date for 1774 which was Sunday, 11
September when the land of the Kiritas was not conquered. Only Mārga-
śirṣa sudi 6 of 1831 Vikram or 1696 Śaka was Friday which corresponds
with Friday, 9 December 1774, which seems hence the probable date of
the composition of this letter.

2. The photograph of the original was kindly supplied by Śrī Lalitjanga
Sijāpati, a Nepalese now residing in Banaras (India). The letter is

3. The Gorkhalese officers sent for the conquest of the land of the
Kiritas.
us: your plan to make a fort at Caudanda, the despatch of troops from Kuhrilya, the arrangement of duties to be performed on all the three fronts and the receiving of submission from every Suba of the Limbus and Šgāryā. The extreme point to which our troops have advanced up to Islimbā and Cāmthāpu must not be surrendered. Strengthen the position there and build forts. (It is my command that) you do this. Moreover, you must be sure to take possession of the land between the Kanka in the west and the Tišṭā in the east after taking possession of (the region near) Islimbā and Cāmthāpu. There is no sense in retaining land of inferior yield and abandoning the land of better quality which produces greater income. You must be sure to take possession of it. If Susim should remain on good terms with us after Islimbā and Cāmthāpu have been made our frontier and do not engage us in war, use your discretion as to how you cross the Kanka. If alarmed at the capture of Islimbā and Cāmthāpu, Susim annuls the treaty and is later on

1. I.e. Caudandī, the state whose territory probably lay in Vallo Kirāt in the Hills and in the plains it stretched from the upper reaches of the Kamlā to the region of the Trijugā river in the east. (vide p. 226, n. 2). It was conquered by Pethvinārāyan in 1773.
2. A place situated on the left bank of the Tamar.
3. The title of the headman of the Rai and Limbu tribes.
4. It is hard to identify this place. Possibly it meant the summit of all the mountains where the Subās (modern Subbās) of the Limbu tribesmen resided (cf. Sk. ṣṇa, 'top or summit of a mountain, peak, crag' (MW)).
5. Places to the north of Ilām and situated in the Singilā range forming the boundary of Pallo Kirāt with Sikkim.
6. I.e. Kankaī (q.v. p. 76, n. 3), which then in its upper reaches also formed the boundary between Morang and Sikkim.
7. I.e. Tišṭā, the river which separated Sikkim from Morang.
alienated from us for such a little cause, you are not to give up the land in the Tarai. You must as expeditiously as possible (subjugate the land) as far as the Tisťā, the boundary of the Hindupati. Remember this is the duty which needs fulfilment there.

I hear that Buddhikarṇa has got a fine elephant. Get hold of the mahout of that elephant, take him in your employ, promise him four or five hundred rupees and send him to steal it. If you tell that mahout to steal the elephant, it will not take long. The mahout's relatives are probably in our own country. Give some promises and assurances and accomplish this work.

If we could have got hold of Buddhikarna Rāi, the conflict in that region would have come to an end. But we did not. Employ some sepoy irrespective of how you do it, promise him 1,000 to 1,200 (rupees) and also promise him some reward. Then you must get him to kill him (Buddhikarṇa RāI). Once this is done all disputes will come to an end as quickly as possible.

Use the funds from the Ambarpur Tarai and the Bijāipur Tarai to meet the wages of the soldiers there and to defray expenses.

1. Implying here the King of Morang. For the meaning of Hindupati vide p.36, n.13.
2. The Chief Minister and later the usurper of Morang.
3. Probably the Tarai part originally belonging to the Makwānpur state or the newly conquered state of Cauḍanḍī.
4. The Tarai part of the newly conquered Cauḍanḍī state. Ambarpur was the headquarters of the Tarai region of this state.
5. The Tarai part of Morāṅg and lying to the south of Vijayapur, the capital.
Furthermore, the 2,001 rupees you sent have been received. The amount has been temporarily entered in accounts and acknowledged. You will receive the official receipt in due course. One last point. Do not go beyond Islimba and Cañthāpu for further conquest. Should Susim attack, make one stronghold and make arrangements to destroy the attackers utterly. If you cross the original boundary of Susim, we shall bring upon us the displeasure of Lāsā in the north. For this reason you must not cross the boundary into the territory of Lāsā in the north by even one inch. You must not harass the subjects of Lāsā in any way. Neither must you invade the original territory of Susim. This is all I need to say now.

Dated Kathmādū, Wednesday, the fifteenth day of the dark fortnight of Āśvina. May it be auspicious.

Respects to Bālksrṇa Jāisī and Bīrbhadra Upādhyā.

1. Sikkim was then regarded to have been a vassal of and subject to Lhasa (i.e. Tibet). Prthvīnārāyaṇ had reason to apprehend hostility from Tibet in the course of his expansion to the eastern region bordering on the territories of Sikkim. Tibet was given to understand that Prthvīnārāyaṇ had invaded the territories of Sikkim and had even aspired to occupy Bhutan in order to be to all intents and purposes the king of the Hills. In consequence the Tibetan Government had ordered one of its generals to march out to Sikkim to help its ruler against Prthvīnārāyaṇ (C.R. Markham: Narratives of the mission of George Bogle to Tibet, and of the journey of Thomas Manning to Lhasa, 2d. ed., 1879, pp.103, 149-50,156).

2. Prthvīnārāyaṇ was alleged to have written to the Tibetan authorities that "he would never encroach a finger's breadth on their territories (Markham, ibid., p.149).

3. Either the region beyond Islimba and Cañthāpu or across the Tisṭā.

4. The date corresponds with 5 October 1774.

5. I.e. Bālksrṇa Arjyāl, an astrologer. An astrologer was invariably attached to Gorkhalese troops for finding auspicious moments for campaigns.
CHAPTER IV

GENEALOGY OF THE SĀH KINGS OF NEPAL

Sāi, Śāi, Sāhi, Śāhi, Sāhā and Śāh are variant forms of the title used by the Kalyāṇ rulers of the Karnālī region now in western Nepal. It is possible that Sāhī is derived from sāi (< Sk. svāmin) which the rulers of this region used as their title from the fifteenth to the seventeenth century. Śāhi, presumably an imitation of Śāh, one of the titles adopted by the Muslim rulers of India, is used in 1568 for the first time by the rulers of Dullū, Dāilekh and Vilāspur, all in the Karnālī region. The Āḍhūkā rulers of Bhīrkot, Garahū, Dhor, Nuwākoṭ, Satahū, Kāski, Lamjung and Gorkhā, all in the Sapta Gaṇḍakī region, who derived from the original Khān house of Lasarghā, had first Khān as their title. Even now descendants of the ruling houses of Bhīrkot, Garahū and Dhor are called Khāns. Later on the rest of the Āḍhūkā rulers took Sāhī as their title. The descendants of the ruling houses of Kāski and Lamjung are as yet called Sāhīs. The title Sāhī used by rulers of Gorkhā was changed into Sāh in 1754 by Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ (regnal period 1742-75) who became king of Nepal in 1769. Even then Sāhī, Sāh and Sāhā were variously

1. IP, vol.II, pt.1, pp.112,120,123,125,128,131-34,138-41, etc. The derivation from the Sk. svāmin leaves unexplained the absence of nasality in the Nepali forms. This is difficult to account for in view of the fact that nasality is so frequently preserved in Nepali words, and indeed has been inserted in certain Sanskrit derived words which had originally no nasality.

2. Ibid., p.123.

3. Lit., 'eight royal houses'.

4. So called on account of its being made up of seven principal rivers some of which had Gaṇḍakī as their last name, e.g., Trīśuli Gaṇḍakī, Būrhi Gaṇḍakī, Kāli or Kṣṇā Gaṇḍakī, Setī Gaṇḍakī, etc.


6. Seen in his letters (vide Appendix A, p.330 ff); also used in his coins for the first time in this year (IP, ibid., p.127, col.2; E.H. Walsh, 'The coinage of Nepal', JRAS, 1908, p.740).
used by the kings and the royal members of the Gorkhā Sāhī family of Nepal. Originally the variants, Sāhī, Sāh, Sāhā (modern Sāhī, Śāhī, Śāh) did not imply difference of status, but later on illegitimate sons of the royal families were called Sāhīs or Bhājus (also called Bājus or Hindu Bājus) to distinguish them from the legitimate sons, who were called Sāhs or Sāhās. This distinction tended to disappear later. The royal house of Nepal today is called Sāh. Some descendants of the previous ruling houses of Jumlā, Jājarkoṭ, Achām, Dullū, etc., in the Karnālī region, also use Sāh as their family name. All the ancient ruling houses of the Karnālī and the Gaṇḍakī regions are called Thakurīs, the tribe being regarded as the seniormost Kṣatriya clan of Nepal. The commoner Thakurīs who were earlier called Sāhīs do not generally write Sāh for themselves. Since in modern times rulers of Nepal and members of their family are called Sāh, we have used this title for the names of the kings of Gorkhā and their descendants.

The earlier portions of the Nepalese chronologies vary with regard to the genealogy of the Sāh kings of Gorkhā. Nevertheless although they contradict one another in many places, they all agree in attributing the origin of the Sāhs to the Rajputs of India. Various recensions

1. As late as the middle of the nineteenth century, as is apparent from the genealogy in HP, vol. 51, fo. 116, illegitimate sons of the Newār concubines of the Malla kings of the Nepal Valley were called Bhāju Rajās (Bāburāma Ācārya, 'Śrī 5 Rājendralakṣāmī Devī', Rūparekha, Year 5, no. 5, Kāthmandu, 1963, p. 27). The Sāh kings of Nepal also used Bhāju, as the title for the illegitimate sons born of the Newār concubines.

2. There are four divisions of Kṣatriyas in Nepal. The seniormost are Thakurīs. Next in social status are Rāṇās. Lower than the Rāṇās are Khāses who are also called Chetris. The last are Khatris, being the issue of Chetri concubines kept by Brahmanas.
of these chronologies have been published. Some of them are in Kāthmāndu in the Viṣṇupustakālaya (Darbar Library) and in the private library of the late H.H. Kaiser Shamsher Janga Bahadur Rana, others in the private possession of individuals, Pandit Bāburām Ācārya and Sūryavikram Jñāvālī, both of Nepal, and in the Hodgson Papers in the India Office Library.

It is not possible to reconcile the genealogical records given in these chronologies and accept at the outset that the Śah kings of Nepal were descended from the Sisodiya Rajput clan of Chitor, later of Udayapur. The earliest of the genealogies of the Śah kings were composed in Sanskrit verses by Citravilās and Dharaṇīdhar Sarmā respectively, during the times of Rām Śāh, King of Gorkha (1601-36), in whose court the authors appear to have resided. Curiously enough, though these writers were contemporaries, they present two different versions of the origin of the Śah family. The genealogy given by Citravilās gives the founder as Jillaraį, conqueror of the countries of the Bhillas, and king of Citrakūṭa in Medapāṭa, whereas that by Dharaṇīdhar traces the ancestry even to an earlier king, Ayutāvum, belonging to the Solar race,

1. For the Hodgson Papers vide p.91, n.2.
2. Chitor was the capital of the Mewar state until 1567 when the seat of the government was transferred to Udayapur (K.D. Erskine: A gazetteer of the Udaipur state, p.102).
3. These genealogies are published in IP, vol.II, pt.iii, pp.572-75. Citravilās, who acknowledges his composition as a fulfilment of Rām Śāh's order, gives Sāhi, the title as of the Gorkhā rulers from Yāsobrahma onwards, whereas Dharaṇīdhar gives Śāh as the title of Pūrna and his son Rām.
4. There are various spellings of this name in the Nepalese accounts: Jillaraį, Jillarāį, Jillarāya, Jillaraye, Jilla, Jillaha, etc. Rāį, rāį, rāya, rāye, lex., 'king'.
5. Other spellings, Ajita, Ayutam, etc.
whose son Varavumba became king of Gaḍhājambīra. In the latter genealogy the name Jillarāi, who became king of Chitor, comes seventh in line from Ayitavum. Both Citravilās and Dharaṇīḍhār, however, give identical names from Jilla onwards. Spellings differ in these genealogies, but this minor discrepancy was probably due to the exigencies of metres. There are two other genealogies, one mentioned by Gaurīśāmkar Ṣīrācanda Ojha, and the other in the Viṃapustakālaya, wherein although the names of the founders of the Śāh dynasty are different, and some names of the earlier kings mentioned by Ojha are not found in the cognate Nepalese genealogy, many names from Jilla onwards are identical.

With an exception of a few historians almost all, native or foreign, accept the origin of the Śāh kings of Gorkhā as being from the Sisodiya Rajput clan of Chitor. The Nepalese tradition accepts this origin without question though the compilers of genealogies confuse us with their poor knowledge both of geography and history. The earliest chronology in Nepali is later than the two genealogies in Sanskrit referred to above, the initial portion of which is said to have been copied by Prthvīnārāyaṇ himself. This chronology contains too many inconsistencies, incongruities, fictions and mythologies to be susceptible.

---

1. Locality unidentified. In HP, vol.51, fo.111, there is mention of Gaḍhagīr (lex., 'fort Gīr') from where a branch of Rajputs migrated to Fort Chitor. It could be Ajayameru, a city founded by Gauhāns in Rajputana during the first half of the twelfth century (Bāburām Ācārya, 'Ḍotīko aitihāṣīk jhalak', Hāmro Nepāl, year 1, no.6, Jhāpā, Nepal, 1953, p.13). Gaḍhājambīra is perhaps Gaḍha Ajambīra, the latter derivable from Ajayameru.
5. Ibid., pp.141, col.1, and 143, col.2.
of a scientific analysis. In it the person from whom the Sāh dynasty of Gorkhā descended is stated to be one Narjīt of Ujjīr [? Ujjain] in the country of Maḍuvār [? Mārwār]. In the later portion it refers to the demand made by the Muslim emperor of Delhi for the hand of the daughter of Jayamalpattā Rāī whose forefather had been made king of Chitor by a contemporary Muslim ruler. The Rajput king refused the demand but, realising that if fighting broke out his defeat and death were almost certain, he gave poison to his wife and daughter rather than leave them alive to be disgraced at the hands of the non-believer, and ordered some of his faithful servants to take away his son Hīrā Sāhī, the Crown Prince, to a safer place. The king died in the course of the fighting. Hīrā Sāhī was taken by the servants to China, the emperor of which appointed him king of the Hills. He established his kingdom in Dullū under Chinese suzerainty. Tārācan, Hīrā Sāhī's younger son, was later appointed king of Jumlā by the Chinese emperor. Obviously the contents of this chronology are too fanciful to be accepted. Even the reference to Jayamalpattā Rāī is erroneous, let alone the reference to Chinese suzerainty and the appointment of kings by the Chinese emperor. We know that Akbar, the Mughāl Emperor of Delhi, invaded Chitor in 1567 when Mahārāṇā Udayasiṁha was ruling, and that Jayamal and Pattā, the two Rajput heroes, fought heroically for the Mahārāṇā. Jayamal was wounded by Akbar and died while fighting. The chronology then continues as follows: Hīrā Sāhī's twenty-

1. Mahārāṇā was the title of the rulers of Chitor and later of Udayapur. Udayasiṁha was forced to leave Chitor after the capture of the fort by Akbar. He established his seat at the site where the capital of Udayapur grew later (J. Tod: Annals and antquities of Rajasthan, ed. William Crooke, 3d ed., p.380-82).  
two successors ruled over Dullū and the twenty-third, Manirājā Sāhī, went to Arghā from where his grandson Adidam Sāhī migrated to Nuwākot. The latter’s son Kāl Sāhī went to Lamjung where he was killed by Gurungs, the local tribal people, after which they brought another of his brothers, Jasbam Sāhī, to be made their king. His younger son Darbe Sāh, born of the junior wife, became king of Gorkhā where his line continued on the throne.

No kings of Dullū and Jumlā with names like Ḩīrā Sāhī, Tārācan and Manirājā Sāhī have been traced. We do, however, find one Manirāj, a Kalyāl king of Jumlā. The genealogy of the Kalyāl kings also claims that their descent was from the Sisodiyā clan of Chitor. The first Kalyāl king was Balirāj, said to be a Rajput. When pregnant his mother had gone on a pilgrimage from Chitor to Mānsarovar. On her way back she gave birth to him at a village called Kalā in Soru Darā of Jumlā. He lived in the court of Malāibham, ruler of Khārācakra. With the assistance of some Brahmins, Balirāj became king of Jumlā, which was then ruled by Jakti-siṁha of Jaktipur and comprised Jumlā, Sijā and Lāmēthārā. The genealogy mentions the year 1404 as the date when Balirāj established his capital at Sunārgāl of Jumlā. It further mentions that the Kalyāls belong to

1. The central and not to be confused with the eastern situated on the bank of the Trisūlī river. All references to this place before Narbhūpāl Sāh’s times (1716-42) are for the central.
2. No reason has been given for the change of the title from Sāhī to Sāh.
3. Whence Balirāj and his descendants are known Kalyāls.
4. Darā means 'a subdivision of the district'. It is current in Jumlā only.
5. Therefore Manirāj, the fifth in line from Balirāj, perhaps flourished some time during the last quarter of the fifteenth century, the time being assumed by roughly allowing an average of 20 years' rule to each of his predecessors.
the Raghu dynasty (i.e. the Solar dynasty). The first ancestor is named 1 as Ṛṣirāj and their gotra is given as Ravi. Another genealogy of the Kalyāls, however, states that they belonged to the Lunar race and their gotra was Ravi with the fivefold Ṛṣi pravara: Sāvarṇī, Cyāvana, Jāmadagni, Mārgava and Āplava. The latter genealogy enumerates fifty-nine predecessors of Balirāj of whom the first five were Ṛṣis (i.e. Brahmans) and the rest, presumably non-Brahmans, had Āditya, Rānā (? Magar), Pāl and Rāj as their titles in succeeding generations. No such genealogy and titles for the Sisodiyās are found elsewhere. Moreover, it is known that the Sisodiyās belonged to the Solar race, and that their gotra was Baijavāpa, with the threefold Ṛṣi pravara: Āṅgirasa, Bārhaspatya and Bhāradvāja. There are also a few other genealogies of the Kalyāls but their accounts conflict, and on their evidence the claim to Sisodiyā lineage cannot be regarded as established.

The chronology copied by Prthvīnārāyan does not mention the names of the first twenty-two successors of Ṛṣirāj Sahī but only that of the twenty-third, Manirājā Sahī, who migrated to Arghā. If we give an average of twenty years to each generation and make a calculation back

2. Ibid., p.106.
3. C.V. Vaidya: History of the mediaeval Hindu India, vol.II, pp.50-55, 57. H.C. Ray gives a reference to this threefold Ṛṣi pravara of the Sisodiyās: Ātreya, Gāvisthira and Pauruṣātitha (The dynastic history of northern India, p.1155). There are some Baijavāpas who have this pravara whereas some have a different one: Ātreya, Arcanānasa and Pauruṣātitha (John Brough: The early Brahmanical system of gotra and pravara, pp.140-44).
from Dravya Śāh, who became king of Gorkhā in 1559, to Manirājā, five generations, the latter must have lived round about the third quarter of the fifteenth century. It is tempting to take Manirāj Kalyāl and Manirājā Sāhī to be one and the same person but the absence in the accounts of Jumlā of any reference to the Kalyāl migration to Arghā makes such an assumption doubtful.

There is a chronology in Nepali, now published under the name of Gorkhāvamsāvalī, which begins from Dravya Śāh and ends with the death of Nabhūpāl Śāh, father of Prthvīnārāyaṇ, in 1742. It includes the early career of Prthvīnārāyaṇ also. We are unable to fix a date of its compilation, but presumably writing ceased about 1742 the date at which the narrative ends.

The Gorkhāvamsāvalī tells of an attempt made by Rām Śāh (1609-36) to find out his lineage and the guardian deity of his family. For that purpose he sent his men to Chitor, Udayapur, Jodhpur, Kota, Bundi, Jayapur, etc., to contact the Rāṇā, Rāṭhor, Hārā and Kachvāhā Rajputs. The men are alleged to have found out that the Śāh family belonged to the Sisodiya clan, and that they obtained an augmentation of the praśasti of the Śāh kings from the Sisodiya ruler of Udayapur. This praśasti included the title of girirājacakraudāmaṇī (the crest jewel amongst the cycle of the kings of the Hills) which was also approved by the emperor of Delhi when he was requested to do so by the Gorkhalese emissary.

2. GVY, pp.33-38. The chronology means that girirājacakraudāmaṇī was added to the praśasti of the Rāṇā ruler of Udayapur to be used by Śāh kings of Gorkhā, but the praśasti of the Udayapur rulers was entirely different (Suryavikram Jhāvalī: Rām Śāhko jīvancaritra, p.21).
It is very strange however that no contemporary Muslim historian refers to this event, which would seem to involve the supremacy if not the suzerainty of the Muslim emperor of Delhi over the independent Himalayan king. The absence of such a reference may be taken as evidence against the truth of the story of Rām Śāh's mission. The adoption of the praśasti by the Śāh kings may have prompted the compiler of the chronology to coin some major event to justify the use of the title. Nevertheless, we fail to understand why Rām Śāh needed the recognition of the Delhi emperor for his praśasti when there were other grounds on which he could justify his claim to be 'the crest jewel amongst the cycle of the kings of the Hills'. It was this Gorkhā ruler who had enlarged his territory by conquering some chieftainships of Magar and Gurung tribes and attempted even, though in vain, to expand it further towards the north into Tibet. He had become the most famous amongst the contemporary rulers of the various principalities of the Nepal Himalaya not only by the reason of these exploits but also as a result of his social code which introduced a number of social reforms previously unheard of in Nepalese society. It is possible that he himself adopted the praśasti to commemorate his achievements.

1. Neither is there any mention in the accounts of Mewar about this emissary. Ojha says that from the times of Maharānā Jawān Singh (1828-38), ruler of Udayapur, the people of Nepal came into contact with Mewār (Udayapur rājya kā itihās, vol.I,p.88).

2. Known as Rām Śāhko thiti (vide GVY,pp.25-40).

3. There is nothing extraordinary in the praśasti adopted by Rām Śāh. It was also used by some rulers of the Himalayan countries. It was used in the tenth century by the Katyūrī kings of Gāhwal (Edwin T. Atkinson: The Himalayan districts of the North-Western Provinces of India, vol.II, forming vol.XI of the Gazetteer, N.-W. P.,p.467, n.1), and also used by the Samal rulers of Achām (near Jumla) which seems to have been founded in 1470 (IP,vol.II,pt.iii,pp.391,393,398).
The Gorkhāvāṃśavālī is regarded by the Nepalese as the most authentic of the chronologies. It appears to have been a source for other accounts published in the various volumes of the Itiḥāsprakāṣ. There is a chronology in the Hodgson Papers which is almost identical to it. Hodgson has not given any heading to it, a thing which he has to a number of other chronologies or genealogical accounts in his collection, together with the names of the persons through whom they were obtained and when. Nevertheless it is said that the chronology was sent to Hodgson from the royal palace of Nepal. It cannot be definitely said which of the two, the Gorkhāvāṃśavālī or its cognate in the Hodgson Papers, is older. The latter, which also gives an account of Prthvīnārāyaṇ, ends with his second unsuccessful invasion of Kīrtipur in 1764, and hence it may be

2. Vol.51,fos.:5-107. The initial portion of this chronology is in Hindi and the rest in Nepali. There are 106 volumes and rolls of the Hodgson Papers. Almost all the materials of these Papers were collected by B.H. Hodgson during his residence at Kāthmāndu from 1820 to 1843 where he was first Assistant Resident and later Resident of the British Residency. These Papers contain manuscripts in Sanskrit, Nepali, Newari, Hindi, Persian, English and in other dialects of Nepal. They were collected "for the full exposition of the history, institutions, races and tongues, revenue and commerce" of Nepal. They were presented to the Secretary of State for India in 1864, and are now available in the India Office Library (William Wilson Hunter: Life of Brian Houghton Hodgson, p.338).
3. Hodgson Papers (hereafter abbreviated HP), vol.17,fo.1 ('prepared by order of Maha Rajah in 1837-42'), vol.18,fo.11 ('from the Chountra'), ibid.,fo.15 ('Matabar Sing's'), vol.52,fo.108 ('From the Rajah'), ibid.,fo.117 obverse (in Nepali 'Dhakāl Mejarbāṭa', i.e., from Major Dhakāl; in English 'From Maha Rajah'), ibid.,fo.172 ('Futeh Jang - Gorkha Bansa-vālī'), vol.56,fo.40 ('From Maha Rajah'), vol.74,fo.97 ('Recd. 4 Sept. 1824'). There is also a list in HP,vol.74,fo.96, where the sources of some of these chronologies and accounts are mentioned.
4. HP,vol.74,fo.36.
assumed that the annalists stopped at this period. All the chronologies
collected by Hodgson from different traditions claim the origin of the
Śāh dynasty to be from the Rajputs of India, although the place from
where they migrated, the person who migrated and the place in the hills
of Nepal where he first settled vary.

It was Bhīmsen Thāpā, Prime Minister of Nepal (1804-37), who
arranged the official chronology of the Śāh dynasty in order to trace
the pedigree and more particularly to give a detailed account of the
campaigns and conquests undertaken by kings from Prthvīnārāyaṇ onwards
and also to enumerate the roles played by those who fought and died for
their kings and country. This chronology seems to have been written in
early 1814 when Gīrbāṇayuddhavikram Śāh (1799-1816), great grandson of
Prthvīnārāyaṇ, was reigning. It states that the Śāh dynasty originated
from Ayutam Rāṇājī, King of Chitor Fort in Udayapur city in the country
of Māl [Mārwar], and belonged to the Lunar race. As a result of a
domestic quarrel amongst the sons of Vīrvikram Rāye, the seventh king
in line from Ayutam Rāṇājī, Jillaha Rāye left his ancestral home to enter
the Hills in the north. Bhūpati Rāye, the thirteenth in line from Jillaha
Rāye, went to Khilung in Bhārkot. Jayanta Khān, one of his four sons,

2. A detailed account of events after 1813, particularly of Nepal's
   expansion into Kumaū, Garhwal and countries further to the west, is given
   in a chronology (IP,vol.II,pt.iii,pp.442-46) of which earlier portion
   agrees with the one compiled at the instance of Bhīmsen Thāpā.
3. The chronology is silent regarding the lapse of the titles Rāṇājī
   and Rāye and the adoption of Khān.
gave Khilung as a gift to his preceptor Paramānanda Bhaṭṭācārya and went to Nuwākoṭ to be its ruler. He was succeeded by Vicitra Khān and Jayadeva Khān. The latter's son took the title of Sāhī. Kulamanḍan, the successor of Jayadeva Khān, became king of Kāśkī. He took the title of Sāhā. One of his sons, Yasobam Sāhā, became king of Lamjung. Yasobam's second son, Dravya Sāhā, became king of Gorkhā. Although chronologies differ to a great extent regarding the early genealogy as well as in the spelling of the names, all agree with the line of successors and the principal events from Yasobam Sāhā, i.e. Yaśobrahma Sāh onwards.

By the end of the eighteenth century when the Sāh kings of Nepal had become dominant a reconstruction of their genealogy was perhaps deemed imperative. The compilation at the instance of Bhīmsen Thāpā may have been prompted by an attempt, now that the position of the Gorkhā Śāhs had been exalted on account of their exploits, to claim their origin from the Sisodiya clan of Udayapur in order to establish their superiority over the other rulers of the Nepal Himalaya, since amongst the Rajputs clans the Sisodiya is regarded as one of the purest and the superior.

Another chronology composed in Sanskrit verses by Gaurīdatta during the

1. No reason has also been given for the adoption of Sāhī and then change to Sāhā.

2. These discrepancies will be apparent from the comparison of the chronologies by Citravilās, Dharanīḍhar, Bhīmsen Thāpā, etc.

3. The chronology names all the kings of Gorkhā from Kulamanḍan to Prthvīnārāyaṇ with the title of Sāhā. The use of this title for the latter's successors is however not consistent and the spelling varies between Sāh and Sāhā. Sāhī is the title given to the illegitimate issue of the royal family, e.g. Rudrī Sāhī, Narbhūpāl's illegitimate son and Prthvīnārāyaṇ's step-brother (IP, op.cit.,p.124, col.2), Ranasiṃha Sāhī, Prthvīnārāyaṇ's illegitimate son (ibid., p.128, col.2). Vide also HP, vol. 74, fos.97-98, for this distinction.

reign of Gībāṅayuddhavikram may have been compiled for the same purpose. While augmenting and closely following the chronology by Citrāvilās, the author of this latter chronology has added later material. It tells that Vikram, after having defeated his enemies, entering the Hills. After him there was Jīllarāj. But the author does not say where the kings from Jīllarāj onwards were domiciled. Gaurīdatta seems to prefer the chronology by Citrāvilās to that by Dharaṇīdhār perhaps for the reason that the former described the origin as from the house of Chītor, which the Sāhus could use as a support to their claim, whereas the latter simply mentioned the ancestral home as being Fort Jambīra from where Jāhi Khān, the ninth in line from Jīla, entered the Hills to settle subsequently at Lasargha and from there his descendants branched off to places near and around it.

At the turn of the eighteenth century when Nepal came into contact with the British in India, British officers in the service of the East India Company in Bengal and those sent on duty to Nepal or to the region bordering on it began to collect information regarding the country. The earliest of them to submit an exhaustive account was Captain (afterwards Major General) William Kirkpatrick of the Bengal Army. He was sent to Nepal as a mediator between Nepal and China during the Nepal-China War (1791-92). But before he arrived hostilities had

1. Jāhi Khān in the chronology by Gaurīdatta.


terminated and so he had to leave Kathmāndū. Although his stay in Nepal was short and he was handicapped in many other respects, his account of Nepal, the first of its kind to be published in English, is remarkably detailed and accurate, though there are of course a number of errors and inaccuracies. The book is to all intents and purposes a gazetteer. It deals with tribes and castes, Nepalese institutions, administrative, military and land systems, measures and weights, revenue, peasantry, mineral and vegetable productions, routes, climate, trade, etc. But its historical sketch is very brief. Kirkpatrick found the theory prevalent that the Sāhs were descendants of the Rajputs of Rajputana.

Dr. Francis Hamilton (formerly Buchanan) was the next after Capt. Kirkpatrick to write on Nepal. He was in the suite of Captain (afterwards Major) W.H.D. Knox, also of the Bengal Army, sent to Kathmāndū in 1802 as British Resident. Dr. Hamilton did not accept the Nepalese traditional belief that the Sāhs are descendants of the Rajputs of Chitor.

The chronology compiled at the instance of Bhīmsen Thāpā has been a source of a few chronologies compiled from 1814. These also

2. Kirkpatrick, ibid., p.269.
4. He was also in the suite of Capt. Kirkpatrick (Kirkpatrick, ibid., Preface,x-xi).
5. Knox's mission was also unsuccessful and Hamilton had to leave Kathmāndū after fourteen months' stay. He however remained on the frontier for two years collecting information about the country (Hamilton, ibid., Introduction).
claim the origin of the Śāhs as being from the Rajputs of Chitor or Udayapur belonging to the Sisodiya clan. One of these is the chronology composed by King Rājendravikram Śāh, (1816-47), son and successor of Gīrbanṣyuddhavikram Śāh. It is in fifteen Sanskrit verses and forms an introduction to his Rājakalpadruma, a Sanskrit work on tantricism. Like Gaurīdatta he takes Vikram, King of Chitor, who entered the Hills, to be the founder of the Śāh house of Gorkhā. His son was Jillarāj. The names of the kings from Jilla onwards wholly agree with those mentioned in the chronologies by Citravilās, Dharanidhar and Gaurīdatta. The latest of the Nepalese chronologies seems to be Gorakṣādhisacampu, also written in Sanskrit, partly in verse and partly in prose, and hence the name campu for this genre. It is the most elaborate of the other Sanskrit chronologies referred to above. It ends with the birth of Surendravikram Śāh, the Crown Prince, in 1829. The chronology translated from Nepali into English by Munshi Shew Shunker Singh and Pandit Shri Gunanand, and edited and published by Daniel Wright was perhaps a contemporary work for we find an identical king-list and almost all the statements are identical. These two chronologies differ significantly from the earlier ones, excepting in the claim of the Śāhs to origin from the royal Sisodiya

1. Some lines of this chronology are wholly reproduced and some are adapted from the chronologies by Citravilās and Gaurīdatta.


4. History of Nepal, Cambridge, 1877. He was for some time Residency Surgeon at Kathmāndu. Shew Shunker Singh was the Mīr Munshi of the Residency and Shri Gunānand a native Pandit of Pāṭan, the southern sister town of Kathmāndu.
The statements made in these chronologies have generally been accepted by native historians. Sylvain Lévi, the great Oriental scholar who went to Kāthmāndu to write an authoritative history of Nepal, did not find tenable the claim of the Gorkhā Śāhs to Rajput ancestry. Gorakṣādhīsaṃcāpa and the chronology published by Wright ascribe the origin of the Śāh family of Gorkhā to Bhaṭṭārak Raśirāj Rāṇājī, King of Chitor Fort, belonging to the Lunar race. For thirteen generations kings of this house preserved their independence from being overrun by the Yavanās called Māunās, who however defeated the fourteenth king, Ayutavamba, and reduced his state. He dropped the title Bhaṭṭārak since he thought that the defeat at the hands of the Yavanās did not justify it, and retained the second title Rāṇājī. The three kings, Barāvumba, Kanakbam and Yasbam, who ruled over Chitor after him, did not use this title Bhaṭṭārak. The fourth king Ḫudumbara was given the title of Rāva by the Emperor (i.e. the Muslim emperor of Delhi) and from him onwards

---
1. Jñāvalī: Prthvīnārāyaṇ Śāh, p.15, wherein he emphatically opines that the Śāhs are of pure Kṣatriya blood; also D.R. Regmi: Modern Nepal, p.14. Bāburām Ācārya, the father of Nepalese history, however, does not accept the Rajput lineage of the Śāhs of Gorkhā. He believes them to be the Khas.
3. For the first time we see the claim to this origin. Perhaps the chronology of the Kalyāls (q.v. p. 88) meant by Raśirāj, their ancestor, the same Bhaṭṭārak Raśirāj Rāṇājī. From the chronology and genealogical list of the Kalyāls it is clear that they derived from Brahmans but it is not clear whether the person mentioned to be the first ancestor of the Śāhs is a Brahman, though the name Raśirāj makes us to suppose so.
fifteen kings known as Rāva ruled over Chitor. Bhūpati Rāṇājī Rāva, the fifteenth Rāva king, had three sons, Udayabam, Phattesimha and Manmath, and one daughter named Sandal. The Muslim emperor of Delhi demanded the hand of the princess. With the characteristic pride of the Rajputs Bhūpati refused to comply with the demand of the Muslim who thereupon attacked Chitor and destroyed it completely. Bhūpati, Phattesimha and a host of other Rajputs were killed in the course of fighting. The princess burnt herself to death by jumping into a pan of boiling oil. Udayabam left for Udayapur and settled there. Manmath also left his ancestral home and settled at Ujjain. The latter had two sons, Brahmanik and Bhūpāl. As a result of a quarrel between these two brothers Bhūpāl left Ujjain and went towards the Hills in the north. He came to Rīṣī. From there he

1. GC, verses 12-17, IP, vol.II,pt.iii,p.600; but sixteen in Wright, op.cit.,p.274.

2. The statements of the chronologies are wrong. The titles Rāval and Rāṇā were for the first time adopted by two Mewar families after Karpa-simha, ruler of Chitor (1193-1201). These titles originated from his eldest son and a younger son, Kṣemsimha and Rāhup respectively. The Rāṇās ruled at Sisodā and called themselves Sisodiyā (Tod: Annals,ed. Crooke,vol.I,p.304,n.3). No such names as Bhaṭṭārak Rāj Rāṇājī and those of his successors having the titles of Rāṇājī and Rāva as mentioned in Nepalese chronologies are found amongst the Rāṇā and Rāval branches of Mewar.

3. GC, IP, ibid.,p.601; but the sixteenth in Wright,ibid.

4. GC,ibid. But in Wright,ibid.,p.275, it is said that she was Phattesimha's daughter and that her name was Sadal. Other names Padmini (GVY, pp.33,34) and Padmakumārī (HP,vol.52,fo.52) are also met with. It is said that she was demanded by the Muslim emperor. IN HP,ibid.,it is said that she was the daughter of Rāmnāryansimha Rānā of Chitor Fort. GVY,ibid., does not mention the name of her father or that of the Muslim emperor.

5. Chronologies also confuse with the name of Akbar, the Muslim emperor alleged to have demanded the hand of the Rajput princess, a statement which at this period is anachronistic as well as distortion of historical fact.

6. A sacrificial rite called Jauhar performed by the Rajput ladies to save themselves from being captured and molested by the infidel.

7. A place about 10 miles to the north-west of Tānsen in western Nepal.
moved to Lasargha and finally in 1495 to Khilung in Bhirkot. Here his
two sons, Khancā Khan and Micā Khan were born. For them brides of
Raghuvaśi Rajput origin (i.e. Rajputs of the Solar race) were obtained
from Madhyadesā (the Indo-Gangetic plains). Khancā Khan established for
himself an independent kingdom at Dhor. Later, he conquered some districts
belonging to the Magars and became the ruler of a large tract comprising
Garahū, Satahū, Bhirkot and Dhor. The younger Micā Khan went further
to the north-east and became the ruler of Nuwakoṭ.

According to the chronologies Jayan Khan, Sūrya Khan, Micā Khan
II, Vicitra Khan, Jagdeva Khan and Kulamanḍan ruled after Micā Khan I.

1. About the place vide p.94, n.2.
2. For the first time a date (1495) is mentioned in the Nepalese chrono-
logies, a fact which helps us to probe the veracity of the hypothesis
of the migration of the ancestor of the Sāhs from Chitor into the
Hills (vide pp.116-17).
3. Khancā and Micā are Magar words derivable from karḥanca > khāncā, 'elder or the eldest of the brothers', and from mharca > micā,
'younger or the youngest of the brothers'. The etymology of Khan is dubi-
ous. These two brothers are also known by their Sanskrit names Harihar-
simha and ŚAjayāsimha (Hamilton, op.cit.,p.240; Jñāvālī: Dravya Sāhko
jīvanarittra,p.6, Pṛthvīnārāyana Sāh,p.20). In Nepalese society brothers
are nicknamed jetbo (elder or the eldest, <Sk. jyeśṭha-), mahilo (middle,
<Sk. madhyama-), kancho (younger or the youngest, <Sk. kaniśṭha-), etc.
Considering the region of the Magars where Bhupāl ruled, it is not un-
likely to find the nicknames of his sons prevalent amongst the local people.
4. All these places where Bhupāl and his sons settled are situated to
the north-east of Riri and in the region watered by the Modi and Ādhi
rivers. The region then, as now, comprised settlements of the Magars. Khan
5. Two Micās are found and hence we shall call the latter Micā Khan II.
6. He is said to have annexed Kāski (Jñāvālī: Dravya Sāhko jīvanarittra,p.7).
7. Jayant and Jagdeva are variously spelt: Jayanta, Jayata, Jayadeva,etc.,
since in the Devanāgarī script in which Nepali is written all these are
possible in a careless handwriting. Jayanta may be read Jayata in absence
of the nasal mode, Jagdeva may be read Jayadeva if -ga is not clear, and
similarly if -ga is indistinct, Jagadeva may be read Jagadeva. Jayanta,
Jayata and Jayadeva are heard as Jainta, Jaǐta and Jāideva in speech,
and hence these forms are also written.
8. This name is not found in some chronologies. In some two variants,
Kulamanḍan and Kulamanḍan are met with (Jñāvālī,ibid.),the latter being an
unasalised form of Kulamanḍan.
Kulamanḍan got the principality of Kāśki. He is said to have pleased the emperor of Delhi who conferred upon him the title of Sāh and since then his descendants began to be called Sāhs.

Kulamanḍan had seven sons. The eldest succeeded him on the throne of Kāśki. The second, Kālu, was asked for by the people of Durāṣāra in Lamjung who made him their king; but the Sekhāntas the tribal people of Lamjung, while escorting him to the forest for hunting, killed him with a poisoned arrow. For some time after this the people of Lamjung remained without a king but seeing that they could not do without one, they came again to Kulamanḍan to ask for another son. Grieved at the cruel death of his son, he at first refused to comply with their request, but the Lamjungites asserted their innocence and he was prevailed upon to allow them to select any one of his sons except the eldest, the choice to be made while the sons were asleep. The Lamjungites found that the youngest, Yaśobrahma, possessed some divine power and so they selected him to be

---

1. Lex., 'the ridge inhabited by the Durās'. They are a tribal people of western Nepal, originally of Durā, south of Lamjung.

2. It is difficult to say what people they were. Probably they were some aboriginal people now extinct. They are said to have been cow-eaters. But a few tribal peoples of Nepal who are also cow-eaters do not use this name for themselves. The suffix -ānta, however, suggests that they were the people of Sekh (on the analogy of Magarāt, 'the land of the Magars', Kirāt, 'the land of the Kira', though now Kirātī is the name of the people themselves; cf. kirāt, 'the land of the Kirātīs'. Sekhānta is derivable from -ēṣāntaka (ēṣa + antaka), 'the end of the border' or 'boundary' (MW) and hence the Sekhāntas were perhaps the people of the frontier, maybe of Seshānta Siklik (modern Siklis), then quite possibly the frontier between Lamjung and Kāśki, the place being to the north-west of the former and to the north-east of the latter. The place Seshant Siklik appears in the map given by Orfeur Cavanagh in his book Rough notes on the state of Nepal, its government, army and resources, Calcutta, 1851.
their king.

Yasóbrahma had three sons, Narhari, Narpäti (otherwise Narindra) and Dravyá. The eldest succeeded his father on the throne of Lamjung while the youngest carved out for himself the principality of Gorkhá. Chronologies say that high caste Hindus, Brahmans and Kṣatriyas, of Gorkhá were not happy at being ruled by their king who was a Khārkā, belonging to a Khas clan which then used to take alcohol without involving excommunication and hence considered to be of a very low caste. The ruler also oppressed his high caste Hindu subjects. Two Brahmans, Nārāyaṇ Arjyāl of Khilung and his disciple, Gaṇeś Pāre, availed of the discontent. They brought the Magars of Gorkhá to their side and became successful to make Dravya Sāh the ruler of Gorkhá in 1559. Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ was the ninth king after him to rule over this state.

Gōrakṣḍadhīśacampu and the chronology published by Wright may further be compared with another genealogy to show how king-lists vary in their contents and claims. The genealogy in question is that of the

1. According to a chronology referred to by Jñāvālī: Dravya Sāhko jīvan-caritra, p.8, Yasóbrahma was the son of Nardeva who is said to have succeeded Vicitra and annexed Lamjung. But the name of Nardeva is not found elsewhere. Perhaps it was the mistake of the scribe who wrote Nardeva instead of Jayadeva or Jagdeva.

2. GVY, pp.3,5; IP, vol.I,pp.98-99, and p.121,col.2; HP,vol.51,fo.5,vol. 52,fo.59; Jñāvālī, ibid.,pp.8-9,12. But the order of their names varies. It is also said that Yasóbrahma had two wives: from the senior was born Narhari and from the younger Dravya (IP, ibid.,p.142). Quite possibly Narpati was not conspicuous or that he died during his youth and not regarded as worthy of mention he has been omitted in some chronologies.

3. GVY, pp.5-7; Jñāvālī, ibid.,pp.17-24.
Athika Thakuri royal houses, which differs in the names of the rulers of Lasargha, Garahū, Dhōr, Bhīrkoṭ, Nuwākoṭ, Satahū, Kāski, Lamjung and Gorkhā, all these in the Sapta Gaṇḍakī region of the central Nepal. It appears that the founder of the original line, who is unnamed, ruled over Lasargha. His two sons, Jāīta Khān and Micā Khān, became rulers of Bhīrkoṭ and Nuwākoṭ respectively. Jāīta Khan had two sons, Sūrya Khān and Daśarath Khān, the former became the ruler of Bhīrkoṭ and the latter founded the principality of Garahū. The fourth king after Daśarath Khān I had two sons, Karṇa Khān and Daśarath Khān (II), the elder of whom succeeded his father whereas the younger went to be the king of Dhōr. Thus three independent lines, those of Bhīrkoṭ, Garahū and Dhōr, originating from Sūrya Khān, Daśarath Khān I and Daśarath Khān II, came into existence as branches of the original house of Lasargha. Micā Khān, King of Nuwākoṭ, had three sons, Bhakti Khān, Sirabumba Khān and Vicitra Khān. Bhakti Khān became king of Nuwākoṭ, Sirabumba of Satahū and Vicitra of Kāski. But this genealogy does not say how the house of Lamjung evolved. It begins with Jasobam Sāhī [Yaśobhrama Sāh] from whose two sons, Narhari and Dravya, the houses of Lamjung and Gorkhā evolved. A later list gives the names of rulers of Garahū as being descended from Śrībhakta Khān whose ancestry is not, however, mentioned. Of these eight royal houses, those of Bhīrkoṭ, Garahū and Dhōr continued to be known as Khāns; those of Nuwākoṭ, Satahū and Kāski, earlier called Khāns,

1. IP, op.cit., pp.67-68.
2. Ibid., p.68, col.1.
3. Khāns in modern times.
later on adopted Sāhī as their title. The house of Gorkhā until Narbhūpāl's times were called Sāhī. Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ and his successors are called Sāhī.

There is another chronology the context of which has no historical validity at all. It traces the origin of the Sāhs of Gorkhā to the ancestors who had Simī i.e. Simha as their title. The ancestral seat is said to have been in Raurā, a mountain country in the west of Nepal, where the first ancestor was born of a pure Kṣatriya bride. Their youngest son, Harinārāyaṇaśimha came to Gir Fort. His youngest son, Rāmnārāyaṇaśimha (otherwise Rāmsimha) came to Chitor Fort and took the title of Rānā. He had two sons, Jāimalśimha Rānā and Phattesimha Rānā, and one daughter, Padmakumārī. The emperor of Delhi demanded the hand of Padmakumārī, and the refusal resulted in the fighting that took place between the emperor and the Rānās. The Rānās held out for twelve years. Seeing that his defeat was inevitable, Jāimalśimha Rānā sent his wife and son, Viṣṇusiśma Rānā, out of his country for their protection, saying that if he survived in the fighting with the Muslim emperor he would have them searched out. Jāimalśimha fought but was defeated. Padmakumārī was sacrificed. Jāimalśimha and a host of other Rānās were killed. Their fort was destroyed. Viṣṇusiśma Rānā came to Vaighā Lasarghā.

1. The kings of Nuwākoṭ, Satahū, Kāskī and Lamjung, who were contemporaries of Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ are also called Sāhs (IP, vol. II, pt. iii, p. 586).

2. Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ used the title Sāh for himself but as far as it can be ascertained not before 1754 (vide p. 82, n. 6). The use of this title by later chronologists is however not consistent and the spelling seems to vary between Sāh and Sāhā (IP, vol. I, pp. 126-28, 161-63, vol. II, pt. iii, pp. 418-19, 433-46).

His son was Ātalsimha Rānā. He had two sons. The elder, Harisimha, became king of Garahū and took the title of Khān. The younger, Ajapsimha, became king of Nuwākoṭ (the central) and took the title of Sāhī. His younger son, Jasbam Sāhi, became king of Lamjung. His younger son, Darbe Sāh, became king of Gorkhā in 1559.

Howsoever confusing the earlier portions may be, the accounts in all chronologies from Dravya Sāh onwards seem authentic although at places they are slightly blurred by myths and legends. There is unanimity among them in giving 1559 as the year when Dravya Sāh became king of Gorkhā. But accounts of the kings previous to him cannot be accepted without reservation. We have seen how chronologies and genealogies differ in referring to the founder of the Sāh family of Gorkhā, his original seat, the branching off of the collateral families, their migration and settlement, the order of names and their spellings and other things about which we have already spoken. Although Goraksādhīśacampu and the chronology published by Wright are generally accepted by historians, they contain such discrepancies as render very doubtful the claim of the Sāhs to the Sisodyā Rajput lineage. Even the name of the ancestor given in these two sources, Bhaṭṭārak Ḍhirāj Rāṇājī, King of Chitor, cannot be accepted on their authority only as his name and the names of his successors which are enlisted do not appear in the annals of Mewar.

The earlier history of the various houses of rulers in the region from the Trisuli to the Karnali is shrouded in mystery. Almost continuous warfare in this region, where many petty kingdoms evolved, may be chiefly responsible for the destruction of a great deal of historical material. Whatever reliable accounts are now extant, they baffle us because of their long intervals. But from what remains and the meagre accounts so far published a fairly plausible reconstruction of the history of at least Dothi and Jumla, the most prominent in the Karnali region, is not altogether impossible. A list of kings of Dothi and their accounts, especially with reference to their relations with kings of Kumau and Garhwal, is given by Atkinson. He states that the kings of Dothi were for many generations styled Deva, but that after Nāgamalla Deva (who flourished towards the end of the fifteenth century) they became known as Sahās. Their capital was at Dothi, now the westernmost district of Nepal, and during the first half of the fifteenth century the dominion of the state extended beyond the Kali river, now


the boundary between Kumāu and Nepal, and included Sirā, Sor, Askot, and the valleys of Dārmā and Juhār, inhabited by people of the Tibetan origin. There fighting often took place between the kings of Doṭī and Kumāu as late as the eighteenth century in the course of which territories often changed hands and each side often accepted the suzerainty of the other. The senior branch of the royal house of Doṭī was known as Rāinkā Rājā and ruled over Doṭī with its capital at Dāreldhurā. The junior branch was known as Bam or Malla Sāhi and ruled over Sirā and Sor. Doṭī was annexed to Nepal in 1790 during the reign of Raṇa Bahūdur Sāh.

The state of Jumlā was far more prosperous. Its kings Nāgrāj, Krācalla, Aṣokacalla, Rīpu Malla, Pṛthvī Malla, etc., are well known. The kingdom reached the zenith of its power during the times of Pṛthvī Malla (1338-58) whose dominion, including almost all the Darās of modern Jumlā, and comprised a large area beyond the Himalaya, now

1. Badarīdatta Pāṇḍe, op.cit., pp.529-30, however, erroneously says that all the kings after Nāgamalla are called Mallas.


3. Atkinson, op.cit., pp.516-18, refers to a grant of this king issued from Dullu in 1223 in which he is mentioned as "the destroyer of the demolished city of Kantipur [Kathmandu]" and victor of Kārtikeyapur i.e. Kumāu.

4. Mentioned as the king of Sapādalakṣa (the central Himalayan region of Kāngā, Ṭehri Gaṛhwal, Gaṛhwal and Kumāu) in his inscription found in Bodh Gaya (Bhagavanlal Indrajī, op.cit.), which shows not only his munificence and devotion towards Buddha but also his power. Petech assigns his regnal period 1255-78 (Mediaeval History of Nepal, p.198).

5. He penetrated in 1313 as far as the Nepal Valley. His regnal period was 1312-38 (Petech, ibid., p.108; IF, vol.II, pt.i, pp.79-81).
in Tibet. In the west it comprised the regions of Bājurā, Bajhāng, Thalarā and Achām, where states of these names evolved in later times.

In the south its boundary extended to Surkhet and in the east to Tibrīkoṭ. Prthvī Malla's summer capital was Sijā (also called Sefija or Sījā) and the winter capital Dullu (also Surkhet sometimes for a month or two).

After him the regular line of the Mallas. We see his successors Samsār-varmā and Medinīvarmā without the title Malla. The latter's capital was at Sunārgāū. After him Balirāj, styled Rāula (prince) and belonging to a new dynasty called Kalyāl, became the king of Juṃlā in 1404 and established his capital at Sunārgāū. His successors known as Sāis during the fifteenth century and afterwards Sāhis, Sāhis, Sāhās or Sāhs could not prevent subdivision of Juṃlā. Nevertheless it continued to

---

1. As is apparent from his inscriptions published in IP, vol.II, pt.i, pp.45-47, 49-52, 58-61, 68-70; Himavatsamskṛtī, year 1, no.1, p.31; Tucci, op. cit., pp.62, 64, 68.

2. Yogi Narharināth in IP, ibid., pp.74, 81-82.

3. IP, ibid., p.109 though earlier mentioned as Mahārājādhirāj (great king of all the kings) (ibid., p.108).


5. As is apparent from the inscriptions and grants published in IP, vol.II, pt.i, pp.120 ff.

6. From 1404 mention has been made of two Juṃlās, upper and lower (ibid., pp.109, 115, 117). In 1437 we see a separate existence of the state of Achām including Dānā in its dominion (ibid., pp.112-14). Independent states of Dullu, Dāllekh and Vilāspur are mentioned in 1568 (ibid., pp.123-24, 169). Another state Rāskoṭ is also mentioned in 1620. Its capital was at Dhāulyātri, near Khocarnāth, the frontier with Tibet (ibid., pp.132-36). Perhaps after the middle of the sixteenth century the Kalyāls ruled over the eastern portion of Juṃlā with their headquarters at different places: Chināsim, Tibrīkoṭ, Liku, Kākakoṭ, Kotīpur (near Tibrīkoṭ), Dunsā, etc. (ibid., pp.123, 125, 128 ff).
be regarded as the seniormost amongst the states in the Nepal Himalaya until it was annexed to Nepal in 1789.

From the accounts and inscriptional and archival materials referred to above, although some of them are fragmentary, we learn that the rulers of Doti and Jumla were originally Khases whose forebears had come to settle in the eleventh century from the neighbouring region of Garhwal and Kumaon. These invading Khases appear to have conquered the local tribal peoples and established domains over them. Most of the ministers and counsellors of the earlier Khas Mallas and Kalyàls were Khases and some were possibly Magars. Their surnames, which are mentioned in inscriptions, royal donations and grants, are even now used by various clans of these two tribes. The Magars were the first tribal people to be converted to Hinduism. Some of their clans were subsequently upgraded to be Kṣatriyas. Vanquished by the new intruders, some of the Magars left their original homeland in the Karnali region and went towards the east to dwell and establish their chieftainships in

3. Adhikārī, Bhāḍārī (modern Bhārārī), Bīṣṭa, Buḍhāthokī or Buḍho or Buḍhā (modern Buḍhāthokī), Ḍāgī, Kāṭhait (modern Kāṭhāit), Kārī, Khaḍgā or Khaḍgāhā (modern Khārkā), Mahatārā or Mahatra (modern Mahat), Rāul (modern Rāval), Rāut, Rokāyā or Rokāhā (modern Rokāyā or Rokā), Thāpā, etc.
4: As can be presumed from some common surnames of the Magars, Thakurīs and Khas Chetris.
5. They have still now their compact settlement in Dullu (as mentioned by Yogi Narharināth in IP, vol.II,pt.i,p.184), and in the Karnālī region between Dhundrās and Chāpre (Tony Hagen: Nepal, pp.68-69,71).
Bārha Magarā in the Sapta Gaṅḍakī region, which is now regarded their ancestral home. After some time there too they seem to have been deprived of their political supremacy by the expanding Khases who carved out different principalities for themselves in the Magar country. Prominent among them were the Samāls of Parvat, Galkoṭ and Dhiring; the Gandas of Pyūṭhānā; the Sens of Pālpā, Tanahū, Rising and Pāiyū; and the two Khān brothers of Dhor, Garahū, Bhīrkoṭ, Satahū, Nuwākoṭ and Kāski. By the sixteenth century we find many principalities in the whole region from the Triśūlī to the Karnālī the rulers of which came to be known as Ṭhakurīs and in later times as superior Kṣatriyas. All these are known to have claimed Rajput ancestry. The descendants of some of the rulers of these principalities later took the name Sāhī (Sāhī and Sah in recent times), perhaps in imitation of the rulers of Jumālā, Achām, Dullu, Dāilekh and Rāskoṭ.

1. I.e. the region comprising Satahū, Pāiyū, Bhīrkoṭ, Dhor, Garahū, Rising, Gherī, Gurlī, Arghā, Khācī, Musikot and Ismā. The region is watered by the Rīrī, Barī Gaḍ, Ādhī, Kālī (Kṛṣṇā) Gaṅḍakī, Jagādī, Setī, etc., rivers. The names of most of the rivers of western Nepal end in -dī which in the Magar language means water, e.g. Mayāngdī, Modī, Mādī, Marsyāngdī, Darāṇādī, Jagādī, Tādī, etc. The names of other rivers seem to have been modified, e.g. Bherī < *Bhedī, Ādhī < *Ādī, Rīrī < *Ridī, Setī < *Sedī, etc. The names of all these rivers suggest the Magar settlement in their catchment areas.


4. For the Nepalese Kṣatriyas vide p. 83, n.2.
Most of the Sapta Gaṇḍakī region is even now inhabited by Magars and Gurungs. The Gurungs were the northern neighbours of the Magars. Their original home was the region round about Lamjung, Chandrung and Siklis, i.e. the southern flank of the Annapūrṇā mountain where even now their settlement is compact. Their country is bounded on the west by the Kālī (Krṣṇā) Gaṇḍakī and on the east by the Marsyāngdī. But like the Magars the Gurungs are scattered throughout Nepal as is seen from their straggling settlements. They seem to have come into less contact with the Khases and so remained largely animists following their traditional social customs although to some extent influenced by Buddhism, and also by Hinduism in comparatively recent times. Neighbours to the Tibetans, they were naturally influenced more by Tibetan customs, traditions and religion, and by Buddhism to which they were gradually initiated. But since the Magars were Hinduised at an early date the possibility of intermarriage between them and their rulers' families cannot altogether be ruled out. The victors must have endeavoured to adapt themselves to the social institutions of the vanquished and to have become firmly rooted in the soil of their domains, thereby achieving a lasting political supremacy. The similarity of physical features between the Magars and Thakurīs, both of whom are decidedly Mongoloid, is a further support for this hypothesis. Even the custom of cross-cousin

marriage which is prevalent amongst these two tribes may have been adopted by the Čakurīs, because it was acceptable to the Magars, and to make the texture of the society more homogeneous. More striking by contrast are the decidedly Aryan features seen in the Nepalese Khas Chetris. Perhaps the Khases did not establish for themselves a status equal to that of the Čakurīs, and came to be regarded as inferior to them. In Hindu society in Nepal and elsewhere the question of caste supremacy is political as well as social and it also tends to be affected by material affluence. We see how Jańga Bahādur Kāvar, a Khas of the Khārkā clan, after becoming Prime Minister of Nepal in 1846, took the title of Rāṇā and managed to marry his sons and daughters into the royal Šāh family of Nepal regarded by that time as superior Čakurī, and purest amongst the Kṣatriyas of Nepal. He laid the foundation of the hereditary Prime Ministership of the agnatic line in Nepal confined exclusively to the Rāṇās who became the de facto rulers of the country until 1951, in the course of which time there were frequent intermarriages between the Rāṇā and Šāh families. The Rāṇās also claimed descent from the Sisodiyā clan of Chitor, presumably to establish their superiority

1. Although they themselves do not now use Khas as their name, their wives are, however, called Khasinī (feminine of Khas).
2. Considered inferior to the Kṣatriyas as late as 1559 (Gīt, pp.5-7).
3. Wright, op.cit.,p.285. Even if we accept the Rāṇās' claim to the Sisodiyā Rajput origin, we fail to account for the endogamous marriage between the Šāh and the Rāṇā families, for the Hindu society does not sanction this. Perhaps their dissimilar gotras made this possible. The gotras of the Šāhs and Rāṇās are Kāyapa and Vatsa respectively
amongst the Khas Chetris as well as social equality with the Sâhs on the ground of their homogeny. After coming to power the Râñas endeavoured to be matched with the Sâhs in all respects: politically they did so by being de facto rulers of the country, and socially by intermarriages with the Sâhs and other Thakurî families. The reason of the intermarriages with the royal family was political in another respect also. The Râñas by such intermarriages aimed to Raṇaise the royal house so much so that they even framed a roll of succession for the throne of Nepal which under certain conditions provided for the daughter of a Râṇâ or her son to be the ruler.

It is however very strange that we do not find in the Hodgson Papers any genealogy of the Râñas although there are many relating to the various tribes of the Nepal Himalaya. We cannot agree that Hodgson left Kâthmându before Jaṅga Bahâdur became Prime Minister and for that reason did not know about the Râñas. He was in touch with Kâthmându during his stay in Darjeeling (1843-58) and had direct contact with Jaṅga Bahadur himself. It would seem therefore that the Râṇâ genealogy was not available while Hodgson was in Kâthmându or in Darjeeling. The first genealogy containing the claim of the Rânas to descent from the Sisodiya clan is that contained in History of Nepal edited by Daniel Wright which was published in 1877. It may be therefore

2. Hunter, op.cit., pp.110,256, who also says that Jaṅga Bahâdur had even invited Hodgson "to direct the education of his son-in-law, then heir-apparent to the throne". The young prince was sent to Darjeeling to be Hodgson's ward and to be treated as his own son (ibid., pp.254-56).
that the Rāṇā genealogy was compiled after the assumption of power of Jāṅga Behādur. This assumption would seem to be confirmed by the fact that volumes of Itiḥāsprakāś which contain details of so many of the ruling families and principal tribes of Nepal make no mention of the Rāṇās.

Whatever be the origin of the Śāh kings of Nepal, it is also to be noted that they married with other families of the Nepal Himalaya, of whom some at least cannot be accepted as pure Kṣatriyas.

During Rām Śāh’s times the houses Makwānpur, Tanahū, Pālpā and Parvat were considered fit for providing brides for the Śāhs of Gorkhā. A princess of Parvat had been selected for Rām Śāh himself, though in fact he married a princess of Musīkoṭ. She was a niece of the King of Galkot whose ruling house was a collateral branch of Parvat. Narbhūpāl Śāh, Prthvīnārāyaṇ’s father, had four wives: they were princesses of Khācī, Pālpā, Parvat and Tanahū. Prthvīnārāyaṇ was the first of the Gorkhā rulers to marry a bride from outside the Nepal Himalaya. His second wife was the daughter of Ahimānsśā, a Bāis Rajput of Banaras, into whose family his brothers were also married afterwards. Prthvī-

1. The Samāl rulers of Sallyānā to whom Prthvīnārāyaṇ’s daughter was married, was not regarded a Kṣatriya of a higher order although it was claimed that he derived from a Rajput clan belonging to the Solar race (Hamilton, op.cit.,p.281). He in fact derived from a Hamāl, the progeny of a Brahman father and Thākurī mother (IP,vol.II,pt.iii,pp.376,388, 391,393,etc.). The house of Parvat (Malebam) evolved from the progeny of Jaṛiṇā (i.e. of Jaṛ, a Tibetan tribe) mother and a Gotāme Brahman father (Hamilton, ibid.). Bāburām Ācārya, however, believes that the Jaṛs are the descendants of the Indian Jaṛs (regarded on par with the Rajputs) who migrated into the Himalayan Hills in the distant antiquity.
nārāyaṇ's legitimate sons, Pratāpsimha and Bahādur Śāh, were married to the princesses of Pālpā, and his daughter to the Samāl ruler of Sallyānā. Of the Śāh kings the most notorious and lascivious was Raṇa Bahādur Śāh, Pratāpsimha's son, who had apart from three legally married wives at least three concubines. Of the legally married wives, the seniormost queen was a princess of Gulmā, and the rest were Khases. Of the concubines, two were Māithil Brahmans, one a widow and the other her own younger sister. From the Brahman widow concubine Girbāṇayuddhavikram was born. Raṇa Bahādur went against all Nepalese traditions in making this illegitimate son his successor, a fact which perhaps induced Bhīmsen Thāpā, Raṇa Bahādur's favourite, to prepare the genealogy which claimed an illustrious pedigree for the royal family. The present line of the Śāh kings of Nepal is the continuation of the descendants of Girbāṇayuddhavikram Śāh.

In 1838 emissaries were sent by the Nepalese Court to various Indian Native States in search of a suitable bride for the nine-year-old Crown Prince, Surendrvikram, son and successor of Rajendra-vikram Śāh. One of these went to Udayapur, the ruler of which, Mahārāṇa Sardār Singh (1838-42), stated in a letter written to the Nepalese king, Rajendrvikram, that the latter belonged to his family. Perhaps

1. They were perhaps daughters of one Buddhi Miśra (HP, vol.50, fo.28). The widow is mentioned as a slave in Secret Consultations, Government of India, 30 March 1844, no.35.
the intended matrimonial alliance outside the Nepal Himalaya needed such a proof for it to be established that the royal family in fact possess a glorious pedigree. Some such authority was needed if they were to maintain their claim to Sisodiya Rajput lineage. The chronology prepared by Bhimsen Thapa in 1814 may have had a similar motive. It is not however unlikely that some Rajputs from the nearby region of the plains, now Uttar Prades, had entered the lower range of the southern slope of the Himalaya and intermarried with the local peoples. This may give substance to the claims of some of the ruling families of the Nepal Himalaya to Rajput blood. There is also the possibility of high-class Aryan immigrants into the Himalayan regions and their marriages with the aboriginal Tibeto-Nepalese peoples. But the claim of the Nepalese Kshatriyas to their illustrious ancestry does not seem warranted by any of the existing genealogical statements. In all probability they are the descendants of the Khas tribe who migrated from their earlier home in the north-west of India and in subsequent times spread in the Himalayan regions and were Hinduised by Brahmans.

From what has been discussed it seems clear that since all traditional Nepalese chronologies and genealogies, which are veritable conglomeration of mythology and fiction, vary in their statement, it is impossible to accept the lineage claimed by the Thakuri royal houses of the Nepal Himalaya. As the later portions of the chronologies and

1. Tucci, op.cit., p.66.
genealogies of the Śāh family of Gorkhā contain a good deal of verifiable historical materials, it can be assumed that the ancestors from whom the Śāh dynasty and other dynasties of the Āṭhṭīkā royal families descended were inhabitants of the Kālī (Kṛṣṇā) Gaṇḍakī region inhabited mostly by Magar and Gurung tribes, and that after establishing their sway over these tribes and their principalities, their descendants had come into prominence by the sixteenth century when they were tempted to connect themselves with the illustrious Rajput clans of India.

We find other inconsistencies in the Nepalese chronologies, inconsistencies of date and historical fact. It is an historical fact that Chitor was attacked and destroyed by Alauddin Khilji in 1303 though Ratnasimha, and not Bhūpati as mentioned in Nepalese accounts, was then its ruler. The attack of Alauddin has been attributed to the refusal of Ratnasimha to hand over his wife, Padminī, to the Muslim ruler. Other Nepalese chronologies say that Akbar demanded the hand of Sandal or Sadal, daughter of Bhūpati, the ruler of Chitor, and that the refusal led Akbar to attack and destroy Chitor. As a consequence of the fall of Chitor, Bhūpati's two sons, Udayabam and Manmath, left their ancestral home and settled at Udayapur and Ujjain respectively. Bhūpāl, the younger son of Manmath, is said to have entered the Hills and settled at Riṇī from where he migrated to Khilung in 1495. Even if we accept the errors in the names of the persons of Chitor, i.e. Sandal (otherwise Sadal) or Padminī, and the different names of the kings, we still cannot reconcile the dates. The invasion of Alauddin was in 1303, Bhūpati is

said to have settled in Khilung in 1495, a 192 years later, so long a period cannot credibly be accounted for by two generations. If we accept the date of the second invasion of Chitor, that by Akbar in 1567, we are faced with the fact that Bhūpāl seemed to have migrated to the Hills when he had reason to flee from Chitor.

Another origin story is to the effect that one of the sons of Samarsi or Samarsiṁha fled to the mountains of Nepal and founded the state of Gorkhā and spread the Guhilot (Sisodiyā) line there. Samarsiṁha was the father of Ratnarsiṁha and was alive up to 1299, i.e. four years before Alauddin captured Chitor. It is also said that Gorkhās (Sāhs of Gorkhā) reached Nepal through Kumāū after the fall of Chitor. Hamilton mentions that Caturbhuj, a prince of the Sisodiyā clan, having left Chitor conquered Kumāū and Jumla where he established his kingship and from where his family spread to Pālpā, Tanahū and the land of the Kirātas. The reference is to the supposed ancestor of the Sen house which in the course of time established the principalities of Pālpā, Tanahū, Māvwānpur, Gāudaṇḍī and Morang. Nowhere in Nepalese accounts mention has been made of the migration of the ancestors of the Sāhs from Kumāū and Jumla. In all the accounts so far known the migration of the ancestors of the Sāhs is claimed to have been into the Sapta Gandākī region.

1. Tod: Annals, vol. I, op. cit., pp. 281, n. 4, 301, 303, n. 1; Erskine, op. cit., pp. 13-14. In a Khyāt (a Rājasthānī word meaning 'a genealogical account') compiled by Thākur Bahādurśimhājī and published under the title of Kesatriya Rājput jeti ki suci it is mentioned on p. 6 that a branch of the Sisodiyā Rajputs became king of Gorkhā.

There is another point which raises doubt about the Sisodiyā origin of the Śāh dynasty of Nepal. The Śāhs belong to the Lunar race and their original gotra was Bhāрадvāja with the threefold ṛṣi pravara, Āṅgiras, Bārhaspatya and Bhāradvāja. It is said that Prthvīnārāyaṇ changed his gotra, Bhāradvāja, to Kāśyapa. There is however some reason to believe that it was his father, Narbhūpāl, who made this change. Gokulvilāsa-Pāre, a Pandit in his Court, had officiated as the Dikṣā guru for Narbhūpāl at the time of his holy thread-giving ceremony when the gotra of the Śāhs, Bhāradvāja, was changed to Kāśyapa, that of the Pandit. Kings have the option to change their gotra to those of their priests and hence it does not matter whether Narbhūpāl or Prthvīnārāyaṇ changed the original gotra. The Sisodiyās on the contrary belong to the Solar race, and belonged to a different gotra, Bājīvāpa, though they have the same pravara, Āṅgiras, Bārhaspatya and Bhāradvāja, as previously the Śāhs had. Though the race and gotra should not be made the basis on which to accept or reject the genealogical claim of a particular dynasty, they provide an ancillary argument for treating the tradition of the origin of the Śāh dynasty of Nepal with reserve.

1. Prthvīnārāyaṇ Śāhko jīvanī, p.7.
2. Information received from Bāburām Ācārya. But GC, verse 74 (IP,vol.II, pt.iii,p.607) says that the priest during the ceremony was Gaurīśvar.
It is quite possible that either the Nepalese kings were unheard of by the amplifiers of the epic रथवीराज रासो, traditionally believed to have been written by a bard, Canda BardaI, or that the poets did not attach any importance to these kings of the Hills, for we do not find them included in the list of the thirty-six clans of Rajputs mentioned therein. Though the epic is taken to have been composed by the end of the twelfth century, scholars believe unanimously that it was amplified to twice its original size before the seventeenth century. It is very strange that the Nepalese kings of BaisI, GaurI, Gorkha, the Nepal Valley and Makwanpur, who claimed to be Ksatriyas and were by no means insignificant in the Himalayas at that time, are not given a place amongst the Rajputs of India. It seems that even by the time the last amplification took place, the Ksatriyas of the Nepal Himalaya had not been accepted into the social order of the Indian Rajputs.

How strong is the desire of the Nepalese Ksatriyas to claim descent from the Rajputs of India can also be seen from their chronologies and genealogies which are jumbles of fact and fiction rather than historical documents. The Canda ThakurIs of Pyuthana claim to be Candels; the Srinet ThakurIs of Pāiyū state that they came from a mountain south-west from the Yamuna; the Sen ThakurIs of Pālpā,

3. Hamilton, ibid. There are Srinet Rajputs also in Gorakhpur who are said to be descendants of the Sakyā-Mauryas (Rājabalī Pāṇḍeya: Gorakhpur jānpad aur uski ksatriya jātiyāukā itihiṣ, p.244). Quite possibly the Srinets of Pāiyū may have migrated originally from Gorakhpur, while there is no historical evidence behind this claim.

and later of Tanahū and Makwāṇpur claim their origin from the Sisodiya clan of Chitor; the rulers of Buṭāul claimed to be Cauhāns; the Rāṇās, originally Kāvar Khārkā, a clan of the Khases, also claim their descent from the Sisodiya clan. Of the other Khases of Nepal, the Bisṭās of Achām state that they were Pāmārs, the Bogaṭīs of Yoṭī claim to be Raghuvāṃśī (the dynasty of Raghu in which Rāma was born), the Khulāls state that they are Candels, the Dulāls claim to have come from Ujjain, the Khas Thāpās claim their origin from Udāi Bhattācārya, a Brahman of Dhārānagari. Even some of the tribal people claim an origin in different parts of India. The Kirāṭīs say that their original home was Kāśī, and instance their gotra Kauśika, though it is more likely that the term Kauśika is connected with Kosī, the name used for the rivers in their region. It is also said that they migrated from Simrāungārh, near Makwāṇpur, to the land where they are now settled. The Gurungs have a


2. Rājabālī Pāṇḍeya, op.cit., p.244. According to Hamilton, ibid., p.131, the earliest ruler of Buṭāul was Tuthā Sen, a descendant of Ratna Sen of Chitor, who in later times came to settle at Prayāg (Allahabad). After being driven out from there he went to the north and seized a country adjacent to the hills of Buṭāul where he and his descendants began to rule. In later times the principality was amalgamated with Pālpa and Tanahū. Perhaps by Ratna Sen is meant Ratnāsimha (q.v. p.116,117).


5. Ibid.,p.338.


8. Ibid.,p.119; HP, vol.56,fo.31.

genealogy which states that they are descendants of Candrasiṃha, a king of Kanauj in Bandelkhand, belonging to the Solar race and having the Bhāradvāja gotra. The Rānā Magars claim to have come from Chitor Fort.

There is as far as is known at present no historical warrant for any of these claims, but the proliferation of them is suggestive.

1. IP, vol.I, p.164, col.1. The spuriousness of the claim may be seen from its hazy geographical description.

EARLY CAREER OF PṚTHVĪNĀRAṆAŚĀH (1722-42)

By the second half of the sixteenth century a number of small principalities had come into existence in western Himalayan region of what is now the kingdom of Nepal, comprising the catchment areas of the Karnālī and Sapta Gaṇḍakī rivers. In the tract from Bajhāṅg to Sallyānā in the east there were alleged to be as many as twenty-two principalities. This tract stretched from the western bank of the Karnālī to the Sānī Bherī and Sārdā rivers, that is to say the catchment area of the Karnālī and its tributaries from the Himalaya mountains in the north to the plains in the south. In the tract from Pyūṭhānā to Lamjung and Tanahū in the east there were similarly alleged to have been as many as twenty-four principalities. This tract formed the catchment areas of the Rāptī (the western) and Sapta Gaṇḍakī rivers. This tract also comprised part of the higher Himalayan mountains in the north and the plains in the south. Gradually the rulers of all these principalities assumed royal status. They maintained their states as separate entities and paid tribute to none. Many of these principalities comprised only a few straggling villages within a radius of five or six miles. These two groups of twenty-two and twenty-four principalities were respectively called the Bāīsī and Gāubīsī kingdoms in Nepalese accounts. The kingdom of Jumlā was the oldest of them. In earlier times its domains

1. Vide p. 82, n. 4.
extended into eastern Kumāṇ and Tibet, but it was confined in later
times to the region from the eastern bank of the Karnālī to Tibrīkoṭ
in the east. The kings of Jumāla were Khas Mallas. They ruled from the
eleventh century for more than four centuries when the kingdom splintered
into several minor kingdoms ruled by their collateral branches who
extended their power over the whole of the Karnālī region as far as
Parvat (afterwards known as Malebam) in the east. Although in later
times Jumāla was reduced in size, its old glory had not altogether
vanished and it continued to exercise some sort of spiritual hegemony
over the Bāisī and also over a number of kingdoms in the Čaubīsī area.
The most prominent kingdoms in the Sapta Gaṇḍakī region were Pālpā,
Tanahū, Parvat, Kāskī and Lamjung. Not included in the Čaubīsī was
Gorkhā, the newest and easternmost in the Sapta Gaṇḍakī region. It was
founded by Dravya Śah on 26 July 1559 and enlarged further by his
grandson Rām Śah. Many principalities in both the regions were probably
ruled over previously by Magar and Gurung tribesmen, but in the course
of time they were gradually overrun by Khases who subsequent to their
coming to power began to be known as Thakurīs, a title which seemed
to give substance to their claim to be the seniormost Kṣatriyas of Nepal.

Gorkhā, with its capital town of the same name, was a mountain-
locked country. It was bounded on the north-west and the west by Lamjung

1. Parvat lay to the north of Pyūṭhānā and stretched from east to west
along the snow lines of the Himalaya touching Kāskī in the east and
Jumāla in the west.
2. PP. 107-8.
and Tanahu, the boundary with the former being the confluence of the 
Cepe with the Marsyangdi, and that with the latter the confluence of 
the Trisuli with the Marsyangdi. To the south lay the Tarai sector of 
Tanahu and Patan, the boundary here being the Trisuli river. To the 
east lay Nuwakot, the north-western frontier province of the kingdom 
of Kathmandu from which Gorkha was separated also by the Trisuli river.
To the north lay the Himalayan range, a region usually known as Bhot, 
beyond which was the territory of Tibet which was also known as Bhot.
In 1742, when Prthvirarayana became king of Gorkha, it was a tiny princ-
ipality both in dimension and population and had not yet begun to emerge 
as the powerful and prosperous kingdom which was to compete so power-
fully with its more famous neighbours in the Nepal Himalaya.

Though deprived of any outlet, and always threatened by the 
kingdom of Lamjung and hardly a match for the prosperous kingdoms of 
Falpa, Tanahu, Parvat, Kaski and Lamjung on the one side and Makwanpur 
and the Nepal Valley on the other, it nevertheless maintained its 
integrity and independence. It was poor in material possessions, though 
there is reason to believe that it produced crops sufficient for its 
people. It had no profitable trade, neither had it a mart where people

1. Perhaps at Cepeghat. (vide DU, Tr., p.20).
2. Quite probably Jyamirghat as mentioned in HP, vol.51, fo.103. It 
could be modern Jyamire.
3. The southern kingdom in the Nepal Valley ruled by Mallas, the other 
two kingdoms were Kathmandu, the central, and Bhatgau, the eastern.
4. For the difference in uses of the term Bhot meaning the Himalayan 
regions and Bhot meaning Tibet vide p. 50, n.116.
6. For the state of Makwanpur vide p.36, n.15.
from neighbouring countries could come with their wares. The traditional lucrative trade with Tibet was mostly monopolised by the traders of the Nepal Valley, a sizeable bulk of which passed through Nuwākoṭ only a few miles east of Gorkhā. Lamjung also to some extent enjoyed commerce with Tibet, the goods being carried through Tārkā, Tanahū, Deughāṭ and Bakrā into the provinces of Bihar and Bengal. Valuable goods were also carried from Mirzapur and Patna into Tibet via Mustang. The mart of Pokhrā (in Kāskī) was frequented by merchants from the Nepal Valley, Fālpā and Parvat. Although relatively a petty principality in the Cāubīsī, Gulmī had a famous mart at Rīpī. Moreover, Gorkhā had no mines worth the name; and it lacked navigable rivers though a few flowed through its territory and became tributaries to others flowing near by in other principalties. The people of Gorkhā had thus of necessity to

1. On the western bank of the Marsyāngdī. Probably it was then in the possession of Lamjung.
2. Near the place from where the Kālī (Kṛṣṇā) Gaṇḍakī flows by the name of the Sapta Gaṇḍakī or Gaṇḍakī river. It was then in the possession of Tanahū.
3. Near Hajipur and to the north of Patna across the Ganges.
6. Ibid., p. 263.
be either farmers or fighters. Hence it was that the kings of Gorkhā began to think in terms of expansion either towards the Nepal Valley in the east or Tibet in the north. To do so was not without danger however as Lamjung always lay in wait to avail of the least opportunity to invade. It was easy for it to disconcert and reduce Gorkhā when the latter attempted to enlarge its territory by pushing on to the east or north. Moreover, Gorkhā was not in a position to defeat its neighbours since they had some sort of agreement with one another although it did not amount to political confederacy. Lamjung was at the head of a league with Tanahū, Dhor, Satahū and Kāski; Bhirkoṭ was the leader of Garahū, Pāiyū and Nuwākoṭ (the central); Pālpā that of Rising, Ghiring, Gajarkoṭ, Arghā, Khācī and Gulmī; Malebam was allied with Galkoṭ, and Pyūṭhānā with Musīkot, Ismā, Khingrī and Bhingrī. Thus Gorkhā was isolated. It was not a member of the Cāubīsi group. It was hemmed in and harassed by a host of hostile neighbours, and was forced to rely on its own resources and the loyalty and patriotism of its people. A characteristic which distinguished Gorkhā from its neighbours was the traditional cooperation between its people and their kings. In the Cāubīsi principalities collaboration between king and people hardly existed; and there was jealousy and suspicion between state and state.

In the early days of its existence Gorkhā lacked the military strength to attempt a large-scale war. The stimulus to action was

1. Hamilton, op. cit., p. 239.
generated in the first place by Pothvīpati Śāh (1669-1716) who was quick to contrast the indiscipline and lack of training of the troops of the neighbouring kingdoms with his own small though well-disciplined and organised army. This superiority of Gorkhā fired him with ambition to conquer. He died however before the possibility was realized. Nevertheless it was his appraisal of the contemporary situation that emboldened his grandson Narbhūpāl Śāh (1716-42) to undertake action for the enlargement of the territory. His plans however lacked coherence and direction and consequently were abortive. After the failure of his expeditions to the north into Tibet, he concentrated his attention on the conquest of Nuwākoṭ (the eastern), the gateway to the Nepal Valley. During the years 1725-32 when the Malla kings of the Nepal Valley were engaged in domestic quarrels, Jayanta Rānā, a Gorkhalese officer, captured and held a portion of the Lāmīdārā district which lay only a few miles to the west of the Nepal Valley. This place, which lay in the north-western extremity of Pāṭan's territory, formed a coterminous boundary with the territories of Tanahū, Gorkhā and Kāṭhmāṇḍu. Meanwhile Kamrājdatta Sen, King of Tanahū, annexed Jogīmārā, the Tarai part of the Lāmīdārā district, with the support of Jagajjaya Malla, King of Kāṭhmāṇḍu (1722-35) and Gaureśvar Pandit, royal priest of Tanahū. Thus forestalled Narbhūpāl

2. Ācārya gives his regnal period as 1694-1741 ('Tanahūko Sen-vamsa', Bhanubhakta-smārak-grantha, ed. Sūryavikram Jñāvalī, p. 72). Once he had attacked some territory of Narbhūpāl. But both came to terms. After the conclusion of a treaty Kamrājdatta gave his daughter in marriage to Narbhūpāl and thus bought the friendship of the Gorkhalese king (Ācārya, ibid.).
had with great reluctance to give up his hold on the Lāmīdārā district in favour of Kāmrājdatta. Out of spite he planned in 1737 an invasion of Nuwākot, but this miscarried. The Gorkhalese troops led by Jayanta Rānā were repulsed by Kāśīrām Thāpā, officer in charge of Nuwākot. Narbhūpāl's third and last attempt at expansion was to conquer Tanahū but foolishly he aimed to achieve it without adequate preparation and was therefore advised by his men to desist until he had made suitable arrangements. Heart-broken at his failure, he ultimately became insane and lived as a recluse for the rest of his life. When Narbhūpāl retired from active life, the chiefs of Gorkhā proposed that Prthvīnārāyana be made king but he refused on the ground that his father was alive. He insisted that Candraprabhāvatī, his senior step-mother (first wife of Narbhūpāl), be made Regent, an office which she accepted. She became known as Cātārā (modern Cātariyā), a title given exclusively to senior male members of the royal family not in the direct line of succession. She was the political as well as administrative head, and dealt with both home and foreign affairs. A lady of wisdom and ingenuity, she saved Gorkhā from destruction at the critical time when Narbhūpāl was ready to resort to impulsive action and Prthvīnārāyana, his successor, was a mere lad of fifteen. She managed affairs very creditably and made

2. GY, pp.125-27.
3. Ibid., p.137.
4. She was the first female member of the Śāh house of Gorkhā to become a Cātārā. Prthvīnārāyana's first wife, Indrakumārī, was the second lady who was made a Cātārā (HP, vol.51,fo.101). Afterwards the title was exclusively given to male members of the royal family.
a name for herself equally as an able administrator and a shrewd diplomat. She preserved Gorkhā from internal disunity, which could have happened in view of the climacteric phase it was passing through, and kept the peace until the omens were more favourable. She understood the limitations which cramped her country and realized that if Gorkhā were to make any headway, the only course left to it was that of tactful diplomacy and shrewdness of timing.

Narbhūpāl had four wives. The first, Candraprabhāvatī, Princess of Khācī, was issueless; from the second, Princess Kausalyāvatī of Pālpa, were born three sons: Prthvīnārāyaṇ, Dalmardan and Prthvīpāl, and two daughters, Padmakumārī and Viśālavadana; from the third, Princess Buddhimatī of Parvat, were born two sons: Vṛndakesar and Śyārapratap, and four daughters: Padmavadanā, Induvadanā, Sarpāvatī (Sarvāvatī) and Hemantakumārī; and from the fourth, Princess Subhadravatī of Tanahū, were born two sons: Kīrtimahoddām (also known as Mahoddāmikṛti or Mahoddāmikīrti) and Daljiṭ, and three daughters: Mahālakṣmī, Padmānetrā and Suratkumārī. Besides these four legally married wives, Narbhūpāl had two concubines also. One was issueless and from the other were born five illegitimate sons: Raṇarudra (also known as Rudrī Sāhī), Bhirmdatta, Keśimadan, Ranaśūr and Jagajjit, and two daughters: Prakāśanā and Bindavāsanā. Raṇarudra was the eldest of all the sons of Narbhūpāl, legitimate and illegitimate.

---

1. GVV, p.113. But Lalitavallabh in his Bhaktavijayakavyam (written in 1769 to commemorate Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ's victory in the invasion of Bhātgaū, in learned speech Bhaktapur) mentions in verses 3-5 only five legitimate sons of Narbhūpāl: Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ, Mahoddāmikṛti, Dalmardan, Daljiṭ and Śyārapratap. It is because by this time only these were alive. Vṛndakesar died in his childhood, perhaps some time after 1735 (IP,vol.I,p.123,col.1). Pṛthvīpāl is mentioned until 1743/44 (Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ Sāhko jīvanī, p.21).

Pṛthvīnārāyan was born on Thursday, 27 Fauṣa 1779 V.S. (corresponding to 27 December 1722) in the ancestral palace of Gorkhā. When he was thirteen there arose some controversy regarding the succession. There was one faction in the court which preferred Vṛndakesar on the ground that he was born ten months after conception whereas Pṛthvīnārāyan was born after seven months and was regarded by them as a usurper. Meanwhile Vṛndakesar died and the succession passed to Pṛthvīnārāyan without contention.

Pṛthvīnārāyan was fortunate enough to have so many brothers who took leading parts in almost all his campaigns. That is why he proudly said that the five brothers were like a reincarnation of the Pāṇḍavas of Mahābhārata fame. He was still more fortunate to have a step-mother like Candraprabhāvatī for whom he had a profound respect. We have seen how he refused to be king when it was proposed by the chiefs and counsellors and instead insisted on her being made Regent. She looked after him as her own son, and from her he got much of his training in statecraft. She coopted him into her Regency and did much to shape his ambition.

Pṛthvīnārāyan's career falls into five clearly defined periods: (1) his early career, until he became king of Gorkhā in 1742; (2) the

---

3. DU, Tr., p. 17.
5. Perhaps in 1739 as mentioned by D.R. Regmi: Modern Nepal, p. 46.
first phase of his campaigns, from 1742 to 1746, culminating in the
conquest of the Nuwākoṭ Province; (3) the second phase of his campaigns,
from 1746 to 1756, ending with the failure of the campaigns against Cāgu;
(4) the third phase of his campaigns, from 1756 to 1767, which included
the capture of Makwānpur, Kīrtipur and a few prominent outposts on the
perimeter of the Nepal Valley; (5) the last phase of his campaigns, from
1767 to 1775, culminating in the conquest of the rest of the Nepal Valley
and of Cāudāṇḍī and Vijayapur (also called Morang). Thus in a career of
thirty-three years he raised the status of Gorkhā from virtual obscurity
to a position of strength hitherto unattained by any state in the Nepal
Himalaya. To begin with he was the king of a minor principality, but he
built it into a kingdom roughly five times bigger than it had been in­
herited. Though his conquests appear to be nothing but territorial
expansion, he succeeded in preparing the ground for what had never been
achieved before, the unification of the many tiny states into which the
Nepal Himalaya had for centuries been divided. The formation of one
Nepalese kingdom was carried out by his successors, but it was his work
which had made such a consummation possible.

According to Hindu custom Kṣatriyas are given the holy thread
at the age of ten. It is quite likely that Paṭhvīnārāyaṇ was given his
1 at this age in 1732. From the times of Rām Śāh the holy thread-giving
ceremony of the royal house of Gorkhā was performed by the members of a
2 Miśra family of Banaras. But since Narbhūpāl had been born and brought

up in Tanahū, his mother had appointed Gaureśvar, the royal priest of Tanahū, to be his priest for the performance of the holy thread-giving ceremony. The change of priest was attributed to all the misfortunes that had befallen Gorkhā from then on. So Harṣa Miśra, a member of the traditional Miśra family, was called from Banaras to perform Prthvīnārāyaṇ's holy thread-giving ceremony. Gaureśvar had hoped that he would be Prthvīnārāyaṇ's priest also. So Prthvīnārāyaṇ was taken from Gorkhā to Māidhī so that the ceremony might be performed without the knowledge of Gaureśvar. When the latter came to know of this he was furious but Candraprabhāvatī pacified him.

After some years of the holy thread-giving ceremony Prthvīnārāyaṇ was sent to Bhātgāū to effect a ritual friendship between King Raṇajitsimha Malla of Bhātgāū and Narbhupāl. Some chronologies give as the reason for his visit that Candraprabhāvatī had been told that her husband would regain his sanity if a ritual friendship could be formed with someone. It was with this hope in mind that Prthvīnārāyaṇ was sent to Bhātgāū. Gorkhā's relations with Pāṭān and Kāṭhmāṇḍū had deteriorated

1. GVY, pp.92,94-95,127-28.
2. HP,vol.51,fo.92; GVY,p.127; IP,op.cit.; also Jñavālī,op.cit.,pp.46-47.
3. This friendship is performed by some religious rite. The forming of the friendship is called miteri lāunu or mit lāunu (q.v. mit lāunu, R.L. Turner: Nepali Dictionary), and the persons who form this ritual friendship are called mit or mitinī meaning "artificial brotherhood or sisterhood". This institution is widely spread in Nepal. For the details vide Lehnard Adam, 'The social organization and customary law of the Nepalese tribes', American Anthropologist, New Series, vol.38, no.4, October-December 1936, pp.540-44.
4. HP,ibid.; GVY,pp.137-38.
because of Narbhūpāl's attempts to occupy some parts of Lāmīḍārā and his
invasion on Nuwākōt. But it seems its relations with Bhātgaū were cordial. It is more likely however that the purpose of Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ's mission was to give him an opportunity to study the true state of affairs in the Nepal Valley. He was a precocious child and though he had little schooling he attained a maturity and a perceptiveness seldom found in persons of his age. From childhood he had known of the activities undertaken by his father for the enlargement of his territory, and ambition had been awakened in him at a very early age. This ambition was strengthened when he was sent to Bhātgaū, where he first gave proof of that political shrewdness which was to be his most prominent characteristic. Since 1725 Malla kings of Kāthmāṇḍu, Pātan and Bhātgaū had been sharply divided amongst themselves as a result of a number of petty domestic quarrels. After seven years of feuds they terminated hostilities and composed their dissensions. But the termination of hostilities was prompted more by tiredness and futility of their desperate efforts than by a real desire for unity. The legacy of bitter feuds still persisted and rivalry soon led to further quarrels. The kings of Kāthmāṇḍu and Pātan must have felt uneasy at the presence in their country of an outsider with whose father they had only recently fought; but astute politician as he was, Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ managed to avoid arousing their displeasure. He won the good

1. Vide p.128. 2. IP, op. cit. 3. Acārya, 'Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ Śākā jīvanīko pūrvārdha', Pragati, year 1, no.4, p.71.
regard of Raṇajitśiṁha of Bhātgāū, and became successful in forming the ritual friendship between him and his father. He also formed the ritual friendship with Raṇajitśiṁha's son Vīrnarśiṁha Malla. Soon afterwards he made a favourable impression on Jayaprakāś Malla of Kāṭhmāṇḍu and formed the ritual friendship with him too. After acquainting himself with the situation in the Nepal Valley he came back to Gorkhā.

Soon after his arrival Prthvīnārāyaṇ expressed to Candraprabhāvatī his desire to invade the Nepal Valley. She realized that it was utterly impossible. On the west there was the kingdom of Lamjung, the sworn enemy, with which Gorkhā had a traditionally hot frontier. Any advance in any direction was sheer foolishness until the King of Lamjung had become an ally or had at least been neutralized. Since Gorkhā was completely isolated and an alliance with other neighbouring kingdom was also impossible, she formed a plan to develop friendly relations with the King of Makwānpur, Hemkarna Sen, which next to Jumla was the largest kingdom in the Nepal Himalaya. It controlled the southern highway to the Nepal Valley along which passed latter's commerce with the provinces of Bengal and Bihar. Friendly relations with such a prosperous and large kingdom had also a prospect of imposing a check upon the Nepal Valley while at the same time maintaining a balance of power with Lamjung, Tanahū, Kāśkī and Pālpā. With this aim in view Candraprabhāvatī got Prthvīnārāyaṇ married to the Princess of Makwānpur, Indrakumārī.

Indrakumārī was not sent to Gorkhā immediately after the marriage. So Prthvīnārāyaṇ had to come back to Makwānpur after one year

to take her home. Digbandhan Sen, Prince of Makwānpur, and Kanakṣimha Bāniyā, its minister, were in favour of detaining him until the Princess gave birth to a son. The parents of the bride also did not like to send her away from home until she came of age and could carry out the duties prescribed by her mother-in-law, Candraprabhāvatī, and be capable of competing on equal terms with her whom they thought of as an upstart, and an arrogant and uncultured highlander. During his one year's stay at Makwānpur, Prthvīnārāyaṇ had felt that he was not respectfully treated. He must have felt insulted specially by the pranks and jokes played upon him, for though such behaviour is usual in a father-in-law's place, he could not tolerate it. He once saw some attendants of Kanakṣimha salute their master by taking off their shoes which they did not do while saluting him. He took this as an insult and killed them on the spot. Hearing this Kanakṣimha became violent. He remarked that being the king of the land of the Magars Prthvīnārāyaṇ was prone to kill human beings. Hence Kanakṣimha was determined to take him to task. He sought the support of Digbandhan in a plan to have Prthvīnārāyaṇ killed. Hemkarna Sen, father of Digbandhan Sen, however managed to pacify his son and the minister, and avoid an awkward situation. Hearing of the

1. HP, vol. 51, fo. 92; IP, op. cit., perhaps according to the social custom, dviragamana ('second coming'), still prevalent in the Tarai. DU also says that the bride was not taken to Gorkhā after the marriage and hence Prthvīnārāyaṇ again came to Makwānpur to take her home (DU, Tr., p. 17).
2. He was younger to Indrakumārī (HP, ibid., fo. 100).
3. HP, ibid., fo. 92; IP, ibid. 4. Gvy, p. 129, HP, ibid., fo. 61.
5. HP, ibid. 6. Ibid., fo. 92.
7. Indrakumārī being his only daughter, Hemkarna did not want any harm to be done to his son-in-law. Seeing that Digbandhan and Kanakṣimha were determined to kill Prthvīnārāyaṇ, he had to place his royal turban at their feet imploring them to spare the life of his son-in-law (HP, ibid.).
plan of Kanaksiñha to kill him, Pṛthvīnārāyaṇaḥ too became impatient and planned to send his men to kill the Prince and the minister. But in the nick of time he was advised by the men in attendance on him not to take such a foolish step in a foreign country and where they could not defend him. Timely intervention thus helped to bring the fiery temper of both sides under control.

Pṛthvīnārāyaṇaḥ cannot be wholly blamed for being out of temper. He was probably weary of this enforced stay at Makwanpur. But there was more to it than that. This prolonged stay at his father-in-law's house was inconvenient in more ways than one. It delayed the expansionist plans it had been designed to foster, and probably it brought upon him the reprobation of the people of Gorkhā who thought that he had willingly submitted to unworthy treatment. It was said that his step-mother Candraprabhavatī, who was responsible for the marriage arrangement, was also being criticised. Furthermore the defeat at Nuwākoṭ was still fresh in Pṛthvīnārāyaṇaḥ's mind, and it is not surprising therefore that he was restive. He was utterly disinclined to take Indrakumārī home even if she were sent along with him. So in order to coin some excuse he said to Hemkarpa Sen in his court that he would not take her home unless a one-tusked elephant and a Navalakāhi diamond necklace were

1. IP, op. cit.
2. After remaining for one year at Makwanpur Pṛthvīnārāyaṇaḥ was again asked to stay further (HP, op. cit.).
3. In the invasion undertaken by Narbhūpāl Śāh in 1737 (vide p. 129).
given to him. Hemkarṣa tried to evade his demands and to defer sending off his daughter one or two years more on the ground of her age. But Kālu Pāre and Bhānu Josī Arjyāl, the persons in attendance on Prthvīnārāyaṇ, said to Hemkarṣa that since he had offered the hand of his daughter to Prthvīnārāyaṇ it was proper that she should be entrusted to her husband and not detained by her parents. They urged the propriety of the demands as being marriage gifts. Hemkarṣa nevertheless regarded the demands as unreasonable and refused to grant. The upshot was an unpleasantness which was never resolved. Prthvīnārāyaṇ told Digbandhan Sen that if his demands were not met he would take them by force. They were not met and the refusal provided Prthvīnārāyaṇ with the excuse he sought to go back without the bride. Before his departure he told his father-in-law that he would send his son, born of another wife whom he

1. DU, Tr., p. 18; and GWI, p.130, mention two demands: a one-tusked elephant and a Navalākhi diamond necklace. According to HP, vol.51, fos. 81-82, 92, it appears that even after one year's stay at Mākwānpur when the bride was not allowed to be taken by him home, and he was asked to stay further, Prthvīnārāyaṇ, though exasperated, agreed to do so provided Kanakṣīṁha was given to him. This was refused by Hemkarna. Prthvīnārāyaṇ then asked for the one-tusked elephant and the Navalākhi necklace; both of which were also refused. It is also said that Hemkarna did send a one-tusked elephant but it appears that it was not that Prthvīnārāyaṇ demanded. Seeing his demands thus repudiated, Prthvīnārāyaṇ left for Gorkhā without even taking formal leave of his father-in-law. IF, vol.1, p.24, col.2, however, puts all the three demands together: Kanāksīṁha, one-tusked elephant and diamond necklace, and says that the refusal to hand over Kanāksīṁha provided Prthvīnārāyaṇ with the excuse he sought for.

For the Navalākhi diamond necklace and the one-tusked elephant vide also p.37, n.18.

2. DU, Tr., p.18.
1. Pāthvinārāyaṇ did actually send his son, Pratāpsimha, born of the second queen whom he married shortly after he returned frustrated from Makānapur, to bring Indrakumārī. Perhaps Pratāpsimha was sent sometime during or after the rains of 1755 when Indrakumārī wrote to Pāthvinārāyaṇ bemoaning that the fault was not hers but that of her brother. By this time Pāthvinārāyaṇ had become a significant power. Apprehending that his kingdom might have to bear the brunt of the Gorkhalese attack or maybe that one day it would be reduced to submission by Pāthvinārāyaṇ, Hemkarna received Pratāpsimha with due honour and sent his daughter along with him with a huge dowry. A cultured lady of the plains and hence comparatively civilised, she introduced a measure of court etiquette into Pāthvinārāyaṇ's court. Still a rough highlander lacking such etiquette, he was so pleased with her that he made her Cautārā and laid down a jaēr for her as well (HP, vol. 51, fo. 100). There are, however, reasons to believe that the marriage with her was not a success for we never find her name but that of her co-wife, Narendraśrī, associated with Pāthvinārāyaṇ in his inscriptions (HP, op. cit., pp. 38, col. 1, 88, col. 2; Samkṛtasandesa, year 1, no. 5, p. 1). Her name in gold coinage of 1771 (Walsh, op. cit., p. 742) also proves that Narendraśrī was the official royal consort.

2. Chronologies are confused in their accounts regarding the time when the quarrel took place. Some say that after the marriage Pāthvinārāyaṇ heard that his parents-in-law deferred the sending off of their daughter until she came of age. This angered Pāthvinārāyaṇ. Realizing that going back without the bride would impair his prestige, he made demands which they could not comply with. He did so deliberately to invent an excuse to return although without the bride but without loss of prestige (GVY, pp. 129-31; HP, op. cit.).
she had Prthvīnārāyaṇa married in the same year with a daughter of Ahimānsimha, a Bāis Rajput of Banaras. Afterwards his brothers, Mahoddhāmkirti and Dalmardan, were also married into the same family.

While returning from Makwānpur, Prthvīnārāyaṇa came by way of Candragiri, a mountain situated towards the south-west corner of the Nepal Valley, from where he surveyed the whole region of the Valley and saw the possibility of conquering it. An alliance with the King of Makwānpur now being out of the question he had to find out some other way of accomplishing his desire. He hurried to Dhāding from where he sent orders to his frontier officers, Raṇajit Basnyāt, Mānśimha Rokāhā and Vīrbhadra Pāṭhak, stationed on the embankment of the Cepe river, to rush to Māidhī to meet him. In the course of consultations with

---

1. It is said that soon after Prthvīnārāyaṇa's second marriage his mother died and Dalmardan performed her obsequies. Soon after this Candraprabhavatī also died and Prthvīnārāyaṇa himself performed her obsequies. According to Hindu custom kings are immune to obsequial performances. The fact that Prthvīnārāyaṇa did not perform his mother's obsequies whereas he did his step-mother's shows his deep regard for Candraprabhavatī. She was alive until 1744 (vide p.157).

2. She was called Narendralakṣmī from whom the Crown Prince Pratāpsimha and Bahādur Sāh were born. From Indrakumārī only one daughter was born. Besides these two legally married wives Prthvīnārāyaṇa had several concubines. One of them was called Sobhāvatī (vide p.202). In Markham: Narratives, p.157, mention has been made of three married wives and six concubines (vide also Jñāvālī, op. cit., p.195). Mention also has been made of Narsiṃha Sāhī, an illegitimate son of Prthvīnārāyaṇa. He is seen alive until 1824 (HP, vol.74, fo.97). Perhaps he was otherwise called Raṇāśimha Sāhī (HP, vol.9, fo.26).

3. Prthvīnārāyaṇa Śāhko jīvanī, p.29.
them regarding the invasion they encouraged him to invade. After reaching Gorkhā he heard that his maternal uncle, Prince Udyot Sen of Pālpā, had gone to visit temples of Śiva at Gosāīkunḍa and Kāthmāṇḍu, and on his way back home was to pass through Gorkhā to visit the temple of Gorakhnāth. Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ waited for him in order to seek his advice regarding the invasion.

In the meantime Narbhubāl died and Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ became king of Gorkhā on Saturday, 3 April 1742.

---

1. DU,Tr.,p.19.

2. According to Regmi,op.cit.,p47, who says that Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ ascended the throne on the day of Rāmanavami of that year, which corresponds with this Christian date.
CHAPTER VI

FIRST PHASE OF PRTHVĪNĀRĀYAṆ'S CAMPAIGNS (1742-46)

When Prthvīnārāyaṇ succeeded to the throne of Gorkhā there was no collaboration between the Thakurī rulers of the Baīsi and Cāubīsī kingdoms, or the Malla rulers of the Nepal Valley, or the Sen rulers of Mawkānpur, Cāudanḍī and Morang. All these many kingdoms kept aloof themselves as separate and independent entities. They were not interested in what was happening in neighbouring kingdoms and were reluctant to help them even when they were threatened by a king whose policy was so clearly one of piecemeal conquest.

Considering the slender resources which Gorkhā possessed, and the fact that it was surrounded by kingdoms far superior in size, military strength and wealth, Prthvīnārāyaṇ's achievement stands out as an example of remarkable brilliance, courage and tenacity of purpose. Credit too must be ascribed to the Gorkhalese people who in spite of the odds confronting them, assisted him loyally in the achievement of his ambition.

Another factor that facilitated Prthvīnārāyaṇ's campaigns was the domestic quarrelling that so often broke out in the Nepal Valley. The Valley, which had been called Nepal from remote times, had for many centuries been one kingdom. It had been a prosperous kingdom with a tradition of learning, artistic ability, religious devotion and tolerance,
and commercial acumen. It had been for centuries the most civilised kingdom in the Nepal Himalaya and had even vied with the states of northern India. During the times of Sthiti Malla (1383-94/95) however it began to disintegrate. His grandson Yaksha Malla (1428-82) could not prevent its final disintegration and at the time of his death in 1482 it was divided amongst his sons. The division resulted in the formation of the three principalities of Kantipur (Kāṣṭhmanaṇḍap or Kāṭhmāṇḍā), Lalitpur (Lalitpaṭṭan or Pāṭan) and Bhaktapur (Bhāṭgāṇ). From that time on the history of the Valley was one of intrigue, counter-intrigue and domestic quarrels.

When Prthvinārāyaṇ became king of Gorkhā, the kingdom of Kāṭhmāṇḍu had under its jurisdiction almost all the famous tola in the Valley, e.g. Thimī (which formed the frontier with Bāṭgāṇ and Pāṭan), Lūṭikot (Bālāju), Thamel, Hārīgāṇ, Nandigrām, Māligrām, Cabhel, Devapāṭan, etc., as well as the settlements or outposts of Kāhule, Kakanī, Tōkhā, Gokarna, Cāgu, Sākhu (Saṃkhapur), Sāgācok, Nagarkot, Mahādeva Pokharī and Nāldum. Outside the Valley its domains included in the west the Nūwākoṭ province which extended to the north as far as Kerung, the latter forming its frontier with Tibet; in the due north Sindhu Pālcoṅk and Pāṭibhanjyang; in the north-east Muktēra, Dolakha, and the tract of the territory between the Indrāvatī and Bhoṭe Kosi rivers tapering off to Kuti, another frontier with Tibet. The kingdom of

1. The form Kāṭhmāṇḍu has come into general use now.
2. Once Lalitpur was the capital of the Nepal Valley. Hence the name Pāṭan, which means 'city'.
3. Residential areas. A tola is a distinct social and religious entity.
Bhātgāū, the eastern kingdom, had inside the Valley a small tract of the land bounded from north to the south by the Bhadramatī, Hānumatī and Kaśāvatī rivers; beyond the Valley its territories included the Banepā Valley, Dāpcā and the land up to Cisaṅkhu where it was bounded by the Dūdh Kosī, the latter separating it from Kīrāt, the land of the Kīrātīs (Kīrātas in learned speech). Pāṭan, the southern kingdom, possessed in the Valley the whole tract south of the Bāgmatī river, and it extended in that quarter as far as the Medinīmalla forest which later separated it from the kingdom of Makwānpur. Outside the Valley it also possessed the fertile valleys of Dhunībesī, Jhilṅung, Pālung, Tistūng, Citlāṅg and Godāvari, which apart from being noted as granaries of agricultural produce had rich mines of copper, iron and other mineral ores. The people of Kāṭhmāṇḍū were mostly traders. They controlled almost the whole of the traditional trade of the Valley with Tibet by way of Kerung and Kutī. The people of Bhātgāū were mostly farmers and those of Pāṭan craftsmen. The principal inhabitants of the Valley were Newārs.

From 1725 onwards the kings of the Nepal Valley were constantly involved in domestic squabbles which broke out into open violence at the least provocation from any side. Old rivalries and disputes drove them apart. Matters became particularly bad in 1735, the date of the accession of Jayapракāś Malla to the throne of Kāṭhmāṇḍū. These

1. For the political divisions vide also Henry Ambrose Oldfield: Sketches from Nipal, pp.101, 114, 132.
factors had a very weakening effect on these kingdoms and made the way easier for Prthvīnārāyaṇ. He cleverly utilised the division between the Malla kings to accomplish his plan of capturing outlying parts of their respective territories one by one and occupying certain posts of strategic importance. When the Malla kings realized what damage their own bickerings had done, Prthvīnārāyaṇ had built up his strength and was too firmly entrenched to be repulsed.

Soon after the succession to the throne of Gorkhā, Prthvīnārāyaṇ planned to invade Nuwākot as a first step to entering the Nepal Valley. It was also in accordance with the custom of Magarāt, the land of the Magars, which required the king to invade a neighbouring kingdom in the year of his accession. A Nepalese chronology tells that when rumours reached Jayaprakāś that Prthvīnārāyaṇ was intending to invade the Nepal Valley he sent him a letter to Gorkhā threatening to reduce his country if he made any such attempt. This threat only strengthened Prthvīnārāyaṇ's ambition and he replied that he was indeed thinking of doing so. He took back into his service certain Magar chiefs who had been dismissed earlier by his father on the ground that it was their incompetence which had resulted in the unsuccessful invasion of Nuwākot in 1737. He appointed Virāj Thāpā, a Magar chief in the court of Gorkhā since the times of Prthvīpati Śāh (1669-1716), and sent him in 1741 in command of the troops to invade Nuwākot. Not thinking it

1. Ācārya, 'Śrī Śrī Jayaprakāś Malla', pp. 41-42.
wise to advance without making requisite preparations, Viraj Thapa encamped at Khincet on the western bank of the Trisuli, one mile to the west of Nuvakoṭ, and looked about to find some suitable opportunity to launch a successful attack across it. Being situated across the river and on a high ridge, Nuvakoṭ had a seemingly unassailable position.

Prthvinārāyaṇ was annoyed by the delay. Viraj Thapa was accused of incompetence and dismissed. He was replaced by two Brahman officers, Bali Panta and Maheśvar Panta. They acted recklessly. In a fit of bravado they crossed the river and fell upon the enemy troops in their strong position. Their operation was not well-planned. The troops of the Malla kings were strongly entrenched in Nuvakoṭ, and Jayapraṅś Malla came himself to assist in the defence. The Gorkhalese troops were completely routed. Prthvinārāyaṇ's attempt to capture Nuvakoṭ ended in failure. The two Brahman officers were banished from the country.

The miscarriage of the invasion was a serious blow to Prthvinārāyaṇ's ambition but it did not take him long to recover. It was his first experience of a military campaign and it taught him a valuable lesson. It made him realize that his troops were far too ill-equipped and small in number, and that if he were to attack Nuvakoṭ again, his

1. HP, vol.51, fo.93. But IP, vol.1, p.124, col.1, however states that Maheśvar was the commander and Bali Panta one of the chiefs deputed with him. Jñavāli, op.cit., p.57, also says that Maheśvar Panta was sent in command of the Gorkhalese troops. These Pantas, who were in the service of Gorkhā from the time of Narbhpāl Śāh, belonged to the Thar Ghar (q.v. p.35, n.9). The genealogy of Maheśvar Panta is not known; but that of Bali Panta is given in HP, vol.74, fo.102.

2. HP, ibid.

3. HP, vol.50, fo.25.

4. Prthvinārāyaṇ Śāhko jīvani, p.24, wherein it is further mentioned that they were forgiven and recalled by Prthvinārāyaṇ next year.
forces had to be superior in every respect. In a bid to collect better arms and ammunition he collected a huge sum of money and went to Banaras. Before his departure he made arrangements for the defence and administration of his country. Envoys were sent to a few neighbouring kingdoms in order to establish friendly relations with them. Bhānu Arjyāl was sent to Bhātgāū, Harihar Panta to Kāthmāndu and Gaṅgādhar Panta to Kāskī. Kālu Pāre’s relatives were sent to other kingdoms. Prthvīnārāyaṇ entrusted him with the administration of the country.

It is alleged that when Hemkarna Sen came to know that Prthvīnārāyaṇ was passing through the plains for Banaras in order to fulfil his mission, he sent some men and money to assist him. But Prthvīnārāyaṇ refused the assistance, telling the men to return with the message that he would take what he wanted when he came to take Indrakumārī home.

Prthvīnārāyaṇ’s entourage included Kālu Pāre, Virāj Bakhetī, Jayā Bāniyā, Bhānu Arjyāl, Kulānanda Dhäkāl, Śivarāmsīnha Basnet, Devarśi Upādhyāya, Virbhūdra Upādhyāya, Maheśvar Josī, Anāgad Dvāre and several others. There were also Sardār Balibhaṇjan Malla of Parvat and other hillmen of Parvat, Pālpā and Pyūṭhānā who joined Prthvīnārāyaṇ in the course of their pilgrimage. He won them over by telling them that though they belonged to different states in the Hills, now that they were in plains they were all hillmen and should remain united. They

1. Prthvīnārāyaṇ Śāṅkō jīvanī, pp.1-2. 2. Ibid., p.3.
3. The name appears in HP, vol.51, fo.93. Possibly, he was the Brahman Kālu Pāre (q.v., p.50, n.116) and not the celebrated Khatri Kālu Pāre (q.v., p.41, n.51).
4. Prthvīnārāyaṇ Śāṅkō jīvanī, p.3.
accepted this proposal and all lived together in Banaras. The total party
is said to have numbered 600.

At Banaras Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ was introduced to a Siddha, a mendicant
of the Aghor sect, and named Gulābrām, by Jayamaṅgal Miśra. The latter
was the priest who had performed Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ's second marriage at
Banaras. The mendicant, probably a Brahman of the Avasthī clan, was the
preceptor of Jayamaṅgal. It is said that the mendicant gave a sword to
Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ as a mark of his favour, and assured him of success in
his campaign against the Nepal Valley. In return Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ gave him
Dhāibung as a gift, although the place which was situated north of
Nuwākoṭ, was not yet in his territory. He used to offer lands as gifts
and issue grants to people conferring on them emoluments and freehold
lands in others' territories, hoping possibly to honour his pledge when
the places of lands came into his possession. It is said that at Banaras
Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ once jumped into a well in Lolārkakūṇḍa with the sword
given by the mendicant in order to commit himself to an ordeal, survival
from which would be regarded as an augury of success. He came out un-
hurt and henceforward optimistic that his ambition would be realized.

After some time he returned from Banaras with a satisfactory
collection of arms and ammunition in the collection of which he had been

1. Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ Śāhko jīvani,p.4.
2. Ibid.,p.6
3. Ibid.,pp.6-8; HP,vol.51,fo.93.

2a. I.e. Aghorādhāthin, a particular sect of
Sāivas who eat loathsome food and are
addicted to disgusting practices (MW).
assisted by his father-in-law Ahimānsimha. He was escorted on his return by Lakṣmīnārāyaṇ Pāre, Guṇanidhi Panta, Virāj Bakhetī and Rāmkṛṣṇa Thāpā. They were once held up by some toll collectors on the bank of the Gomātī river in the domain of Nawab Wazir of Awadh. They wanted to check Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ's baggage which was enormous owing to the large quantity of arms and ammunition he was carrying. Ultimately he was constrained to kill them in order to clear his way, an act which amply illustrates how violently Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ could act when occasion demanded.

The King of Doṭī and Balibhaṇjan Malla, who were with him at the time, assisted him in the encounter. Apprehending danger to his person he arranged for Jayā Bāniyā to impersonate him, and had him carried in the royal palanquin. Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ himself walked on foot as a commoner until he crossed the boundary of the Nawab's territory through which the Gorkhalese party had to pass. The whole party then came to Buṭāul.

Buṭāul was then in the territory of Pālpā and was its winter capital. Gandharva Sen, King of Pālpā, was in residence there at the time. He was Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ's maternal grandfather. There too Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ acted violently. He attacked some soldiers in attendance on the Crown Prince of Pālpā, Udyot Sen, because, so he alleged, he had been treated with

---

1. It seems that the party of Balibhaṇjan which also included the King of Doṭī had returned with Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ after visiting religious places. Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ Śāhko jīvanī, p.10, mentions that the King of Doṭī met Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ at Banaras.

disrespect by them. Skirmishes took place between the Gorkhalese and the Pālpā soldiers. Gandharva Sen controlled the situation by appeasing Prthvīnārāyaṇ, and further made overtures to him to strengthen friendly relations between Pālpā and Gorkhā. In order to win the favour of the people of Butāul Prthvīnārāyaṇ scattered coins for the poor and mendicants to collect, such dispersal of coins being regarded as a religious act in Hindu society. He then left for Tanahū on the way back to Gorkhā. At Tanahū he parted with the King of Doṭī, Balibhaṇjan and other hill-men who were in his party. At the time of parting Prthvīnārāyaṇ is said to have told the King of Doṭī that although he would undoubtedly conquer his kingdom, he would nevertheless let him continue to rule, and he gave him a royal grant to bear testimony to that assurance. To Balibhaṇjan also he gave his kind assurances, telling him to come to his service if he did not like to be in the service of Parvat. But Balibhaṇjan replied that if he ate another's salt he would then prefer to serve him. After a few days' halt at Tanahū Prthvīnārāyaṇ proceeded towards Gorkhā. At the frontier he was received by his brothers and ministers, Māhoddāmkīrti, Dalmardan, Šūrapratāp, Daljit, Prthvīpāl, Rudrī Śāhī, Kālu Pāre, Caturbhuj Panta and Govinda Jośī Arjyāl. This was early in the spring of 1744. Shortly afterwards he commenced the

1. Prthvīnārāyaṇ Śāhko jīvanī, p.10, mentions that Prthvīnārāyaṇ gave this grant at Banaras. Nothing, however, is known about this grant. Doṭī was conquered by Nepal in 1790 during the reign of Raṇa Bahādur Śah.
2. He did join the service of Raṇa Bahādur Śah and was killed in action in the course of Nepal's conquest of the Cāubīsī (IP, vol.II, pt.iii, p.434).
4. Ibid., p.16.
reorganization of his old-fashioned army on the British model.

Some time after Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ's arrival home, Kulānanda Ḍhakāl, the royal astrologer, suggested to him that he should once more invade Nuvākot at an auspicious moment to be found by him in the almanac. Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ was hesitant to do so. Dissatisfied with this hesitancy which he took to be cowardice, and scorning the service of a king who lacked martial spirit, Kulānanda left for Lamjung.

Nearly two years after Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ's return from Banaras his maternal uncle, Prince Udyot Sen of Pālpā, repassed Gorkhā on his way home from a pilgrimage. Asked by Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ for his advice regarding the invasion of the Nepal Valley, he suggested that he should maintain a friendly relationship with the King of Lamjung, which he said was an essential preliminary to any such move. He further urged him to rely solely on Khas soldiers.

Lamjung was the most formidable enemy of Gorkhā. Animosity between the two had existed from the time of Dravya Śah, who founded Gorkhā in 1559. The then King of Lamjung, who was the elder brother of Dravya Śah, had demanded the cession of Gorkhā but Dravya Śah refused

---

2. HP, vol.51, fo.94. Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ, however, called him back when he was ready to invade Nuvākot for the second time the same year (vide p. 153).
3. HP, vol.17, fo.85; vol.51, fo.94.
and much to the chagrin of his brother declared himself an independent king. The enmity thus created was inherited by successive kings of the two kingdoms. On account of the leadership Lamjung had acquired among the Caubisi states it could easily swing the rest to go against, and perpetually threaten, Gorkha. Although intermarriages took place between the houses of the Caubisi families and the Sah family of Gorkha they did not bring about a cessation of the traditional hostilities.

In accordance with the advice given by Udyot Sen, PrsthvInara yan sent an embassy to Lamjung consisting of Rana Rudra Sah (Rudri Sahi), LaksmInara yan Pare and Guhanidhi Panta, with the proposal of friendship between the two states. He saw the necessity of developing friendship also with other Caubisi states, and accordingly sent Harihar Pandit, Sri Upadhyaya Karariya and Sadasiva Upadhyaya Kadyal to Tanah, Manikantha Rana to Palpa, and Gangadhar Panta to Kas. They told the kings to whose courts they were sent that PrsthvInara yan had determined to undertake a campaign against the Nepal Valley, and requested them to undertake a joint operation and partake of the rich spoils accruing to the conquest.

Lamjung shared its northern boundary with Tibet, with which it conducted some trade. Kas too was an outlet for Tibetan trade. Palpa and Tanah, though far from Tibet, commanded gates to the trade routes to the plains and consequently shared the Tibetan trade. But

the bulk of the trade with the prosperous areas in central and eastern Tibet passed through the Nepal Valley. Apprehending unpleasantness with Tibet and the Nepal Valley if they accepted Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ's proposal of a joint operation, the kings of Tanahū, Pālpā and Kāskī preferred not to be aligned with him in his plans to conquer the Nepal Valley. Nevertheless as Lamjung was the most powerful of the states, they left the decision to support Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ or not to Ripumardan Sāhī, King of Lamjung. They asked the Gorkhalese envoys to go to Lamjung, telling them that they have communicated their decision to Ripumardan. Hence it was essential for Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ to develop friendly relations with the King of Lamjung, and ensure that if he would not assist him in his campaign he would at least not interfere. Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ had reason to be confident that if Lamjung remained neutral he would have nothing to fear from other states. In the meantime the envoys sent to the Gaubisī states assembled at Lamjung. Kālu Pāre was also sent there to make overtures to its king. He promised Ripumardan a major share of the spoils of the war. Thus assured Ripumardan sent an envoy to Gorkhā with a draft of the pledges he was prepared to make, and the request that Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ should draft and return to him a similar document and state in the document the sum which would be payable to Lamjung in the event of Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ's attack on the Nepal Valley being successful. Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ accepted the general proposal but when it came to stating the amount payable to Lamjung he used the
ambiguous term \textit{lakh bis}. This term could be interpreted as meaning twenty lakhs or one lakh twenty thousand. The Lamjungite envoy, however, did not realize that the wording of this part of the treaty was equivocal and expressed himself satisfied with the terms of Pr\textit{thvInārāya\~n}'s guarantee. Pr\textit{thvInārāya\~n} was happy that Lamjung accepted his proposals.

Soon afterwards Kālu Pā\~re arranged a meeting between Ripumardan and Pr\textit{thvInārāya\~n} at Cepeghāṭ, the confluence of the Cepe and Marsyāngdī, where the frontiers of Lamjung and Gorkhā met. The result was satisfactory to Pr\textit{thvInārāya\~n}. A treaty of friendship was drawn up. In order to bring lasting amity between the two states, Pr\textit{thvInārāya\~n} effected a particular ritual friendship between Vamsāraj Pā\~re, son of Kālu Pā\~re, and Vīrmardan Sāhī, Crown Prince of Lamjung. He also wrote a letter to Kulānanda at Lamjung, informing him of his decision to undertake a campaign against the Nepal Valley and asking him to return to him. Kulānanda was satisfied and returned to Gorkhā.

This diplomatic success was due to the ingenuity of Kālu Pā\~re whose negotiations with Ripumardan had throughout been masterly. The treaty provided for a mutual agreement that each side would enlarge its territory without any interference from the other and that each would if needed send its own Sardārs and troops to the other's aid.

1. Pr\textit{thvInārāya\~n} Sāhko jivanī, pp.26-29.
2. I.e. \textit{mit lāunu} (q.v. p.132, n.3).
3. HP, vol.51, fo.94.
4. Pr\textit{thvInārāya\~n} Sāhko jivanī, ibid.; DU, Tr., p.20.
It also laid down that Gorkhā could push on to the east as far as Sindhu, and Lamjung to the west as far as Arghāū. This treaty was a great diplomatic victory for Gorkhā considering the traditional rivalry that had existed between the two states and in view of the hegemony which Lamjung exercised over the Gāubīsī states. To push on towards the east without making Lamjung neutral, if not an ally, would have been inviting disaster. That is why Prthvīnārāyaṉ was highly pleased with Kālu Pāre, the main architect of this treaty, and offered him a ministership. He found out that Kālu Pāre was equally popular with his subjects and with the kings of the Bāīsī and Gāubīsī states. It was hoped by all that as a minister he would maintain cordial relationships with all the states and run the home affairs of Gorkhā capably as well. Though Virāj Bakhetī was Prthvīnārāyaṉ's favourite and his first choice for the post, Prthvīnārāyaṉ realized that Kālu Pāre possessed superior political prudence, and hence the ministership had to be offered to him. It is quite possible that Virāj Bakhetī, who had remained with Prthvīnārāyaṉ throughout his stay in Banaras, endeared himself to his master by helping in his mission, and was in consequence the favourite for the ministership. On the other hand Kālu Pāre, who was left at Gorkhā to take charge of the administration of the country,

1. HP,op.cit.,fo.94. Sindhu, a mountain village situated in the valley of the river of the same name, formed the eastern limit of the Nuwākoṭ province. It lay near Pāṭīhanjyāṅ, the northern territory of Kāṭhmāṇḍū. Arghāū, about 70 miles to the west of Gorkhā and 4 miles to the east of Pokhṛā, was then the frontier between Lamjung and Kāskī (Jñavāḷī,op.cit., p.72).
2. DU, Tr.,p.21.
had become popular in and outside Gorkhā due to his ability. Prthvīnartaya did not dare go against the wishes of his subjects and those of the other kings for fear of hostile reactions internally and externally. He knew how much Jayaprakāś's misfortunes were due to his failure to keep his subjects happy and his officers under control.

Since his main aim was to invade the Nepal Valley, he could not, under the circumstances, but appoint so widely popular an officer as Kālu Pāre as his minister. It is also quite likely that he followed the tradition of Gorkhā according to which a minister was required to be a man who was skilled in foreign affairs. Prthvīnartaya further brought about a firm unity between the Pāre and Basnet families, members of which held high positions in his service, by arranging for Kālu Pāre's daughter, Citrādevī, to be married to Keharsimha Basnet, son of Abhimānsimha Basnet.

There is another and slightly different account regarding the appointment of Kālu Pāre to the ministership. It is said that while he was making preparations for the second invasion of Nuwākoṭ, Prthvīnartaya was preoccupied with the problem of appointing a suitable person as minister. He sought advice from Candraprabhāvati. He told her that since the Magars and Pantas had already showed their incompetence in the earlier invasions of Nuwākoṭ, and since Kālu Pāre had

1. GVY, p.105. It also seems likely that Prthvīnartaya followed the sacred books which say that a person with whom subjects are pleased should be made a minister (vide p.41,n.53).
2. DU, Tr.,p.21.
3. HP,vol.51,fo.94.
pleased him by what he had done in the course of his journey to Banaras, he preferred him for the ministership. She concurred and accordingly the offer was made to Kālu Pāre. He was at first not very eager to accept it but did so ultimately after consulting the members of his own family, those of the traditional families and all the influential people of Gorkhā. It is recorded too that he consulted the common people, one of whom Bisyā Nagarcī, a drummer, was mentioned by name. All assured him of their cooperation. Meanwhile Prthvīnārāyaṇ remembered his maternal uncle’s instructions and made arrangements for a meeting with the King of Lamjung. The meeting resulted in the drawing up of the treaty as stated above. It is quite possible that the ministership had already been offered to Kālu Pāre and that his prudence in effecting the treaty with the King of Lamjung made Prthvīnārāyaṇ confirm him in that post. Kālu Pāre may have hesitated at first, perhaps apprehending jealousy from Virāj Bakhetī, the king’s first favourite, but assurance of cooperation from all, great and small, ultimately led him to accept it. It is also said that before accepting the ministership Kālu Pāre requested Prthvīnārāyaṇ to lay down that so long the descendants of Kālu Pāre remained loyal to the throne and were capable of discharging their duties they would not be dismissed from the post of ministership. Prthvīnārāyaṇ made a pledge to that effect and Kālu Pāre accepted the ministership offered to him.²

1. HP, vol. 51, fo. 94.
2. Prthvīnārāyaṇ Śāhko jīvanī, p. 23.
Now that the potentially dangerous enemy, Lamjung, had become an ally, Pṣṭhvīnārāyaṇ sent his troops under two commanders, Bhadru Sāhī and Nandubisu Panta, to assist Ripumardan, King of Lamjung, in the conquest of Arghāu. The combined troops, however, met with serious reverses. Pṣṭhvīnārāyaṇ then sent word to Ripumardan that he had done his part and it was now the latter's turn to help him in the campaign against Sindhu. Ripumardan sent a very small force not more than 200 soldiers under the command of Sardār Mahīman Khavās. Candraprabhāvatī fully understood the hazards that confronted Gorkhā on the eve of the invasion. Though comparatively well-equipped with arms and ammunition, the army was not large, nor was financial position of the state sound. She therefore felt it necessary to enlist some mercenaries from the plains even at the risk of repercussions which seemed likely to ensue in the state. They would have to be given better pay and that might lead to discontent among her troops, which would be particularly dangerous at a critical time when their complete loyalty was necessary. In consequence she advised Pṣṭhvīnārāyaṇ and Kālu Pāre to delay the recruiting the mercenaries until they had explained to the people why such step was necessary. She suggested that the proposal would be acceptable to the people if a definite promise was given to them that it would be they and they only who would partake of the spoils. She also advised Pṣṭhvīnārāyaṇ to tell the people of the serious situation in which now the country found itself, a situation which only the
employment of mercenaries could save them from. He was however to tell them that it was only a temporary measure designed to meet a pressing emergency. The advice that she gave her son is proof that Candraprabhāvatī was a remarkably foresighted woman. She realized the danger of discontent which might be caused by the recruitment of the mercenaries but most of all she saw that no campaign was likely to be successful unless there was complete mutual trust between ruler and ruled. Frthvīnārāyan and Kālu Pārē followd her instructions. They addressed themselves to the entire population of Gorkhā, even the poorest were approached and it would appear that the lame, the halt and the blind were not omitted. The upshot was that the people agreed to the employment of the mercenaries and promised their loyalty and support.

Having secured the loyalty of his people, Frthvīnārāyan began to make preparations for the invasion of Nuwākoṭ. He established a Council of Regency consisting among others of Kājī Rudrī Sāhī, Kājī Maheśvar Panta, Catūrbhuj Panta, Govinda Josī Arjyāl, Lakṣmīpati Panta, Gaṅgārām Pārē and Kālu Rānā Gyāngmā to look after the affairs of Gorkhā during his absence in the course of the invasion. He stationed commanders at Liglig, Lakāṅg and Mirkot, all these strategical outposts in the rear of Gorkhā and marched out during the early rainy season of 1744 with all the remaining prominent chiefs and his brothers on an auspicious day selected for him by Kulānanda. He encamped at Simalcāur near Khincet where his soldiers disguised themselves as farmers.

1. HP, vol.51, fos.94-95.
2. Frthvīnārāyan Sānko jīvanī, p.38.
working the fallow land there. Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ also won over an influential and experienced person in the locality, one Kālañ Upādhyāya Rimal. Kulānanda had in the meantime found an auspicious day for the fixing of a pole on the Mahāmaṇḍal, the highest ridge of Nuwākot, where the defenders had entrenched themselves. The fixing of a pole was an old tantric custom, which implied success in the project if the deed was done at an auspicious moment. At first nobody was willing to undertake such a perilous task, which involved going into the stronghold of their adversaries. Eventually however one Kālu Jaisi Adhikari offered himself. He proposed that his face be smeared black and that he should feign to have been ignominiously ejected from Gorkha. He would cross the river and enter the enemy camp all the time abusing Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ, as if out of spite against him, so as to be taken into the confidence of the enemy. Surprisingly enough the Malla troops took him in and believed that he was genuinely dissatisfied with his king. Without questioning his identity, they welcomed him and provided accommodation for him in their camp. He completed his hazardous assignment without discovery, having left the camp on the pretext of attending to the call of nature. Throughout the day he remained in the midst of the enemy gathering all sorts of intelligence, and then at midnight he stole through their ranks, and swimming the flooded Trisūlī, came back to the camp of Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ. The king was immensely pleased with him for his brave

1. HP, vol. 51, fo. 95; DU, Tr., p. 23.
2. Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ Śāhko jīvanī, p. 38.
feat and gave him some freehold land in Dhārkharka.

This time circumstances were favourable to Prthvīnārāyaṇ. The rulers of the Nepal Valley were again at loggerheads. Pāṭan had been independent since 1729 and this time was ruled by Viṣṇu Malla. He had asked Prthvīnārāyaṇ for help against Jayapraḳāś and had promised in return to be neutral when he attacked Nuwākoṭ. The latest cause of estrangement between Pāṭan and Kāṭhmāṇḍu was on the question of the Lāmīḍārā district. It had been occupied by Gorkhā and Tanahū, the major part of the hilly area of the district remaining in the hands of the former. Jayapraḳāś had supported Tanahū at this time. As a result of this loss Pāṭan's outlet to the west, through which necessary commodities were imported, had been closed. Kāṭhmāṇḍu and Pāṭan attempted independently to recover some of the lost territory. Jayapraḳāś sent his minister, Sikhvāl Kājī, to Tanahū to negotiate; and a minister from Pāṭan, Kālidās, solicited Prthvīnārāyaṇ for his help in its recovery, whereupon the latter obliged the King of Pāṭan by returning the tract held by Gorkhā.

In the meantime the three Malla rulers had assembled in Cobhār in connection with a religious celebration; but at the same time Jayapraḳāś had sent some of his men to attack the fort of Pāṭan. This act

1. HP, op.cit., fo. 95.
precluded any possibility of collaboration between Pāṭan and Kāṭhmāṇḍū and the formation of a common front to check Prāthvīnārāyaṇa's advances.

As for Jayaprakāś, his life had been a succession of crises. Even his accession to the throne had been a matter of contention. According to a tradition prevalent in Kāṭhmāṇḍū only a prince born in Mohancok during the reign of his father was eligible to be king. Rājendra-prakāś, the eldest of the brothers, and Jayaprakāś, the next eldest, were not born in Mohancok; and they were both born before their father Jagajjaya became king. The date of Jayaprakāś's birth was 1716. Jayaprakāś's younger brothers, Rājyaprakāś, Narendraprakāś, and Candraprakāś, were born in Mohancok and after Jagajjaya Malla had mounted the throne in 1722; Rājendraprakāś died in 1731, and Jayaprakāś would have become heir apparent by right of primogeniture, had he not been debarred by the circumstances of his birth. Jagajjaya had a great fondness for

1. One of the courtyards in the royal palace called Hanūmāṇḍhokā. It was built by Pratāp Malla (1641-75).

2. A grandson (daughter's son) either of Bhāskar Malla, King of Kāṭhmāṇḍū (d.1715), or Mahindrāsima, King of Dolakhā, a principality which it seems he had founded. He later became king of Kāṭhmāṇḍū and Pāṭan (1717-22). Dolakhā appears to have been then absorbed in Kāṭhmāṇḍū. After Mahindrāsima's death his daughter's son, Sukul Thākur, was made his successor and placed on the throne of Kāṭhmāṇḍū under the name of Jagajjaya Malla by Jhagal Thakul, since 1705 minister of Kāṭhmāṇḍū (HP, vol.50, fo.23, vol.52, fo.103; Ācārya, 'Lalitpurkī Maiyā Yoṃmatī', p. 21, 'Śrī Śrī Jayaprakāś Malla', pp.38-39).


Rājendraprakāś. So had he outlived his father it is possible that he might have succeeded to the throne by reason of his father's favour. One reason for Jagajjaya's fondness for his eldest son was his belief that he himself became king on account of the favourable conjunction of stars under which Rājendraprakāś was born. Jagajjaya on the other hand did not like Jayaprakāś at all. He believed that if he became king he would destroy gods, religion and the kingdom itself. He was very sad at the death of his favourite son and greatly disturbed by the thought that Jayaprakāś might be king after him. Then the youngest son, Candraprakāś, died too. Jagajjaya was so stricken with grief that he did not come out of his palace for three months. He was, however, comforted by his Khas army chiefs, who belonged to the Thāpā, Būrhā-thokī, Raṅguvālī Bista and Basnet clans. They promised to make Rājyaprakāś king on the ground that he had been born in Mohancok during theregnancy of his father.

On the death of Jagajjaya Malla in 1735 there arose two factions in the court, one faction led by a minister named Jhagāl

1. HP, vol.50,fo.25. Khases had been in the military service of Kathmandu from the times of Ratna Malla (1482-1512) (HP,vol.55,fo.67).
2. HP,vol.55,fo.67.
3. Ācārya,'Śrī Śrī Jayaprakāś Malla',p.39. According to HP,vol.52,fo.41,vol.55,fo.67, and Wright,op.cit.,p.223, he died in 1732 (perhaps some time during the third week of May). Jīma ṛālī has mentioned two dates of his death: 1735 (Prthvīnārāyan Śah, p.76) and 1736 (Nepāl upatyakāko madhyakālīn itihaś, pp.120 and 169).
Thakul supported the cause of Jayaprakāś, and curiously enough in doing so he had the approval of Rājendra-prakāś himself. The other faction consisted mostly of the Khas army officers above referred to. They demanded that Rājyaprakāś should be made king. The leader of the second faction was Kāśirām Thāpā who had been appointed officer in charge of Nuwākot by Jagajjaya Malla. Rājendra-prakāś himself was afraid of incurring the wrath of Jayaprakāś Malla and fled to Pāṭan before the traditional mourning period for his father was over. At Pāṭan he was received by the King Viṣṇu Malla who adopted him as his heir. The main candidate having thus fled the Khas officers then advanced the claim of Narendra-prakāś. Kāśirām Thāpā took him to Devapāṭan where he declared him king of the north-eastern portion of Kāthmāndu consisting of Nandīgrām, Devapāṭan, Gokarna, Cāgu and Sākhu. Jayaprakāś became furious and four months later sent troops to deal with the rebels. Kāśirām Thāpā fled to Bhatgāū and entrusted Narendra-prakāś to the protection of Raṅajitsimha, the King of Bhatgāū, while he himself retired to his home at Cāgu. Shortly afterwards however Narendra-prakāś died.

2. Ibid., p.39.
3. According to Ācārya, ibid., p.40, it appears that Rājyaprakāś fled to Pāṭan in 1741 for a different reason.
4. He became king of Pāṭan some time during 1745/46 after the death of Viṣṇu Malla (Ācārya, ibid., p.43; Jñavālī: Nepāl upatyakāko madhyakalīn ītihas, p.177).
5. Ācārya, ibid., p.40. There is, however, no agreement regarding the name of his village. Palāncok is mentioned in HP, vol.51, fo.97. A third name Sipā is also met with (Jñavālī, ibid., p.170). Cāgu was in the possession of Jayaprakāś and not of Raṅajitsimha as mentioned by Ācārya, ibid.
It was during these uneasy times that Narbhuṣāl had attacked Nuwākoṭ. Jayaprakāś managed to save it, and fortunately for him he was joined by Jayanta Rānā, who until 1737 had been in the service of Gorkhā. It was Jayanta Rānā who had been dismissed by Narbhuṣāl for the failure of the attack on Nuwākoṭ, for which he was directly held responsible. Thereupon he joined Jayaprakāś, presumably to take revenge upon Narbhuṣāl. Jayaprakāś appointed him officer in charge of Nuwākoṭ in place of Kāśīrāṁ Thāpā. In 1739 he also dismissed his minister Jhagal ȳhakul whose capacity for intrigue he suspected. Nevertheless the defection of Kāśīrāṁ Thāpā and the other Khas officers was a serious blow to the efficiency of Jayaprakāś's army and the loyalty of his troops.

While the Khas officers and their troops were in action against Jayaprakāś, Raṇajitsimha of Bhāṭgāū captured a portion of Kāṭhmāṇḍu territory. Jayaprakāś who seemed to have a genius for alienating his own fellows executed his minister, Māskī Sukul, on the pretext that he had been in league with Raṇajitsimha. In his place he appointed a Newār Brahman, Bhājuvāśiṁ Bhāju, and marched out to recover the lost territory. His attack failed whereupon he dismissed his new minister for incompetence and appointed Täuḍhik in his place.

This constant change of ministers failed to strengthen Jayaprakāś's

1. Ācārya, op.cit.,p.39; Jhāvāḷi: Psthvīnārāyaṇ Śāh, p.36
2. Ācārya,ibid.,p.40.
3. Jhāvāḷi, ibid.,pp.77-78.
position. His relations with Bhātgāū were bad, neither was there any
care lost between him and the King of Pāṭan. His army was disorganised
and his officers did not trust him. Such a situation was particularly
favourable to Prthvīnārāyaṇ's plans, and there is no doubt that it
influenced his decision to attack at once. The objective was Nuwākot.

Prthvīnārāyaṇ fully understood what a dangerous opponent
he had in Jayanta Rānā for besides being a gallant fighter, he knew all
about the organisation and strength of the Gorkhalese army. He therefore
invited Jayanta Rānā to return to his side and become the seniormost
of the Magar chiefs. Jayanta Rānā was loyal to the salt he ate, and
refused the proposal. He replied that he would never be untrue to Jaya-
prakāś whom he was now bound in honour to serve to the last. Neverthe-
less Prthvīnārāyaṇ was not deterred. This time he was accompanied by
a large army, equipped with better arms and ammunition. His subjects
were behind him and above all there was no danger from Lamjung because
the arrangements stipulated in the treaty of friendship and alliance
were now in operation.

Therefore on Saturday, 16 September 1744, a day declared
to be auspicious by the astrologer Kulānanda Dhakāl, Prthvīnārāyaṇ led
his army to attack. The troops were secretly ferried across the swollen
waters of the Trisūlī by a boatman named Jalevā Mājhi. His fortune

1. DU, Tr., p. 23.
held, for the Malla troops had vacated the low-lying land on the other bank some time previously for fear of malaria. They had withdrawn to Mahāmandal. Thus Prithvīnārāyaṇ was able to reach the Nuwākoṭ Valley without opposition. He sent his troops to invade Nuwākoṭ in four columns via Gerkhu, Dharampānī, Asāubārī and Tīndhāryā. The first three points were situated on the northern perimeter of Nuwākoṭ and at higher altitudes. Each column was led by a competent commanders. Jayanta Rāṇā had perhaps thought that the Gorkhalese troops would make the usual assault from the west after crossing the Trisuli river and that if they did he would be in a position to rout them. He was taken by surprise. Dalmardan Sāh, Prithvīnārāyaṇ's 12-year-old brother also accompanied the troops. He is said to have fought heroically and killed Śaṅkhamaṇi Rāṇā, the son of Jayanta Rāṇā, at Mahāmandal. Jayanta Rāṇā, when effective resistance ceased to be possible, escaped to Belkoṭ, four miles south of Nuwākoṭ. The fort of Nuwākoṭ was beleaguered; and, there being no relief, it fell to the Gorkhalese troops during the early autumn. Prithvīnārāyaṇ marched via Tīndhāryā to take formal occupation of it at the head of a triumphal procession.

The presence of Jayanta Rāṇā only four miles away from Nuwākoṭ remained however a matter of anxiety to Prithvīnārāyaṇ. In one

2. There are conflicting accounts regarding the routes through which the Gorkhalese troops were sent. Some mention three while some only two (HP, vol.51, fo.95, vol.52, fo.108; Prthvīnārāyaṇ Sāhko jivan, pp.40-41,43; Jñāvali, ibid., p.84). It appears that Prthvīnārāyaṇ himself followed the troops marching through Tīndhāryā.
3. DU, Tr., p.24.
of the fits of passion to which he was prone, he marched to attack him without a properly organised force. His chiefs, who were at the time all scattered in various places in the performance of their respective duties, were alarmed at his rashness. They rushed back and attempted to dissuade him from such a foolhardy action. Kālu Pāre overtook him at Ghorghāṭ and advised him not to be so impulsive. Prthvīnārāyaṇ ridiculed him and called him a coward and dashed off in hot haste to do battle. Kālu Pāre nevertheless remained loyal to his king, and it was he who, in the course of the heavy fighting which ensued, saved the situation by his outstanding gallantry when the Gorkhalese were almost on the brink of defeat. They achieved victory in the end, but at the cost of heavy casualties. Prthvīnārāyaṇ was sad to see so many of his men fallen. He now realized his mistake. He praised Kālu Pāre for his superior skill in the art of fighting and promised not to undertake a campaign without consulting him. Jayanta Rāna was captured and taken to Nuwākoṭ. There he was flayed alive. The occupation of Belkoṭ rendered Nuwākoṭ secure. Prthvīnārāyaṇ fortified it and shifted his headquarters there from Gorkhā. Now he was just outside the Nepal Valley and poised to fall upon it.

1. A place quite close to Belkoṭ Fort and situated at the confluence of the Sindhure and Tādi rivers.
2. HP, op. cit., fcs.95-97.
3. Prthvīnārāyaṇ Šahko Īvanī, p.46.
Jayaprakāś was stunned at the loss of Nuwākoṭ. One year passed before he could muster forces sufficient to attempt to recover it. In the meanwhile Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ used the opportunity to consolidate his position and extend his domains to compromise the whole of the Nuwākoṭ Province as far as Sindhu and Pāṭībhanjyāṅ in the east. Before Jayaprakāś could take action he had first to achieve some concord with the other two Malla rulers, for they were still divided even though the enemy was literally at their gates. This time he succeeded, if only temporarily, in composing their dissensions, by stressing the consequences of Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ's presence so near their territories. Together they reorganised their military establishment and concerted their defence efforts. An allied army was prepared under the command of Raṇabhīm Thāpā, a Khas officer of Jayaprakāś. Meanwhile Jayaprakāś called Kāsīrām Thāpā to come again to join him, pledging himself to let bygones be bygones. Thus assured, he came back again to Kāṭhmāṇḍu to serve Jayaprakāś; but he immediately expressed his distrust of Raṇabhīm, and suggested that he was an agent to the Gorkhalese. He proposed that the command be given to himself instead. Jayaprakāś, who was always ready to believe the worst about his officers, imprisoned Raṇabhīm in Nolche, and appointed Kāsīrām Thāpā in his place and sent him at the

1. HP, op.cit., fo.97; Acārya, 'Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ Śāhkā jīvanīko pūrvārdha', p.73.
head of the allied force to recover Nuwākōṭ. This was in 1746. Hearing that his enemies were coming with a big force to attack him, Prathvīnārāyaṇ made ready to face the onslaught. He sent his family across the Trisūlī, and posted Mukhādānākūttī Śāh, Kālu Pārē and Tulārām Pārē to defend Gorkhā, ordering them to ensure that the King of Lamjung stayed neutral according to the existing agreement. The Crown Prince was encamped at Sallyān Tār, midway between Gorkhā and Nuwākōṭ, but the Queen remained with Prathvīnārāyaṇ, affirming that she would not leave her husband at the critical hour and would share any consequences, however dire, which might befall him. Prathvīnārāyaṇ had to plan his whole strategy with bare 1,300 soldiers, the total strength he had kept with him. He stationed some of them at Belkoṭ and kept the rest with himself to resist the enemy attack. He advised them not to rely on guns and bows alone but to fight also with swords if necessary. Some soldiers

1. HP, vol.51,fo.97, which also mentions the number of the allied force as 8,000. IP, vol.I,p.125,col.1, however, mentions the number 1,200. The statements of the Nepalese accounts are perhaps considerably and intentionally exaggerated. Presumably the strength of the allied force was far in excess of Prathvīnārāyaṇ's army's strength. The population of the Nepal Valley is alleged to have been 60,000 in 1767 (vide p.260). Father Giuseppe, who was then Prefect of the Roman Mission in Kāṭhmāṇḍu, has mentioned that the number of houses in the Nepal Valley was 70,000 and that the King of Kāṭhmāṇḍu, i.e. Jayaprakāś, had always about 50,000 soldiers. Father Giuseppe seems to have exaggerated too.


3. I.e. Pratāpsimha (also known Simhpratāp) Śāh. He was born probably in 1745 (DU, Intro.,p.5). IP, ibid.,says he was born soon after Kāśīrām Thāpā was repulsed by the Gorkhalese.

4. I.e. the Junior, Narendralakṣmī. The Senior, Indrakumārī, was still at Makwānpur (vide p.138, n.1).
were dissatisfied that he should have sent his family to a safe place while they were expected to fight to the death. Pūthvīnārāyaṇ assured them upon his word of honour that he would never forsake them to save his own life but would fight until the last. He appealed to their loyalty and valour and stressed the crucial urgency of the action they had to take to meet the challenge to their country's existence. His eloquent appeal restored their confidence. The Queen too played her part by distributing provisions, which consisted of flat rice (cyūrā) and sugar, with her own hands. Thus assured and confident, the men marched out to fight in an orderly manner. Battle was joined at Gāirī-theum where the Malla troops had assembled. The Gorkhalese routed them and chased them in retreat as far as Thāpāgāū. As a result of this victory Pūthvīnārāyaṇ was master of the whole of the Nuwākoṭ Province. Ashamed of the humiliating defeat, Kāśīrām preferred to go to his home in Palāncok, in the territory of Bhatgāū, rather than show his face to his king. Though he was sent for three or four times he refused to go. Jayaprakāś was furious that he should have gone into the territory of Raṇajitsimha whose sincerity and trustworthiness he still doubted despite the alliance between them. Kāśīrām later went to Kāṭhmānḍu with the other seven officers, on Tuesday, 22 July 1746 to perform a religious rite Śrāvaṇī, at Gaurīghāṭ on the bank of the Bāgmatī river.

1. HP, vol. 55, Ρ. 50.
2. For Kāśīrām Thāpā's home vide p. 163, n. 5.
3. HP, vol. 55, Ρ. 68, n. 74. Śrāvaṇī occurs on the full moon of Śrāvaṇ when Brahmans and Kṣatriyas change their holy threads for new. The Śrāvaṇī of that year corresponded to the Christian date referred to above.
He stayed in Kutubahil, a neighbouring tol. Jayaprapas himself went to the place where Kasiram was staying. He charged him with desertion and had him murdered along with the other seven. The same day also he had two of his ministers, Dati and Bhiñkhwa, decapitated in his palace garden. These murders increased Jayaprapas's unpopularity with his ministers and undermined the loyalty of his soldiers, many of whom were hillmen and Khases to whose tribe Kasiram Thapa belonged. Kasiram Thapa's murder was particularly unwise in view of his high standing as a military chief and his popularity especially among the Khases and hillmen. Kathmandu was in turmoil and the fortunes of Jayaprapas were at a low ebb. Rañabhim Thapa was released from prison; but it was too late. The situation got steadily worse. The brother of Bhiñkhwa, Tauqhik, himself a minister, fled to Patan to seek the protection of Rajyapras, Jayaprapas's younger brother, who had recently become king there. Once there Tauqhik strove to strain still further relations between the Malla kings. Parasuram Thapa, Kasiram Thapa's younger brother, was then at Palancok. When he heard the news of his brother's death he fled to Kabhre out of fear and hid himself there. From there he went to Bisañkhu and afterwards to Patan. There he aligned himself with its ministers, Dhanakseya, Ksnadas, SaikhwaI and Dhanavanta.

1. HP, op.cit., fos.97-98.  
2. Acarya, op. cit., p.43.  
3. HP, ibid., fo.98.  
4. Acarya, ibid.  
5. Prathvinaraavan Sanko Jaini, p.33
They entrusted him to the protection of Raṇajitismhā, the King of Bhātgaū, who made him his minister and chief of the army. Paraśurām Thāpā was also determined to take revenge upon Jayaprakāś for the murder of his brother Kāśīrām Thāpā. He did much to increase disaffection amongst the hill-men in the territories of Jayaprakāś. At this point Jayaprakāś was completely isolated.

Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ on the other hand was in a position of great strength. Nuwākoṭ was not only a gateway to the Nepal Valley but it was also the highway through which Nepalese trade with Tibet passed. It derived a considerable income from customs duties. It commanded the valleys of the Tādī, Likhu and Sindhu rivers, which flowed east and south-east into the Trisūlī. Apart from the strategical and commercial importance it possessed, the whole fertile region comprising the valleys of Nuwākoṭ and these rivers was to be of a source of supply to Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ for the maintenance of his troops who then had been considerably increased. The acquisition of the Nuwākoṭ Province was a turning point in Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ's career. The experience of his campaigns against it had shown him that even the combined strength of the Malla kings was not as powerful as he had thought. But the most important feature of the possession of Nuwākoṭ was that it was an open door into the Nepal Valley though some 33 years had still to lapse before the campaign against the Valley was completed.

1. Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ Śaṅko jīvanī, p.33
2. Ācārya, 'Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ Śaṅkā jīvanīko pūrvārdha', p.73.
CHAPTER VII

SECOND PHASE OF PRTHVĪNĀRĀYANA'S CAMPAIGNS (1746-56)

After the conquest of Nuwākoṭ and now that the whole of the Nuwākoṭ Province was in his possession Prthvīnārāyaṇ began to pay attention to conquests further towards the east. He was now in a strong position and could watch the political drama in the Nepal Valley at close range with an intimate knowledge of the plot and dramatis personae. The loss of Nuwākoṭ had not only deprived the people of the Nepal Valley of their traditional lucrative trade with Tibet but it had also made their life harder on account of an increasing scarcity of necessary commodities like salt, cotton, clarified butter, oilseeds, lentils, etc., which were imported into their country. Prthvīnārāyaṇ realized that it was more profitable for him to blockade and isolate the Nepal Valley by capturing outposts situated at strategical places around it than to plunge into a full-scale war which even at this stage would have needed for its success resources beyond those at his immediate disposal.

Some of the Ōubīsī states envied Prthvīnārāyaṇ his conquest of the Nuwākoṭ Province, and began to concern themselves with the politics of the Nepal Valley. The King of Lamjung who was at this time on friendlier terms with Raṇājitsimha began to invite him against Prthvīnārāyaṇ, who therefore was moved to strengthen relations
with Raṇajitsīṁha in order to forestall the King of Lamjung. Without this there was no prospect of his pushing further to the east. He contemplated capturing Nāldum and Mahādeva Pokharī and handing them over to Raṇajitsīṁha. These two places formed the north-eastern extremity of the Nepal Valley, and were in the territory of the kingdom of Kāthmāndu. Being situated in the immediate neighbourhood of Bhātgāū they were strategically important to Raṇajitsīṁha. As relations between Raṇajitsīṁha and Jayaprakāś were not cordial, the handing over of these places to Raṇajitsīṁha would have the advantage for Pṛthvīnārāyan of creating wider dissension between the two Malla houses. With this aim in view he captured Nāldum and Mahādeva Pokharī on Wednesday, 23 July 1746. In this operation he had the assistance of Raṇajitsīṁha, and he handed over both places to him in order to win his sympathies and deprive the King of Lamjung of an ally in the Nepal Valley. But being a shrewd strategist Pṛthvīnārāyan retained the forts in both places for himself and stationed his own troops in them in order to establish bases inside the Valley. He stationed Cāutariyā Jāhāgīr Sāh and Sardār Mannu Sāhī of Khācī at Nāldum, and Devarṣi Upādhya Adhikārī and Umrāva Āśājīt Bhārārī at Mahādeva Pokharī. After making this disposition he returned to Nuwākoṭ.

1. HP, vol.51,fo.98.
3. HP, ibid.
This action of Ptthvĩnārāyaṇaṇ again fanned the flame of rivalry between Raṇajitsīma and Jayaprakāśa, as indeed he had intended that it should. Raṇajitsīma was too gratified by the extension of his domains to realize the political implications of allowing an external element to interfere in the internal situation in the Nepal Valley. His hatred of Jayaprakāśa blinded him to the best interests of Bhāṭgāū.

Ptthvĩnārāyaṇaṇ was able to seize Nālдум and Mahādeva Pokhari so easily because Jayaprakāśa was at the time distracted by a domestic crisis. His subjects in general were also blind to the fact that the loss of these places constituted a grave danger to their country. Instead of trying to arrive at a closer working relationship with Jayaprakāś in order to repulse Ptthvĩnārāyaṇaṇ they adopted an increasingly defiant attitude towards him. Their opposition was such that it was impossible for the king on his part to reach an agreement with them. Many of them were ready to respond to intriguers who were plotting to dethrone him. The malcontents were secretly getting help from the nobles and ministers of Pāṭan and Bhāṭgāū as well as from their kings. They even went to the extent of asking Paraśurām Thāpā, minister of Bhāṭgāū, to go to Ptthvĩnārāyaṇaṇ in order to invite him to attack Kāṭhmāṇḍu, knowing that since the murder of his brother, Kāśīrām Thāpā, Paraśurām Thāpā had become hostile to Jayaprakāśa. They hoped that, as relations between

---

1. HP, op.cit., fo.98.
2. In Ptthvĩnārāyaṇaṇ Sāhko jīvanī, p.31, it is mentioned that Paraśurām wrote letters to the Queen, concubines, priests and counsellors of Jayaprakāś to arrest the king and enthrone the Crown Prince.
Raṇajitsimha and Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ were cordial, the latter would accede to Parasurām's request.

A major portion of the land which is now Sindhu Pālcock and Dolakha was at that time part of the territory of Kāṭhmāṇḍu. It was almost entirely inhabited by highlanders and Khases who spoke the same language, Parbatiyā [Nepali], which Parasurām himself spoke. This tribal and linguistic affinity made it easier to him to provoke the people of this area. It is said that Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ called Parasurām to propose to him a campaign to be jointly undertaken against Gāgu and Sākhu, the two places in the possession of Kāṭhmāṇḍu. He also said that if conquered these places were to be occupied by Bhātgū. Parasurām was determined to take revenge upon Jayaprakāś for the murder of his brother and so he obtained the concurrence of Raṇajitsimha in this campaign.

Such was the situation in the Nepal Valley when Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ decided to make his next move. He came to Bhātgū with the object of occupying Gāgu and Sākhu with the assistance of Raṇajitsimha. He felt he could also count upon Parasurām, who had been favourably disposed of late, to lend him effective help. The Gorkhalese troops captured Gāgu after a brief engagement with the troops of Jayaprakāś though he himself led them against the invaders. Each succeeding crisis

---

1. Jīnavālī, op. cit., pp. 95-96; In DU, Tr., p. 24, Parasurām is mentioned as having invited Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ to attack Nepal, while simultaneously sending his brother to incite the Čaubīsī to attack Gorkhā in the rear. The statement follows that concerning the occupation of Śivapurī by Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ, which took place in 1759.

2. Ācārya, 'Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ Śāhkā jivanīko pūrvāddha', p. 73, 'Śrī Śrī Jayaprakāś Malla', p. 43.
which had overtaken Jayaprakāś over the past months had been more severe and dangerous than the one before. Gripped in a series of crises, he could not check the Gorkhalese who easily defeating him marched on further to occupy Sākhu. He was too stunned by the defeat to take appropriate measures to check the advancing invaders. Whereupon his subjects took the initiative themselves and approached Rājayaprakāś of Pātān for help and getting it quickly marched with troops under his leadership. They routed the Gorkhalese from the place where they had encamped. The people of Kāṭhmāndu, who were already angry with Jayaprakāś because of the loss of Nālдум and Mahādeva Pokhari, were still further enraged by the loss of Cāgu. Tāudhik, his former minister, besieged the royal palace with the help of troops sent by Rājayaprakāś; and Jayaprakāś was de-throned during the autumn festivals (Dasāī) of 1746 and sent as a captive to Pātān where Rājayaprakāś provided for his comfort. The intriguers put Jayaprakāś's infant son, Jyotiprakāś, on the throne. Even his mother Kumudini, his wife Dayāvatī, and a concubine Māju had collaborated with the intriguers to precipitate his downfall. Dayāvatī was influenced by a Brahman called Dhan Juju, and Māju by a minister called Mihma Pradhān, to side with them. The mother of the infant king


2. HP, vol.55,fol.67, and Wright, op.cit., p.224, say he was of eighteen months. According to Acārya, ibid., p.40, and Jñavālī: Nepāl upatyakāko madhyakālīn itihās, p.96, he was five. Walsh, op.cit., p.696, mentions him to have been 2½ years old.

3. Probably the son of the royal priest who was also against Jayaprakāś (Prthvīnārāyan Sāhko jīvanī, p.32).

became Regent, and Tāuḍhik was made Chief Minister. The latter was quick to realize the threat posed by the advances of Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ into the Nepal Valley. He therefore prevailed upon Kālidās, minister of Pāṭan, to undertake a joint action against Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ, and he also made advances to Paraśurām. Since Paraśurām was angry with Jayaprakāś only to the extent of taking revenge upon him for the murder of his brother, his interest, noy that the king was deposed, was satisfied. He therefore dissociated himself from Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ in the latter's efforts to overrun the Nepal Valley, after advising him not to advance towards Sākhu. Meanwhile Tāuḍhik, assisted by troops of Pāṭan, made a surprise attack upon the Gorkhalese troops lately encamped near Sākhu and put them to flight. Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ, who was then in Bātāgū, returned to Nuwākoṭ. The defeat was a serious blow to him. He realized that the advance into...

1. We find a coin of 1746 in the name of Jayalakṣmīdevī who is alleged to have been the mother of Jyotiprakāś (Walsh, op.cit., pp.731-32). In Nepalese accounts the name Jayalakṣmī however does not appear. It is probable that it was used by Dayāvatī for the coinage. Ācārya, op.cit., p.72, says that Jayalakṣmī was the first wife of Jayaprakāś and her adultery constrained him to marry later Dayāvatī. But there is no mention of the adultery in Nepalese accounts prior to this time, i.e. 1746.


3. Actually he had already realized this fear at the time of the capture of Nālācum and Mahādeva Pokhari by Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ (Ācārya, ibid., p.44).

4. He also one of the intriguers responsible for the dethronement of Jayaprakāś (Jñāvalī: Nepal upatyakāko madhyakālin itihās, p.170).

5. Ācārya, ibid., where he says that Śivarāmaśīha Basnet, the Gorkhalese commander, was killed in action at Sāgācok, the ridge over Sākhu. But his death appears to have taken place later (vide p.199).

6. Ācārya, ibid.
the Nepal Valley was not going to be as easy as he thought, and that he would have to plan with the utmost circumspection before he launched any further campaign. Accordingly he consolidated his establishment at Nuwākoṭ to serve as a base for future action.

In the meantime Jayaprakāś escaped from Pāṭan and began to wander in desperation from place to place inside the Nepal Valley in the territories of Pāṭan and Kāṭhmāndū; but wherever he went he was expelled by the local people who did not dare give him protection for fear of incurring the displeasure of Dayāvatī. She had by this time become powerful enough to slight her minister Tāupilī. She went as far as to enter into an adulterous relationship with Garuḍaśimha, a noble's son, and the people angered by her excesses gradually began to transfer their sympathies back to Jayaprakāś who after two and half years as a fugitive was now in residence in the temple at Guhyesvarī. He requested the Queen's permission to remain in the temple to spend his life in religious devotion. This she granted. Seeing the people gradually favourably disposed to him he prepared an armed band of butchers and sweepers of Devapāṭan in order to regain his throne. When his opponents, the Khāstchiefa; knew that he was staying in Guhyesvarī they came to

1. It is said that when Jayaprakāś heard from one of his ministers about a conspiracy to dethrone him, he escaped to Sākhu. Then the Queen and the royal priest enthroned the Crown Prince. Jayaprakāś remained for some time in Sākhu in the house of his father-in-law, a Newār. The latter was the father of one of his concubines (Prthvīnārāyaṇ Śāhko jīvanī, pp.31-32).

2. HP, vol.55,fo.67; Ācārya, op.cit.,p.45.
attack him; but they were repulsed. After some time he marched with his improvised band of soldiers towards the royal palace. Troops sent by Dayāvatī came over to his side. He reached the royal palace without further resistance. His antagonists scattered, and Garuḍsimha fled to seek the protection of Pṛthvīnārāyan. Tāudhik hid in the house of a noble, Manorathsimha Maske. Dayāvatī was arrested and confined to the Lakṣmīpur courtyard of the royal palace. Jayaprakāś regained his throne on 30 April 1750. The intriguers were treated with great cruelty. All the attendants of Dayāvatī were slaughtered. Tāudhik was forced to commit suicide. The property of Manorathsimha was confiscated on the ground of his having given shelter to Tāudhik. Unable to survive her cruel punishment, Dayāvatī died in confinement. Mihmadhan Pradhān, accused of adultery with Māiju, was killed. Dhan Juju, the Brahman also accused of adultery with Dayāvatī, died as a result of wounds inflicted upon him while undergoing punishment. Only the infant son was spared. Although he had regained his throne, Jayaprakāś had yet to bring peace and security and establish law and order in his kingdom, but this he was unable to do.

Taking advantage of Jayaprakāś’s preoccupation Parasūrām took Sindhu Pālcook and Dolakhā and annexed them to the domains of

1. HP, op.cit., fos.67-68, wherein it is said that the Khas chiefs attacked Jayaprakāś after four days of his residence in the temple.
3. HP, ibid., vol.50, fo.25; Ācārya, op.cit.; Jñāvalī; Pṛthvīnārāyan Śāh pp.97-98.
Bhātgāū. Jayaprakāśa, who was very busy setting his house in order did not attempt to retrieve the lost districts. The situation was calmer but it was still too early for him to achieve stability and to grapple with all the problems that faced him. The Nepal Valley was full of jealousy and he had to handle the situation with great care if he was to keep the peace and make cooperation possible with the other Malla kings. What concerned him most was resumption of the usual supply of necessary commodities like salt, cotton, wool, clarified butter, lentils, etc., to relieve the distress of his people who were living in near-famine conditions. They had to depend entirely upon Tibet for their salt which was imported into the Valley through Kutī and Kerung. The other commodities were imported from Nuwākoṭ and other places in the neighbourhood. As a result of the possession of Nuwākoṭ and Pāṭībhanjyān by Prthvīnārāyaṇa and his control of the route to Kerung, and furthermore, of the occupation of Sindhu Pālcok and Dolakhā by Raṇajītsiṃha and his consequent control of the route to Kutī, the people of Kāthmāṇḍu, whose income was mainly derived from trade with Tibet, were now in deep financial difficulties. Finding himself powerless for the time being to reoccupy the lost districts of Nuwākoṭ, Sindhu Pālcok and Dolakhā, Jayaprakāśa thought it better to attempt to establish friendship with Prthvīnārāyaṇa as well as with Raṇajītsiṃha in order to ease for the time being at any rate the continuing scarcity of commodities.

1. Ācārya, op.cit., p.47.
After Prthvīnārāyaṇ captured Nuwākoṭ, Trivikram Sen, King of Tanahū, began to push towards the Nepal Valley by way of Jogīmārā and in 1748 he captured Cītlang and Pharping which were situated on the outskirts of Pātān, and a few other places which stretched from the Mahābhārat range down to the plains. Prthvīnārāyaṇ put an end to the competition from Tanahūjyasa. He persuaded Rājyaparakāś and his Chief Minister, Dhanavanta, to pay an indemnity to Trivikram for the restoration of the conquered boundary to the jurisdiction of Pātān; whereupon the commander of Trivikram's troops withdrew taking with him the money paid as indemnity. Prthvīnārāyaṇ then took measures to prevent Trivikram from making like advances in the future. He sent Kālu Pāre to occupy Jhīlṭung, which formed a part of the Lāmīḍārā district then in the possession of Pātān, even at the risk of hostility from the side of Tanahū. After occupying it Gorkhalese troops captured Pālung, Tisṭung and Cītlang, all these places in the same district, and annexed the whole of the district without any opposition. The loss of the Lāmīḍārā district, which had fertile valleys and a few mines, further


2. The central range of mountains running from east to west in Nepal.


4. It is not certain when Jhīlṭung and other places in the Lāmīḍārā district were occupied by Prthvīnārāyaṇ. According to a grant made by Rājyaparakāś to a Brahmaṇ, Gāṅgādās Panta, for a gift of Gajurī village this district seems to have been in the possession of Pātān until 1748 (IP, vol.I,pp.155-56). Ācārya, 'Śrī Śrī Jayaparakāś Malla', pp.48, 83, refers to two letters written by Rājyaparakāś and Jayaparakāś to Kālu Pāre after he captured Jhīlṭung. They are also said to have met him. Ācārya says that Kālu Pāre captured Dahacok afterwards. But no mention has been made in HP, vol.51, fo.98, of the capture of Dahacok by Kālu Pāre (vide, p.184).
affected the trade and supply lines of the Nepal Valley. The people of Falung, Tisṭung and Citlāṅg accepted Prthvīnārāyaṇ as their master.

Prthvīnārāyaṇ next began to plan with considerable shrewdness of timing to capture other prominent outposts round the Nepal Valley and strengthen his blockade. Jayaprapāś, though shaken by the pressure exerted by Prthvīnārāyaṇ, was nevertheless vigorously trying to build up his strength. He received to his great relief messages from various kings informing him the possibility of a concerted attack on Gorkhā by the Gaubīsī. This emboldened him to take steps to retrieve Mālдум and Mahādeva Pokharī, still occupied by Raṇajītsimha after Prthvīnārāyaṇ had handed them over to him in 1746, and their forts which were controlled by the Gorkhalese contingents stationed there. Jayaprapāś realized that by collaborating with Prthvīnārāyaṇ in their possession, Raṇajītsimha had endangered the security of Kāṭhmāṇḍu, but concealing his concern at their loss he made it clear to Raṇajītsimha that had Prthvīnārāyaṇ intended unqualified friendship towards him, he would not have retained the forts for himself but on the contrary would have handed them over to him. He emphasised further, that Prthvīnārāyaṇ's retention of them betrayed his ulterior motive which was to establish bases inside the Nepal Valley from which to conquer Bhatgāū and the country to the east of it. Raṇajītsimha was apparently convinced.

Apparently the King of Pāṭan was also won over and the three monarchs

planned to dispossess Prthvinaräyaṇ of the bases he held in the Valley.

As a result of their joint action the Gorkhalese were driven out of Nāldum and Mahādeva Pokhari by Malla troops in command of Gingdi Māske, 1 a minister of Jayaprapāś. Gautariyā Jahāgīr Sāh and Devarṣi Upādhyāya Adhikārī were killed while defending the forts and Sardār Mannu Sāhī and Āṣājīt Bhaṣarī fled with the remaining troops to Nuwākoṭ. The defeat foiled Prthvinaräyaṇ's plan to maintain an eastern gateway into the Valley.

Prthvinaräyaṇ consequently turned his attention to the occupation of Dahacok, an equally important outpost on the western perimeter of the Nepal Valley. It was captured by his troops led by Tulārām Pāre, Mannu Sāhī, Saktivallabh Josī, Bali Panta, Bāgyā Basnet, Motyā Khatrī, Virbhadra Basnet and Harivaṃśa Upādhyāya Adhikārī. Prthvinaräyaṇ was now only eight miles away from Kāṭhmāṇḍu and close enough to make a direct attack. On one side Dahacok linked up Lāmīḍārā and Dhading, and on the other the Trisūlī Valley and Nuwākoṭ. It also controlled the commerce of Kāṭhmāṇḍu with Tanahū; and with its loss the people of the Nepal Valley were hard hit by the cutting off of the commodities they got through it. The blockade in this direction was now almost complete.

Prthvinaräyaṇ made arrangements to strengthen his hold on this strate-

1. Jñavālī: Prthvinaräyaṇ Sāh, pp.101-2, wherein he also says that Jayaprapāś availed of the opportunity at this time when Prthvinaräyaṇ was involved in hostilities from the side of the Cauḍī. 2. HP, vol.51, fo.98. From an inscription of January 1754 (Sanskṛtasandesa, year 1, nos.10-12, pp.72-74) it seems that Nāldum remained in the possession of Raṇajītsīmha until it was recaptured by Prthvinaräyaṇ on 1 August 1754 (vide p.183).

3. HP, ibid.
gically important bastion and stationed troops there under the command of Harivanśa Upādhyāya Adhikārī who was expressly charged to retain it at any cost. From Dahacok Prathvīnārāyaṇ was able to subjugate Pharping and other villages to the south of it, all of which were in the possession of Pāṭān. The elders of some of the places captured paid their revenue to him. In return he gave them some of the villages as gifts but kept Thāṅkoṭ, Balkhu and other villages of strategical importance under his own control.

As a result of the success Prathvīnārāyaṇ felt himself enough to push on to the east beyond the Sindhu Valley even without the support or concurrence of Lamjung. Kalu Pāre was commissioned to do battle for the campaign. He, however, objected to Prathvīnārāyaṇ's plan with some vigour. He thought that such an action was sure to damage relations with the King of Lamjung who had been just placated and whose concurrence in the expedition should therefore be obtained first. He was right to suspect that the King of Lamjung would be annoyed, for Sardār Mahiman Khavās, his representative to the Court of Gorkhā, coming to know of the new move to be set in train by Prathvīnārāyaṇ, gave warning to the latter that to proceed with it would constitute a breach of the agreement made with his master. According to the agreement the approval of the King of Lamjung for any Gorkhalese expansion to the east of the Sindhu Valley had to be secured in advance. The Lamjungite Sardār left Nuvākoṭ.

1. HP, op.cit.
saying that since Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ no longer required the support or concurrence of his king, his stay as his representative, responsible for the execution of the agreement laid down in the treaty between Gorkhā and Lamjung, was no longer justified. Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ realized how difficult the situation now was. He recognised that it would be impossible for him to advance towards the east without the concurrence of Lamjung. He did not wish however to give up his plan of the expedition. So he conferred with Kālu Pāre as to the right course of action. The latter assured him that he would mollify the King of Lamjung if his master would pretend to dismiss him from the ministership and appoint Rudrī Sāhī instead. This was done. Pretending that he had been dismissed from his high office and so humiliated, Kālu Pāre rushed after Mahiman, the Lamjungite envoy, who had by then reached Bayār on his way to Lamjung. It appears Kālu Pāre was received with confidence by the King of Lamjung; and it was owing to the overtures he made to the king that the Gorkhalese troops were left free to march to the east without fear of any attack either by Lamjung or the Caubīsī. Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ sent his troops accompanied by Rudrī Sāhī, Daljit Sāh, Sardār Bali Panta, Jayā Bāniyā, Ranyā Bāniyā, Virbhadra Basnet, Bijyā Khatri and Motyā Khatri for the conquest of the east.

There is a story that about this time Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ had a dream that he was devouring the sea. Taking it as augury that he would

1. HP, op.cit., fos. 99-100.
2. Ibid., fo. 100.
conquer the Nepal Valley, he summoned one of his priests, Rāmkṛṣṇa Josī, to interpret it for him. But the priest told him that it was caused by flatulence. Not satisfied with this interpretation, he called Saktivallabh Josī, one of his astrologers then stationed as the frontier officer of Lāmīḏārā. He said that the dream augured well for the conquest of the Nepal Valley. Prthvīnārāyaṇ was very pleased with this interpretation as it fell in with the ambition which he so greatly cherished. Saktivallabh was a Brahman but being in the military service he had given up his priestly functions. He was made to undergo expiation after which Prthvīnārāyaṇ again made him a priest. Rāmkṛṣṇa on the other hand having enraged his master by his interpretation was retired on a year's pay.

Meanwhile Jayamaṅgal Mīśra came from Banaras to see Prthvīnārāyaṇ at Nuwākoṭ. He was the Pandit of Banaras who had performed Prthvīnārāyaṇ's second marriage, and belonged to the Mīśra family the members of which had been priests to the Śāh kings of Gorkhā since the times of Rām Śāh. Prthvīnārāyaṇ told him that he had been so far successful in his campaigns and wanted to know whether he was likely to succeed in conquering the Nepal Valley. He said that the King had the blessing of the Siddha mendicant and that not only was the conquest of the Valley sure to be accomplished but he could realize besides as many ambitions as he entertained. Prthvīnārāyaṇ was very pleased with

1. HP, op.cit.
2. Vide p.131.
3. About Jayamaṅgal Mīśra and the mendicant vide p.147.
I the priest and he made him the priest of his Queen Nareṇdrālakṣmī. All these divinations emboldened him to undertake the expedition for the conquest of the east.

The Gorkhalese troops captured Deurālī, an important pass beyond the Milāuce river. This was in the possession of Jayaprakāś, and being on the way to Kutī was a gainful acquisition for Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ. The troops also captured Sindhu Pālcek and Dolakhā. These places had recently been captured by Rāṇajit simha from Jayaprakāś. Since relations with Lamjung were again cordial owing to Kālu Pāre's prudence, Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ ventured to occupy these places even at the risk of incurring the enmity of Rāṇajit simha. He was now master of the region stretching from Sindhu and Pāṭībhanjyang as far as the upper reaches of the Sun Kosī river in the east, and Kutī in the north-east. This region was captured primarily to monopolise the Tibetan trade which passed through Kutī, as well as to blockade the Nepal Valley from that quarter. Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ sent his agents Hari (Harideva) Pandit and Jamadagni Upādhyāya to Khāsā and Kutī to buy gold presumably to deprive the traders of the Nepal Valley of the profit accruing from this commodity. This was another

---

1. Hā, op. cit.

2. Jñavāḷī: Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ Śāh, pp.105-6; Ācārya, 'Śrī Śrī Jayaprakāś Malla', p.49, wherein both say that the capture of the region took place after 1755, i.e. after Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ repulsed the Gāubisī invasion of Serhāncok in this year (vide pp.189-90). But the dates of some of the letters written by Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ indicate that the capture took place before 1755 (vide Letters nos. 1, 4, pp.56-58, 61-62).


4. Letters nos. 1 and 4, pp.56, 61. Vide also Ācārya, ibid. ; }.
blow to the Malla kings. The capture of Dahacok, Milâুce, Sindhu Pâłcok and Dolakhâ was clear proof of their inability to defend their territories.

Shortly after, Prthvînârâyâṇ planned to attack Nâldum for the second time. He sent a large body of troops consisting of all his brothers, ministers, chiefs, nobles and elders. It was captured on Thursday, 1 August 1754. He understood the necessity of keeping the people of the lands he acquired under his control and of making them contented as well. Accordingly he sent a letter from Nuwâkoṭ on Wednesday, 7 August, to the headmen and principal inhabitants of Dolakhâ ordering them to surrender and assuring them of security of life and property if they came to terms with him. He also made it clear to them that the people of Pâłlung, Tiśṭung and Citlâng had completely surrendered and thereafter had been enjoying security of life and property.

The spectacular advances made by Prthvînârâyâṇ alarmed the King of Parvat who feared that the Câubîsî and Bâîsî would be overrun by the Gorkhalalese king if he were not prevented from making conquests piecemeal. He therefore suggested to the King of Lamjung that he should take the lead to avert such a catastrophe, and accordingly both of them with the help of other Câubîsî kings made a combined attack on Sirhâncok, a frontier outpost near the boundary of Lamjung and 10 miles north-west of Gorkhâ. Their main purpose was to distract Prthvînârâyâṇ from the

2. Letters nos.2 and 3, pp.59-60.
centre of his activities and make him dissipate his resources by fighting on two fronts at the same time. Gorkhalese officers, Sardär Bhadru Sāhī and Bhadāl Dvāre, informed Prthvīnārāyan of the concerted attack. Sirhāncok was captured by the Cāubīsī troops on Monday, 26 May 1755. Shortly after Prthvīnārāyan sent his troops to defend Ajīrghā, one mile north of Gorkhā. He further sent his troops from Nuwākoṭ accompanied by Mahoddāmkirtī Sāh, Kālu Pāre, Kālāi Dvāre and Ambar Pāre, the Dvāre of Sallyān Tār to recover Sirhāncok. Rudrī Sāhī too went to fight taking with him troops from Gorkhā. The Gorkhalese established a garrison at Rāmcyā on Tuesday, 22 July. It is said that Rudrī Sāhī's wife went herself as far Choprāk with provisions where she made arrangements for their distribution amongst the troops. Severe fighting took place on Saturday, 26 July. Many prominent Gorkhalese chiefs, such as Ambar Pāre, Kālāi Dvāre and others, died. Ultimately however the Gorkhalese were victorious and Sirhāncok was recovered. Many of the enemy chiefs, including Sardār Mahīdhār Sāhī of Lamjung, were publicly shamed by being made to pass under the legs of Bisyā Nagarcī, a Gorkhalese drummer, who was of an untouchable caste. But Sardār Balibhānjān of Parvat was spared

1. Dvāre was the title of the officers stationed at the strategical outposts at the frontiers. It means 'a door-keeper' and is derived from Sanskrit dvāra- meaning 'door'.
3. HP, vol.52,fo.117.
4. It seems he had by this time returned from Lamjung (vide p.186).
5. HP, ibid.
such humiliation. This act on the part of the King of Lamjung brought the friendly relations between Gorkhā and Lamjung to an end.

Jayaprakāś had an opportunity to recover his lost territories at this time while Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ's attention was focussed on the defence of Sirhāncok and Gorkhā, but he was unable to stir his subjects to action and secure the cooperation of the other two Nalla kings; so the opportunity was lost. Once Gorkhā was safe Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ acted with such speed and skill that Jayaprakāś had little time for such manoeuvres.

It was now more than thirteen years (since 1742) that Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ had been ruling. His power was recognised but his ambition to conquer the kingdoms of the Nepal Valley was as yet unfulfilled, and he became somewhat apprehensive. He realized that the Valley could not be reduced unless spies were sent there to fraternise with the people and sow discord among them. Accordingly he sent some spies to Kāṭhmāṇḍū. They included Kājī Tulārām Pāre, Bali Panta, Jayakṛṣṇa Thāpā, Devarāj Kāṭuvāl and Raṇajit Thāpā. They told Jayaprakāś that Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ had sent them on a friendly mission to explore ways and means of establishing peace and friendly relations with him. They were honorably received and permitted by Jayaprakāś to remain in Kāṭhmāṇḍū for a couple of weeks.

1. HP, vol.51,fo.99. Balibhaṇjan may have been spared because of the help he had given to Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ in the past (vide p.148).
2. It is not known when this delegation was sent. Since in the Nepalese accounts Bali Panta is not mentioned after 1757, it is quite probable that it was sent some time during 1755-57.
3. HP, vol.17,fo.95.
In the meantime they had secret meetings with local persons. Jayaprakāś was informed of their fraudulent activities, and had them arrested. Some of the Gorkhalese spies managed to escape from their prison. Jayaprakāś then felt it necessary to put an end to the lives of the rest. All were brought to the temple of Bhairava to be executed sacrificially. Devarāj Kaṭuvāl and Raṇajit Thāpā shook their heads when lamps were placed on their ears, an omen suggesting that the god had accepted them as a sacrifice. Their weapons were hung on the wall of Mālcook, the main courtyard of the royal palace Hanūmāṅdhokā. Jayakṛṣṇa Thāpā did not respond to this sacrificial ordeal and was spared. But when being taken to the prison, he overpowered the guards on its way at ḍhokā Tōl and escaped through a drain to the other side of the Viṣṇumati river. He reached Kāhule safely and joined the Gorkhalese camp stationed there.

Being a Brahman Bali Panta could not be killed. He was therefore sent handcuffed to be imprisoned in Lakṣṇīpur, a courtyard in the royal palace. On account of the ministerial rank and high prestige he held, Jayaprakāś was advised to make use of Tulārām. In consequence he was taken to the temple of the tutelar deity of the Mallas, Taleju (Tulājā Bhavānī), where Jayaprakāś took an oath assuring him of every kind consideration in return for his loyalty. Tulārām also took an oath to be loyal to Jayaprakāś. He was forthwith made a minister and further asked to send for his family to Kāṭhmāṇḍu. But at heart he was not a renegade. He was only outwardly pretending loyalty to Jayaprakāś.
therefore did not try to send for his family. When asked by Jayaprakāś why they had not joined him, he replied that it was impossible for them to join him because he had defected to a hostile power. Tulārām was simply evading. He made one excuse after another to explain the inability of his family to join him. In this way a couple of months passed and Jayaprakāś began to press him more often. Tulārām realized that the time for excuses had passed and that there was every likelihood of his incurring Jayaprakāś's displeasure if he prevaricated further. Realizing that his life was in danger, he one day managed to slip off to Nālдум with the help of Kājī Dhanavanta of Pātān with whom he had formed a ritual friendship. From Nālдум he reached Nuwākoṭ safely and reported to Puṭhvinārāyaṇ. Bali Panta's health was fast deteriorating. He was asked if he wanted to go to the temple of Pasupati or elsewhere, according to the custom prevalent among Hindus who aspire to die in a holy place. He replied that if allowed he would prefer to go to his king. Diseased and past of recovery as his condition was, he was thought to be innocuous. Despite the fact that he was an inveterate enemy, Jayaprakāś freed him to go where he wished. He was unable however to reach Nuwākoṭ to present himself to Puṭhvinārāyaṇ. He died at Belkoṭ, four miles south of Nuwākoṭ.

1. Ācārya, 'Śrī Śrī Jayaprakāś Malla', p.51, says that Tulārām mingled with a funeral procession and came out of the town. He then went to the house of Kālidās, a minister of Pātān, and with his help managed to reach Nuwākoṭ. Jñavālī: Puṭhvinārāyaṇ Śāh, p.109, says that he escaped through the help of Kālidās, and angered at this Jayaprakāś had the Pātān minister murdered later.

The object of sending his men on espionage having proved futile PøthvInärāyaṇ now resorted to another stratagem. He contrived to get into Jayaprakāś's possession some secret letters addressed to the latter's ministers seemingly in answer to theirs inviting PøthvInärāyaṇ to attack the Nepal Valley and promising support in the campaign. These letters, with the usual royal seal, acknowledged the receipt of previous letters by PøthvInärāyaṇ. They expressed his appreciation of their friendship to him, and assured them that he would pursue with all vigour the action suggested by them. They were exhorted not to be impatient at the delay in action which was definitely to be undertaken in the not too distant future. Furthermore, he assured them protection. Jayaprakāś was taken in by this trick. He accepted the evidence of the letters, and without probing further severely reproved those involved for their disloyalty. He was determined to put an end to their lives. He refused to listen to any argument advanced by them pleading innocence of the charges implied by the letters. They were murdered.

Seeing that his subterfuge had brought about the desired effect, PøthvInärāyaṇ next sent to Jayaprakāś a secret letter addressed to his mother Kumudinī, and purporting to have written in reply to hers. In this letter he acknowledged himself to be her son and hence ready to perform the duties a son owed his mother. He also appreciated her dislike of Jayaprakāś for the latter's opprobrious deeds, and implored her not

1. HP, op.cit.
to be upset by the delay in conquering Jayaprakāś's kingdom, promising her to accomplish the action as demanded by her. The letter brought about an estrangement between Jayaprakāś and his mother.

One cannot but notice how gullible Jayaprakāś was. He was ready to suspect anyone at any time and Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ was perspicacious enough to reap full benefit from this characteristic of his opponent. Nevertheless it must in fairness be admitted that Jayaprakāś's position was extremely difficult and perhaps even his excessive suspicion can in part be justified by the fact that he had been betrayed and deserted so often. He had some of the attributes of leadership and was the only one of the Malla kings to realize the full seriousness of Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ's strategy. Unfortunately the other two kings were not prepared to trust him and cooperate in his plans to present a united front to the common foe. At this particular juncture Jayaprakāś's position in his own kingdom and in the Valley was desperate.

Jayaprakāś was still undaunted in spite of his increasing unpopularity. He lacked the skill to prevent affairs from getting out of control, but he still had the urge to act vigorously. He realized that he had been a victim of the tricks played upon him by Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ, so he attempted to work a subterfuge of the same type. He took into his confidence some crafty Jāisī Brahmans of Belkoṭ, Tānsing and Nuwākoṭ, once his subjects but now Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ's. He suggested that they should

---

1. HP, op. cit.
invite Pratāpsimha Śah, the Gorkhalese Crown Prince, to hunt wild boars in the forest of Citlāng, where he could be arrested by his (Jayaprakāś's) soldiers stationed for the purpose. The Brahmans prevailed upon Pratāpsimha to accept their invitation and march from Nuwākoṭ towards the forest. Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ was then away at Dahacok. He did not know what was brewing. But the plot was discovered by Kājī Dhanavanta of Pāṭan who told Jagesāvar Jāisī, Raghunanda Koirālā and other Brahmans of Nuwākoṭ of the intrigue. These Brahmans had been sent to Pāṭan by Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ to collect intelligence under the pretext of meeting their relatives. Dhanavanta warned them to act with speed. Disguised as Newārs they hurried by night to Dahacok to report the plot to Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ. Timely action by him averted the tragedy from befalling his son who was already heading towards the forest and had reached Śivabhakta Pāuvā. The same night he was taken back to Nuwākoṭ. Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ reached there next day. Jagajit Pāre, the main conspirator, and eight of his accomplices were tried. One of them committed suicide after the trial by ordeal which proved him guilty. The rest were decapitated. The property of all of them was confiscated. Henceforth Jāisī Brahmans were debarred from officiating as priests and were further demoted so that they were lower than the Upādhyāya Brahmans.

What Jayaprakāś really needed to check Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ from making his advances into the Nepal Valley was not trickery but collaboration between the Malla kings. The joint action which had been brought

1. HP, op.cit.,fos 101-2.
about by their ministers had proved transitory. Jayaprakāś was unable to achieve any form of collaboration chiefly owing to the increasingly disturbed situation in Pāṭan which was and had always been the weakest of the three kingdoms. Of late it had become even more than before a hotbed of intrigue. The ministers of state attempted to exploit the weakness of their king to build up their own power and in doing so created utter chaos in their own country and strained relations with Jayaprakāś and Raṇajitsimha of Bhātgaū to the utmost.

After the death of Viṣṇu Malla in 1745 Rājyaprakāś, his adopted son, became King of Pāṭan. Since he was a contender to the throne of Kāṭhmāṇḍu, Jayaprakāś did not get on well with him or with the Court of Pāṭan. Rājyaprakāś devoted his time mostly to religious pursuits which gave opportunity to his ministers to become the de facto rulers of the kingdom. The nefarious role played by these ministers was largely responsible for creating an unhealthy political atmosphere in the Nepal Valley.

One of the ministers Dhanavanta, the chief of them, was friendly to Prthvīnāraṇya. He mistrusted Jayaprakāś, for the savage way in which he punished those who opposed him, and Raṇajitsimha of Bhātgaū seemed to him not to be concerned with the security of the Nepal Valley; so he had no option but to turn to Prthvīnāraṇya, in spite of the fact that the latter had already overrun much of Pāṭan's territory.

2. Vide p. 163.
Raṇajitsimha was more anxious to regain Nāldum rather than stand united with Jayaprakāś. Accordingly he sent a request to Prthvīnārāyaṇ asking him to hand over the place once again as he did when he conquered it the first time. Prthvīnārāyaṇ replied that since he (Raṇajitsimha) was incapable of retaining it, he would instead capture Cāgu and hand that over to him. Cāgu was in the territory of Kathmānḍu and it also commanded the route to Bhātgāū, and if captured would be a great strategical asset to Prthvīnārāyaṇ. His greed quickened, Raṇajitsimha wrote a letter to Prthvīnārāyaṇ on Sunday, 31 August 1755, agreeing to his proposal, and assuring him of his cooperation in the action. Seeing that Dhanavanta was friendly towards him and that Jayaprakāś stood alone, Prthvīnārāyaṇ readily accepted Raṇajitsimha's offer. They planned to take joint action for the occupation of Cāgu, under an agreement that Gorkhalese troops would march to Dāchi from Sākhu and those of Bhātgāū would join them at Telkoṭ Bhanjyang. But the minister of Raṇajitsimha, Paraśurāma Thāpa, told his king that Prthvīnārāyaṇ would not honour his commitment, and pointed out to him that he had refused to give him Nāldum though it was in his power to do so. Paraśurāma objected to this alliance on the ground that it was only a means to aggrandize Prthvīnārāyaṇ and was sure to estrange Jayaprakāś. Raṇajitsimha was however confident that Prthvīnārāyaṇ would give him Cāgu if action were jointly undertaken, and

1. Probably this place was vacated soon after 1746 when the Gorkhalese first captured it (vide p.176).
3. A pass in the Telkoṭ ridge which is nearly 4 miles south-east of Sākhu and 2½ miles due east of Cāgu. From Bhātgāū it is 4 miles in the north-east.
Paraṣūrāma was compelled to carry out his master's order to lead his troops, but he purposely delayed the joining of his troops with those of Prthvīnārayana. From the place where he encamped Paraṣūrāma sent a message to the kings of Pātān and Kāthmānḍu about the intended attack and warned them of the serious consequences which would befall all the Malla kings if it were successful. Prthvīnārayana himself marched with his troops hoping to be joined by those of Bhātgāū later, but to his surprise he saw a body of men from Pātān and Kāthmānḍu assembled to resist him. The Gorkhalese troops were not strong enough to face the combined forces of their adversaries and were badly defeated. Śivarāma-siṃha Basnet, a prominent Gorkhalese army chief, was killed at Sāgācok in the course of the fighting. Prthvīnārayana too had a narrow escape when his palanquin-bearers were shot dead in the battle-field. He hurried on foot to Bhātgāū but being unable to walk employed a Newār farmer to carry him on his back for the rest of the journey. He met Paraṣūrāma on the way at the foot of the Telkoṭ ridge, and exhorted him not to be forgetful of the moral duty he owed him. Paraṣūrāma replied that he would 1 do what his duty demanded. So saying he deputed his son to accompany Prthvīnārayana and went himself to Telkoṭ for its defence. Nālḍum also came near to being recaptured by the Malla troops, but the Gorkhalese managed to hold out. When Prthvīnārayana reached Bhātgāū, he charged

1. ? Prabhuṛa. The name is not clear in the account given in HP, vol. 51, fo. 103.
2. Erroneously written Belkoṭ Pass in the account (ibid.).
Raṇajitsimha with having betrayed him. The latter denied the charge telling Prthvīnārāyaṇ that perhaps he (Prthvīnārāyaṇ) knew who had betrayed him but if he did not he would tell him himself.

Prthvīnārāyaṇ remained for one year at Bhatgāū. During his stay he asked Raṇajitsimha for Parasurām Thāpā, the man whom he held responsible for creating unpleasantness between himself and Raṇajitsimha, and for the loss of the action against Cāgu. Raṇajitsimha refused to surrender him to Prthvīnārāyaṇ. Meanwhile much disconcerted at the presence of Prthvīnārāyaṇ inside the Nepal Valley, Jayapraṅāś sent his men with messages to Raṇajitsimha, asking him to arrest Prthvīnārāyaṇ and send him to Kāṭhmāṅgu, adding that if he did not do so, he would endanger the security of both Bhatgāū and Kāṭhmāṅgu. Raṇajitsimha refused to comply. He replied that as a Rajput he was determined to suffer even the direst consequences rather than surrender a person who had sought his protection. Realizing that relations with Jayapraṅāś were fast deteriorating, he ultimately requested Prthvīnārāyaṇ to go back to his country. Accordingly the Gorkhalese king left Bhatgāū for Nālдум, whence he returned to Nuwākoṭ at the end of 1756.

1. HP, op.cit.,fols.102-3.
2. Ibid.,fo.103.
CHAPTER VIII
THIRD PHASE OF PRTHVĪNARĀYĀṆ'S CAMPAIGNS (1756-67)

Next to Lamjung the most powerful kingdom in the Cāubīsī were Tañahū, Pālpā, Kāski and Parvat. Since in the course of Prthvīnārāyaṇ's campaigns no reference to an encounter between Gorkhā and Pālpā is met with, it seems that he was on cordial terms with Pālpā. With the rest his relations were mostly strained. Trivikram Sen, King of Tanahū, had even sent his envoys to Kāṭhmāṇḍu in order to plan an alliance with Jayaprakāś, but owing to the latter's deposition in 1746 this did not materialize. Seeing Prthvīnārāyaṇ advance towards the Nepal Valley, the King of Tanahū tried to keep pace with him by seizing some places in the territory of Pāṭan. Later he supported the kings of Lamjung and Parvat in their joint invasion of Sirhāncok in 1755. Prthvīnārāyaṇ understood the dangers which threatened from this direction, but what seems likely is that he avoided counter-action until he had established his position in Nuwākoṭ, and then as soon as he felt strong enough he began to look around for a pretext to take action against Trivikram.

Some time after his return from Bhatgāū to Nuwākoṭ in 1756 Prthvīnārāyaṇ heard that one of his concubines, who had been procured for him from Pāṭan and who had been with him at Bhatgāū during the year

2. Vide p.162.
4. It is also quite likely that Prthvīnārāyaṇ determined to take action against Trivikram because the latter had permitted Christian missionaries to preach in his country (L. Petech: I missionari italiani nel Tibet e nel Nepal, Part IV, p.231).
he was there as guest of Rāṇajitsimha, was suffering from consumption. The physicians held out little hope of her recovery. So he made plans to send her to a holy place so that she could die there according to Hindu tradition. Although a concubine, she was honoured as a legally married wife. She was sent to Kāśi (Banaras) by way of Citāun. At Deughāṭ, the winter residence of the king of Tanahū, Trivikram Sen uncovered the palanquin in which she was being carried, but he did not detain her. She reached Kāśi and died there. Whatever may have been the reason for Trivikram's action Prthvīnārāyaṇ took it as a great insult to his concubine and determined to take revenge. He sent for Gaureśvar, who was a priest both of his father and Trivikram, and requested him to use his good offices to arrange a meeting with Trivikram at the frontier of both the states, telling him that he wanted to discuss with him the delay in the conquest of the Nepal Valley, ask for his advice in regard to its conquest and also talk about personal matters. Gaureśvar went to Trivikram with this proposal. Trivikram told him that Prthvīnārāyaṇ was very crafty and requested him not to meddle in what was

1. HP, vol.51,fo.103.
2. He was then perhaps in Banaras (vide GVY, p.132; also Jñāvalī, op.cit.,p.115).
3. GVY, p.102.
4. There is a variant story regarding the person whom Prthvīnārāyaṇ requested to arrange the meeting he contemplated. It is said that when he heard the death of his concubine called Svabhābati [Śobhāvatī] after she had been detained at Deughāṭ by the King of Tanahū on her way to Kāśi, Prthvīnārāyaṇ became very angry and determined to take revenge upon the King of Tanahū. He sent one Jñānkar Bārā, a Newār, to arrange the meeting to be taken place at Jyāmīrghat. Prthvīnārāyaṇ was pleased with this Bārā, and appointed him priest of Mānkāmnā temple situated in a ridge called Kaphyāk near Gorkhā (IP, vol.I,pp.46-47).
nothing but a means to take revenge upon him for the uncovering of his concubine's palanquin. The priest was not aware of the real motive of Prthvīnārāyaṇ. On the contrary he told Trivikram that the Gorkhalese king was only worried at the delay in the conquest of the Nepal Valley, and that he wished to win Trivikram's confidence in order to seek his advice regarding the plans and action to be taken for the quick success of the campaign against the Valley, and further added that the Gorkhalese king did not intend any intrigue against him. Trivikram still doubted and so he again told the priest that the latter was completely unaware of the workings of Prthvīnārāyaṇ's heart and his real intention. The priest therefore came to Nuwākoṭ to find if there was any such intention on Prthvīnārāyaṇ's part. He told the king about the fears harboured by Trivikram. Prthvīnārāyaṇ replied that he had to meet Trivikram at any cost, and since both the kings were closely related by marriage he could never harbour any intrigue against him. He told the priest further that he was willing to do anything that would reassure the latter. The priest was back to Tanahū and assured Trivikram of Prthvīnārāyaṇ's pure motive. A letter was written to Prthvīnārāyaṇ, proposing the meeting to take place at Jyāmīrghāṭ, on the banks of the Trisūlī, and that both parties should meet unarmed. Prthvīnārāyaṇ accepted the proposal. He encamped at Phujelṭār. Trivikram also encamped on the bank of the Trisūlī. Prthvīnārāyaṇ had ordered his men the previous night to hide their swords and

---

1. GGY, p.89; HP,vol.51,fo.112; also p.129.
shields in the river close to the tent where the meeting was to take place, and to remain there for a signal to attack. In the morning both the kings proceeded to the venue. Escorted by Gauresvar, Trivikram came unarmed. Once the formal exchanges were over, the two kings retired to discuss business. At the outset पथ्विनारायण sought Trivikram's advice regarding the appropriate course of action to be pursued in the conquest of the Nepal Valley; but later he quarrelled and accused him of insulting his concubine. He gave a signal to his men. In the struggle which ensued many of Trivikram's men were slaughtered. He himself was arrested and accused publicly by पथ्विनारायण of insulting his concubine. He was taken by him to Nuwākoṭ as a captive by way of Gorkhā. On the way Trivikram saw Gauresvar whom he reprimanded for having led him into a trap. Gauresvar was greatly distressed and at Gorkhā he remonstrated with पथ्विनारायण about his behaviour. In consequence he was ordered to leave Gorkhā. Gauresvar was constrained to leave for Tanahū with his family. Trivikram was taken to Nuwākoṭ and subsequently released. This episode abundantly shows how पथ्विनारायण could without compunction resort to any act of betrayal to further his interests.

1. The sons of Gauresvar had been in the service of Gorkhā from the times of Narbhūpāl Śāh. One of his sons was given as gift some freehold land in Gorkhā (GVY, pp.116,132,134).
2. HP, op.cit., fols.103-4.
3. It is not known when Trivikram was arrested and released. He was one of the Cāubīśī kings who had invaded Sirhāncok in 1755 (vide p.201). It is quite probable that पथ्विनारायण determined to take revenge upon him from that time. From an inscription of पथ्विनारायण (IP, vol.1, p.36) it appears that Trivikram was released in or about 1762. Therefore the arrest of Trivikram seems to have taken place some time between 1755 to 1762.
While he was contemplating the meeting with Trivikram Sen, Pṛthvīnārayaṇ was also simultaneously planning to apprehend Raṇajitsiṁha of Bhātgāū. He sought revenge against the Malla king because he had refused to hand over Paraśurām Thāpā whom he held responsible for the failure of the campaign against Cāgu. Pṛthvīnārayaṇ sent Kālu Pāre with some troops to arrest Raṇajitsiṁha, ordering him first to invite Raṇajitsiṁha to meet him at Pālčok and then to arrest him on his arrival there. On the way to Pālčok however Raṇajitsiṁha suspected a plot and did not proceed further than Banepā whence he returned home. Kālu Pāre did not know how the secret had leaked out, and having failed in his mission, he returned to Nuwākoṭ. Pṛthvīnārayaṇ was very angry with him and demanded an explanation. Kālu Pāre explained what had happened, telling him that as he had not been ordered to enter the territory of Raṇajitsiṁha and arrest him there, he had no alternative but to return. Pṛthvīnārayaṇ was not satisfied with this explanation. The apparent outcome of the episode was that henceforth Raṇajitsiṁha no longer remained friendly towards Pṛthvīnārayaṇ, a fact which is also confirmed by the campaigns which the latter undertook shortly afterwards against the dominions of Bhātgāū.

The political situation in the Nepal Valley was complicated and unpredictable. At one moment the Malla kings were at war with one another. At the next they were at peace. They were temperamentally incapable of grappling with, or even recognising, the danger which

1. HP, op. cit., fo. 104.
confronted them and their people. Their jealousy of one another rendered them blind to the threat from outside, and none of them had the wisdom to realize that their only hope of safety lay in unity. In the meantime Jayaprapās's brother Rājyaprapās, who had been ruling in Pātān since 1745, was murdered by his ministers. Jayaprapās once more acted violently. He determined to retaliate. At this Bhīṅkhvādhan, one of the ministers in Pātān, made it known that he would not be subservient to Jayaprapās, but he later went to Jayaprapās when assured by the latter's agent of the word of honour given to him. Jayaprapās got hold of the minister by this artifice and imprisoned him. Bhīṅkhvādhan committed suicide. Jayaprapās also got hold of the other ministers of Pātān by subterfuge and imprisoned them. In their captivity they were paraded in the city of Kāṭhmāṇḍu dressed as women and constrained to beg alms for their subsistence at every shop. They were tortured daily. Their wives, who out of love for their husbands, came to see them with food, were also dressed as she-demons and paraded with them. After some time all were released. But the ministers determined to dispossess Jayaprapās of his throne.

In the meantime Jayaprapās had constructed an inn in the temple of Guhyesvari. Raṇajitsimha envied him his religious devotion. It is said that he sent some Bhoṭiyā thieves to steal some jewelry from the temple. But soon after the theft they were struck blind and were

1. Perhaps in early 1757 for Rājyaprapās's successor Viśvajit Malla is mentioned in connection with the defence of Kīrtipur jointly undertaken by the Malla kings in May of this year (vide p.210).
2. HP, vol.55,fo.68.
constrained to throw away what they had stolen. It was however traced by Gaugadhar Jha, a Næthil Brahman minister of Jayapракāś, and the 1 jewelry was restored to its place. This incident strained relations between Jayapракāś and Raṇajitsimha even further.

Prthvīnārāyaṇa was quick to see his opportunity in the disorder prevailing in the Nepal Valley. He decided to attack Kirtipur, a well-fortified townlet in the south-west part of the Valley. It was part of the kingdom of Pāṭan. It was his possession of the two vantage-points, Dahacok and Näl dum, and the disunity between the Malla kings which prompted him to plan the attack. Accordingly he came to Dahacok accompanied by Kālu Pāre and all the leading counsellors and chiefs. In the discussions which were held there, all his advisors, with the exception of Śūrapratap and a few others, opposed the plan Prthvīnārāyaṇa was contemplating. The veteran Kālu Pāre, the infallible astrologer Kulānanda, and the seasoned strategist Harivaśa Upādhyāya Adhikārī, the frontier officer in command of the outpost, all argued strongly against the invasion for a variety of reasons, urging respectively that the Malla kings had temporarily patched up their differences, that the time was not auspicious, and that they had not so far sent any spies to fraternise with the people and it would be difficult to reduce the post by force of arms alone. Prthvīnārāyaṇa became very angry. He rebuked and abused Harivaśa and Kulānanda for having sided with Kālu Pāre. He

1. HP, op. cit.
also charged them with vanity in regarding themselves as next to none in their profession, and challenged them saying that unsuccess was inconceivable if he himself took the initiative. He further told Kulānanda that if he did not find an auspicious moment for the invasion he would order Bālkṛṣṇa to do so and would 'sure achieve success by invading at the auspicious moment declared by him. Kulānanda on his part berated Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ, telling him that Bālkṛṣṇa was a child in comparison with him, and that to begin the campaign on an auspicious moment found by him was to invite disaster. But Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ was disinclined to suspend the operation. He again asked Śūrapratāp and other chiefs and counsellors for their opinion. They advised him to invade for they were confident that Kīrtipur would be reduced. Kālu Pāre once more implored Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ to suspend the contemplated campaign as the Malla kings and the people of the Nepal Valley were for the moment united, and that the astrologer and the frontier officer, on whom the king himself relied, were also against it. But the opposition only angered him. Feeling himself humiliated, Kulānanda left for Lamjung. Bālkṛṣṇa was ordered to find an auspicious moment for the invasion against Kīrtipur, and it began on Saturday, 28 May 1757, the day declared auspicious by the astrologer.

Meanwhile however the kings of the Nepal Valley had heard of the imminent Gorkhalese attack on Kīrtipur. They hurried up to patch

1. I.e. Bālkṛṣṇa Arjyāl, another astrologer.
up their differences. They realized that Kīrtipur was the heart of the Valley and hence its loss to Prthvīnārāyaṇaḥ would consequently mean loss of their kingdoms. They also realized that Prthvīnārāyaṇaḥ should have been checked even earlier from making his advance to Dahacok. But then they had committed a blunder by letting him occupy it, and hence if they committed another blunder by letting him occupy Kīrtipur it would be only inviting their own destruction. Accordingly they got prepared to take joint action for its defence.

Kālu Pāre, who was ordered to do battle when the auspicious moment approached, implored Prthvīnārāyaṇaḥ for the last time to desist from invading in view of the fact that the combined armies of the Malla kings had arrived at Kīrtipur which was in consequence invincible. He anticipated defeat in the invasion and advised to cause estrangement between the Malla kings first. But far from listening to his advice, Prthvīnārāyaṇaḥ charged him with cowardice. Consequently, Kālu Pāre, stung by so unjust an accusation, plunged into the battle, but as he did not expect to survive the fighting he entrusted his eldest son Vamsarāj to the care of Prthvīnārāyaṇaḥ before marching with his troops. Excepting Kulānanda, who left for Lamjung, the sworn enemy of Gorkhā, we do not see any of the Gorkhalese officers revolting against Prthvīnārāyaṇaḥ in spite of his unreasonable behaviour. On the other hand they forgot what the king had said to them and remained loyal to him. There is no doubt that it was to such virtues that Gorkhā owed its existence.
Meanwhile Jayaprakāś had marched via Tamkeśvar with his whole army, and King Viśvajit of Pāṭan marched via Gaṇeśthān to join him. Although the King of Bhātgāū did not join them, his troops were nevertheless sent to assist them in this joint venture. Jayaprakāś attacked Gorkhalese troops in their rear, the troops of Bhātgāū in their middle column and those of Pāṭan in the van. The battle took place on the bank of a pond outside Kīrtipur near the Balkhu river. Pressed by the enemies on three sides, the Gorkhalese were badly defeated. The dead numbered 400, among whom were Kālu Pāre, Cāmu Sāhilā, Jīvan Khān;\(^2\) Lāṭā Khatri, Sahasrām Rānā, Sobyā Banuva and Sheikh Zorābar. All the mercenaries brought from the plains by Saktivallabh, a Gorkhalese officer, were killed. A great number of Gorkhalese Umravas (commandants) and members of the traditional families died, and almost an equal number were wounded. Kālu Pāre was struck down by Jayaprakāś himself. Prthvīnārāyaṇ, who had also participated in the battle, was saved in the nick of time from being fatally wounded by an enemy. It is said that a sepoy who had raised his sword to strike him was obstructed by another and was told that being a king he was not to be killed. He was carried

1. A Thakuri of 18 who had been made king in early 1757 (Acārya, 'Srī Srī Jayaprakāś Malla', p.51.
2. The name is not clear in HP, vol.51,fo.104, but in vol.52,fo.109, it is Sobyā Banuva. He was perhaps the same Sobyā Banuvā Thāpā mentioned in Prthvīnārāyaṇ śāhko jīvani, p.2.
3. A Muslim who had trained Prthvīnārāyaṇ's artillermen (DU, Tr.,p.54,n.143)
5. Ibid.
away by a Duān (palanquin-bearer) and a Kasāī (butcher), and lastly by 1 Jayākṛṣṇa Thāpā, a Gorkhalese officer, to Dahacok. Jayaprakāś did not chase the Gorkhalese troops on their retreat. He returned with the head, scimitar and shield of Kālu Pāre which he hung in the temple of Bāg-2 bhairava in Kīrtipur. Next day he permitted the Gorkhalese to bury the dead and carry away the wounded. He thought that the Gorkhalese were 3 now destroyed, and made great rejoicings. Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ realized his folly for having repudiated the advice given by Kālu Pāre. He was very and sad at the huge casualties at the death of Kālu Pāre. He stationed men for the defence of Dahacok. Those who survived were sent to Nuwākoṭ. Making these arrangements he also left Dahacok for Nuwākoṭ. He was so sad the costly defeat of Kīrtipur that he suspended his campaign for 5 two years.

Now Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ adopted other tactics. He concluded a treaty of trade and alliance with Jayaprakāś. The treaty contained the

1. There are variant accounts regarding the person who carried Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ on his back to Dahacok and from there to Nuwākoṭ. In Wright, op.cit., it is said that he was carried by a Duān and a Kasāī in one night to Nuwākoṭ. Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ praised the Duān with this exclamation "Syābāś put" (well done son !) and from then on the bearer's caste was known as Putvār. In HP, vol.50, fos.26,27, it is said that Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ was carried by a butcher and a Putvār on their backs. Butchers were given landed property and Putvārs were made personal attendants by him for this help. Ācārya, op.cit., p.52, says that Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ escaped on foot to Dahacok. In HP, vol.51, fo.104, the person who carried him on his back to Dahacok is said to have been Jayākṛṣṇa Thāpā. What seems likely is that Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ was first carried to Dahacok and then to Nuwākoṭ by the persons referred to above, perhaps turn by turn.

2. The weapons were there until 1956 and are perhaps there even now.

3. Ācārya, ibid.

4. Wright, ibid.

5. HP, vol.51, fo.104.
following provisions:

1) The two states, Kāthmāndū and Gorkhā, were to exchange representatives who would be stationed at Kāthmāndū and Gorkhā respectively.

2) The dominions of Pāṭan were to be handed over to Gorkhā and Nālbum must be restored to Kāthmāndū, and that either state would assist the other to retain the areas so acquired.

3) The currency of one state should be free to circulate in the other, though Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ was careful to stipulate that the coins in circulation should be pure and of the same metal content.

4) The non-acceptance of the currency of the other state was declared a punishable offence.

5) Imports of gold and silver from Tibet were to be shared equally.

6) Currency coming in from India was also to be shared equally.

7) Both countries agreed to export equal amounts of goods and coinage to Tibet.

8) Both states would station representatives in Tibet and it was provided that the representatives should affix their seal to all goods imported from Tibet with the proviso that any article

1. The details of the date of the treaty as published by Cittarañjan Nepālī in his article 'Nepāl ra Tibbatko sambandha' (Pragati, year 2, no. 4, pp. 113-14) are Vikram Sāvat 1814 Pauṣa badi 8 Tuesday. The corresponding Christian date, 1 January 1758, was not Tuesday but Sunday. In all probability there is a mistake either in the details given by Cittaranjan or in the text itself. If the details be Pauṣa ėudi 8 Tuesday, the weekday corresponds with the Christian date 17 January 1758.
imported without their seal was to be confiscated and shared equally between the two countries.

9) Traders from Índia who entered the Nepal Valley through the dominions of Pāṭan were to be given right of transit and not molested.

10) Trade with Tibet would ordinarily pass through Nuwākoṭ and goods were liable to be checked and opened provided both parties at the checkposts consented.

11) Gorkhā would not confiscate goods consigned to Kāṭhmāṇḍu and Kāṭhmāṇḍu would not confiscate goods consigned to Gorkhā.

The treaty was concluded with the formula "Aghikā Gorkhāko pachikā Kāṭhmāṇḍāko es karārmā rahyā dharmako vṛddhi hos (.) Karār narākhyā pañcamahāpātak lāgos (.)", which means "May virtue flourish if the agreements made in the first place by Gorkhā and in the second place by Kāṭhmāṇḍā are honoured. May five great sins be attached if the agreements are not honoured."

Soon after signing the treaty Jayaprakāś was again beset with domestic troubles. His only son Jyotiprakāś died of smallpox. This meant that he was left without heir, a situation which seemed

---

1. The text is difficult to translate at this point but the statement given under 11) seems to be the most likely interpretation.

2. I.e. "killing a Brahman, drinking intoxicating liquors, theft, committing adultery with the wife of a religious teacher, and associating with any one guilty of these crimes" (MW).
advantageous to Raṇajītisīha with whom first discord quickly arose. Raṇajītisīha detained some of Jayaprakāś's subjects who had come to Bhātgāū to attend a religious festival. They were, however, released when Jayaprakāś threatened him. By way of retaliation Jayaprakāś confined for six months some subjects of Raṇajītisīha, who had come to the temple of Paśupatināth to perform some religious rite, and released them after they had paid heavy ransoms.

Jayaprakāś was far-sighted enough to realize that the disturbed situation in the Nepal Valley and the continuance of disputes between the three kingdoms were bound to weaken their resistance to pressure from outside. His situation, however, was difficult as he did not seem to enjoy confidence of his own people. His own volatile temperament was to a large extent responsible for this. At the present time however he was particularly unpopular because of his employment of mercenaries in his army. He had been compelled to employ mercenaries because after the murder of Kāśirām Thāpā the Khas and Magart tribesmen from the surrounding hill districts who had hitherto served in his army refused to do so. This is probably true also for the Khas and Magar families who were at the time resident at Kāthmāndu. In these circumstances Jayaprakāś had no alternative but to employ mercenaries. The men he brought in to serve in his army are said to be Nagarkotīs from

Kāṅgrā. This however seems unlikely in view of its distance from Kāṭhmāṇḍu. It is more likely that they were Bhoṭiyās, some of whom he had employed on an earlier occasion; or the reference might be to the sect of the Sannyāsīs known as Nāgās who operated as raiders in northern India where they were employed as mercenaries.

Unfortunately for Jayaprakāś the employment of these mercenaries strained relations between him and his people still further. His personal treasury was empty and to pay for the mercenaries' service he was obliged to seize the jewelry from the temples of Paśupatināth and Jayavaśeśvarī. This was an act of necessity not of impiety. Jayaprakāś had earlier, and also later, given proof of pious devotion to his religion. We find references to his repairing old temples, setting up new images of different deities and performing other acts of religious merit. On this occasion he promised to pay back twice the value of the jewelry he had taken. It is most likely that the common people were deeply offended and refused to accept his assurance, not only because the removal from and utilization of jewelry of a temple was an inexcusable profanation in their eyes, but also because the jewelry was

1. Modern Nagarkot is west of Simla and south-east of Kashmir. In the seventeenth century the name Nagarkot was extended to the whole chain of mountains that separated India and Tibet (Lévi: Le Népal, vol.I,p.93).
2. Vide p.196.
3. For the details of the Sannyāsī raiders vide Jamini Mohan Ghosh: Sannyasi and Fakir raiders in Bengal, Calcutta, 1930.
4. Wright, op.cit.,p.228; also Father Giuseppe, op.cit.,p.312.
utilized to pay for the mercenaries when they themselves were suffering the results of financial stringency. It is also probable that his action offended the rulers and the people of Pāṭan and Bhātgāū as some of the jewelry held at Paśupatināhād from time to time been offered to the temple by them.

Jayaprakāś was compelled by the defection of many of his previous supporters to appoint Māithil Brahmans to position of authority. One of them was Gaṅgādhar Jhā whom he had appointed his minister. The Māithil Brahmans had also been held in high esteem by Jayaprakāś's father Jagajjaya Malla. It is alleged that once they forecast that Jagajjaya would be king on the fourth day. This proved true, for on the fourth day he was made king of Kāṭhmāṇḍu. He took them as his deities and gave them gifts, and also freehold lands in Nuwākoṭ. His love for them however made the Khases violent. They plundered and appropriated the property of the Māithil Brahmans. Jayaprakāś's love for them further made the Khases of Kāṭhmāṇḍu resentful. They went to Prthvīnārāyaṇ and transferred to his name the revenue and possession of the lands they enjoyed within the jurisdiction of Kāṭhmāṇḍu.

1. Wright, op.cit.; HP, op.cit.
2. HP, ibid.,fo.68.
3. HP, vol.52,fo.41.
5. Ibid.,fo.70.
Jayaprakāś's embarrassment was soon utilized by Prthvīnāraṇya to his own advantage. The treaty he had entered into with Jayaprakāś was a little more than a year old, but he did not hesitate to abandon it in pursuit of his own policies. This is one of the many examples which illustrates how unscrupulous Prthvīnāraṇya was and how little a solemn promise meant to him when it suited his purpose to break it. In spite of the disorder in the kingdom of Kāṭhmāṅdu Prthvīnāraṇya was not disposed to pursue his policy of armed attack. His previous attempts had not been successful. He realized however that he could weaken the Malla resistance without actually invading the Valley. He therefore determined upon a more intensive policy of blockade. He turned his attention therefore to the passes which led into the Valley and to the outposts which controlled them. The first step was to the capture of Śivapuri.

He called Kulānanda, his astrologer, from Lamjung apologising for having acted against his advice and assuring him that henceforth he would act as he advised. Kulānanda did indeed come back to Nuwākoṭ being apparently satisfied by Prthvīnāraṇya's reassuring letter. He was asked to find an auspicious moment for fixing a pole in Śivapuri. Kulānanda declared midnight of Sunday, 2 July 1759 to be auspicious for that purpose. Prthvīnāraṇya took the first step. He sent his troops to fix a pole at the auspicious moment and capture Śivapuri. It was captured shortly afterwards. The victory none the less cost a great

1. For Śivapuri vide p.44, n.73.
2. A tantric rite (q.v. p.159).
number of the Gorkhalese troops. Amongst the casualties were Bīru Kapardār who was killed and Debyā Gurung who lost his leg. Following on this success, Prthvīnārayan decided to capture other outposts as well. He sent a force which included Daljit Śah, Śrīharṣa Panta, Bhadru Sāhī, Rāmkṛṣya Kāvar, Vīrbhadra Basnet, Pratīman Adhikārī, Śyām Adhikārī, Bhīmsen Thāpā and several prominent chiefs to capture Palāncok. They captured it on Friday, 11 January 1760 after defeating a force of Jayaprapāś's troops in a pitched battle in which Bhīmsen Thāpā fell fatally wounded. These two places, Śivapurī and Palāncok, were outposts of considerable strategical importance. The former formed a natural northern boundary of the Valley, and the latter controlled the route from the land of the Kirātas to Bhātgāū via the valley of Banepā. Thus they were a great acquisition for Prthvīnārayan. Next the Gorkhalese troops further marched west and captured Kābhre, an important fort nearly 10 miles to the south-west of Palāncok, where they defeated some troops of Raṇajitisīnha, who were stationed there in defence. It appears that Jayaprapāś and Raṇajitisīnha had been since their joint action for the defence of Kīrtipur become united to resist Prthvīnārayan's advances. But one notices their inability to compete with Prthvīnārayan in building

1. An officer (Umrāva) recalled to join this expedition from Sirhāncok the frontier outpost of Gorkhā near Lamjung, where he had been earlier stationed in charge of its defence.

2. A place to the east of Banepā Valley. It is nearly 35 miles to the east of Kāṭhmāndū and was in the possession of Bhātgāū.

3. For the land of the Kirātas vide p. 149, n. 105.

4. A village nearly 10 miles to the south-west of Palāncok. It was also in the possession of Bhātgāū. Both the places Palāncok and Kābhre commanded the routes to the Nepal Valley from the land of the Kirātas.
up strategy. The loss of Śivapurī, Palāncok and Kābhre to Pūthvīnārāyaṇ illustrates their incapacity to cope with him in a campaign. The inhabitants of Kābhre were hostile to Pūthvīnārāyaṇ for a considerable time and so he had to come there personally to persuade one of its headmen (Pradhān), Abhudsi [Abhyudayasiṃha] Pradhān, to create a division there for which he was promised some high rank. In 1761 Pūthvīnārāyaṇ captured two more outposts, Cāukōṭ on Monday, 8 June, and Kāhule sometime later. Thus he was now master of some prominent outposts from the western to the south-eastern perimeter of the Nepal Valley.

There is an account of the fighting which preceded the capture of Cāukōṭ, the inhabitants of which defended it with a great heroism for a fortnight. The Gorkhalese first attacked it on Monday, 24 May 1761 and renewed their attacks daily for a fortnight, i.e. till Sunday, 7 June but in vain. Pūthvīnārāyaṇ was surprised at the resistance put up by the people of so small a village. On the following day (Monday, 8 June) fighting was resumed ever more severely. The Gorkhalese were victorious but only after Mahīndrasimha (also called

1. Letter no.5, p.63.
2. HP, vol.51,fo.105. According to IP, vol.I,p.126, col.1, Bāgya Basnet was in command of the Gorkhalese troops who attacked Cāukōṭ. The place is roughly one mile to the south of Banepā.
3. IP, ibid. For Kāhule vide p.46,n.91
5. In Wright, ibid.,p.254, only dates and not the year are given. The first attack took place on Jyeṣṭha badi 6 and the final victory was achieved on Jyeṣṭha śudi 6, which for Saka 1683, the year of this campaign, correspond with Monday, 24 May, and Monday, 8 June respectively. In HP, vol.52,fo.109, the details of the date for the capture of Cāukōṭ are mentioned as Saka 1683 Jyeṣṭha 30 Monday, which also correspond with Monday, 8 June 1761.
Mahendrasimha) Rai, its gallant defender, had been killed, and his 
companion, Namsimha Rai, had fallen unconscious with a severe wound 
in his shoulder. After some time the latter came to senses but seeing 
the Gorkhalese approach him and observing that Mahindrasimha was dead, 
he fled away to safety. The villagers seeing their leaders fallen fled 
also. The Gorkhalese set fire to the village. Next morning Prthvinarayan 
himself went to inspect the battlefield. He saw Mahindrasimha dead, 
and, moved by his gallantry, undertook to protect and support his family. 

Some little time after June 1761, Jasram Thapa, a minister 
of Jayaparakas, who had left Kathmanu for Banaras owing to some 
difference with his master, was arrested while passing through Dahacok. 
Harivamsa Upadhya reported the arrest to Prthvinarayan and asked for 
further orders. Jasram for his part wrote to Virbhadra Upadhya, an 
officer in the service of Prthvinarayan. The letter is lost; but one 
may assume from the later course of events that he indicated a willing-
ness to enter Prthvinarayan's service. Happy at the arrest of Jasram, 

1. Narasimha Rai in Jhavali, op.cit., p.140. Possibly, Mahindrasimha 
(otherwise Mahendrasimha) and Namsimha (otherwise Narasimha) were Kiratis 
of the Rai sept. But it is curious that the names of Mahindrasimha Raya 
and Karmasimha Raya, both of Caukot, are mentioned to have been killed 
and their property confiscated after Prthvinarayan's conquest of Bhatgau 
in 1769 (HP, vol.50, fo.26 reverse). The discrepancy is hard to be 
accounted for. The title Raya is a pedantic variant of Rai or Rai used 
by the Kiratis.


3. HP, vol.2, fo.104; also vol.51, fo.105.
Prthvīnārāyaṇa ordered Harivamśa to send him to Nuwākot where he received him hospitably. In the course of consultations regarding the conquest of the Nepal Valley, Jasrām told Prthvīnārāyaṇa that there was no possibility of conquering it until Makwānpur had been taken. Prthvīnārāyaṇa was satisfied with his opinion, and began to plan the conquest of Makwānpur. To ensure the loyalty of the Thāpā clan of which Jasrām was a member he arranged a marriage between Dambar Thāpā and the daughter of Tulārām Pāre. This stroke of policy was apparently successful because the members of the Thāpā clan were now assured of Prthvīnārāyaṇa's favour towards them, and were content to remain at Nuwākot. This was a shrewd act on the part of Prthvīnārāyaṇa as certain members of the large Thāpā clan were residents in Kathmāndu and the treatment that the Thāpās had received in Nuwākot was not likely to have passed notice by them.

Mention has been made of one Thāpā minister of Jayaprapās, who was sent to attack the Gorkhalese troops stationed at Kāhule. In the course of the action he was arrested by them. At the time the Thāpā minister made his surprise attack, the Gorkhalese troops were busy cooking their food and were undressed as their caste regulations required that they should be while so employed. Although attacked

1. HP, vol.51, fo.105, wherein it is not said who is this Dambar Thāpā.
2. Ibid.
3. IP, op. cit., where the name of the minister is not given.
unawares, they hurriedly assembled without putting on their clothes and repulsed their adversaries. The Thāpā minister was captured and sent to Prthvīnārāyaṇ at Nuwakot who was very happy at the capture. He spared his life and promised to give him emoluments to the same value as those given by Jayaprakāś, provided he agreed to serve him loyally. The Thāpā minister accepted the offer and when ordered to make plans to expedite the conquest of the Nepal Valley, he advised Prthvīnārāyaṇ to conquer Makwānpur first as a necessary preliminary. This Thāpā minister might well have been Jāsrām Thāpā who is referred to above. The two stories about him are not necessarily contradictory. The story of his capture might be interpreted as follows. He was sent by Jayaprakāś to capture Kāhule and after the defeat there fled to Dahacok Where he was apprehended. The defeat was unlikely to increase his credit with Jayaprakāś, so it is quite likely that he had made up his mind to flee to Banaras whither he was actually going when he was captured by the Gorkhalese troops.

Acting on Jāsrām Thāpā's advice Prthvīnārāyaṇ proceeded to devise a plan to antagonise Digbandhan Sen, King of Makwānpur, and provided himself with an excuse for attacking his country. He understood that Makwānpur was a potential danger to his plans. Its king in the past had come to the assistance of the Malla kings and he was at that

1. IP, op.cit.
time on friendly terms with one of the ministers in Pāṭan. Furthermore, the possession of Mākwānpūr was an important element in the blockade of the Nepal Valley which was now being planned. Outposts which Prthvi-nārāyaṇ already held guaranteed that the routes from the south-west and the south-east would not be available to the Mallas. But the route to the south led through Mākwānpūr and was consequently open to them. Prthvi-nārāyaṇ determined therefore to isolate the Valley from that quarter also. He began by repeating his earlier demand for the Navālākhī diamond necklace and the one-tusked elephant, this time asking for a few elephants more to make sure that the demand would be rejected as unreasonable. In actual fact Kanakasmīha, who was still a minister in Mākwānpūr, turned the demand down without even informing his king about it. Thus provided with the pretext he needed, Prthvi-nārāyaṇ quickly drafted a sizeable body of troops, including Mahoddāmkīrti Śāh, Dalmardan Śāh, Daljīt Śāh, Śūrapratāp Śāh, Vaśarāj Pāre, Kūlānanda Dhakāl, Nāharsimha Basnet, Keharsimha Basnet, Abhimānsimha Basnet and Nandubisu Panta, and sent them to Mākwānpūr, the capital of the kingdom, to attack it. As the later course of events shows it appears that Prthvi-nārāyaṇ had also followed to supervise the operation. They laid siege

1. Jñavālī, op.cit., p. 134; also Acārya, op.cit.

2. For the Navālākhī diamond necklace and the one-tusked elephant vide p. 37, n. 18.

3. According to IP, op.cit., col. 2, the persons sent were Śūrapratāp Śāh, Tulārām Pāre, Lakṣmīnārāyaṇ Pandit, Rāmkṛṣṇa Kāvar, Ambarsimha Thāpā, Virāj Bakhetī and several others.
on Friday, 20 August 1762 and captured the place after one day's heavy fighting (on Saturday, 21 August). Between 50 to 60 Gorkhalese died while fighting. Casualties on the side of the Makwānpur forces included nearly 400 dead. Taking his Queen and Crown Prince with him, Digbandhan fled to Hariharpur, about sixteen miles to the east of Makwānpur. He was accompanied by Kanakṣiśha and the remaining troops. Stationing Nandubisu Panta at Makwānpur in charge of the fort, Prthvīnārayaṇ ordered his troops to march to capture Hariharpur, Sīdhulī (twenty-two miles to the east of Hariharpur) and Timāl. The column led by Daljit Śāh, Vamsāraṇ Pāre, Jīva Śāh and Rudrī Śāhī captured Timāl on Tuesday, 14 September after heavy fighting in which 300 Gorkhalese were killed. Another wing laid siege to Sīdhulī on Tuesday, 21 September, and captured it losing between 50 to 60 men only. Digbandhan was thus surrounded by his adversaries. The Gorkhalese fell upon Hariharpur violently and captured it in the early dawn of Tuesday, 5 October after heavy fighting. About 500 men of the Makwānpur troops were killed. The Gorkhalese captured a few elephants. The Queen and the Crown Prince were arrested and brought before Prthvīnārayaṇ. But King Digbandhan and his minister Kanakṣiśha escaped. Hearing this Prthvīnārayaṇ became very angry as he observed to his men that they were the persons who should have been

1. Hariharpur and Sīdhulī were two important forts of the Makwānpur state. Probably Timāl is the modern Timāḷḍāṛa, a village situated on a ridge 18 miles to the south-east of Kābhre. It seems to have been then the frontier between the states of Bhātgāū and Makwānpur. It commanded the route to the Nepal Valle by way of Dumjā.
captured. Bāgyā Basnet, a Gorkhalese officer, comforted Prthvīnārāyaṇ saying that the king was sure to surrender out of love for his wife and child. This indeed happened, for Digbandhan surrendered the same day. Prthvīnārāyaṇ was very pleased with Bāgyā Basnet. Digbandhan was taken to Nuwākoṭ with his family. Prthvīnārāyaṇ had not forgotten the treatment he had received previously from him, and so he imprisoned him at Nuwākoṭ. Kanakāśimha, however, could not be arrested. He managed to escape to Bettia where he requested Mir Kasim, Nawab of Bengal and Bihar, for succour to renew the fight with the Gorkhalese; but before help could be sent the conquest of Makwānapur was completed by Prthvīnārāyaṇ. This conquest was a great gain for him. He got some 700 guns and the stores which the state possessed, and it is said that with this possession he formed within the year five companies of his army, Śrīnāth, Vajravāṇi, Sabuj, Gorakh and Kālībakṣa. He was also very happy that the blockade he had planned to impose upon the Nepal Valley had been now achieved, and was confident that the Valley would also be conquered. He permitted Jasrām Thāpā and Campasiṁha Godār Thāpā to send for their families from Kāthmāṇḍu and to them he gave the revenues of Sīdhubī to be shared

1. HP, vol.51, fos.105-6. Digbandhan seems to have been in prison until 1769 (Original Consultations, 31 October 1769, East India Company, Bengal).
4. Perhaps the same Jasrām Thāpā mentioned earlier (pp.221-22). Or he could be the Jasrām Thāpā, a Jamādār of the Nepalese army, who was killed at the Nepalese outpost of Barhārva near Makwānapur on 25 October 1814 by the English army on the eve of the Nepal Wars of 1814-16 (Papers respecting the Nepal War, p.309).
5. Godār is a sub-clan of Khas Thāpās. It is not known to which sub-clans other Thāpās, e.g. Kāsīrām, Dambār Thāpā, Jasrām Thāpā, etc., belonged.
equally by each. Keharsimha Basnet was given the revenue of Makwānpur, and he went as far as Jalesvar (now the headquarters of the Mahottari district in the eastern Nepal Tarai) to supervise administration and make settlements there. With the conquest of the Makwānpur state Prthvīnārāyaṇ's territory was now contiguous with the southern boundaries of Pāṭan and Bhātgāū, and the Nepal Valley was now almost completely beleaguered. In order to ensure that the blockade was fully effective Prthvīnārāyaṇ stationed his pickets at the passes through which the Valley's trade was transacted. He ordered the pickets not to let salt, cotton, food grains, etc., enter the Valley. Early next year the Gorkhalese captured two more outposts, Parevākoṭ on Sunday, 2 January 1763 and Kavilāspur the following Saturday (8 January).

No sooner had this stage of his campaign been completed than Prthvīnārāyaṇ had to turn to meet another foe. Kanaksimha's appeal

2. HP,vol.51,fo.221. Probably the southern part of what is now the Saptari district, which was then in the possession of Makwānpur, was not annexed by Prthvīnārāyaṇ. It was annexed to Nepal during the time of his son and successor, Pratāpsimha Śah (January 1775-September 1777). The northern part of what is now the Saptari district was then in the possession of the Caudaṇḍi state, and it was occupied by Prthvīnārāyaṇ (vide'p.301).
3. IP, vol.II,pt.iii,pp.463,467 (Letters nos.5,9); also Father Giuseppe, 'An account of the kingdom of Nēpāl', Asiatick Researches, II, 1790, p.317; Ācārya, op.cit.,p.76.
4. HP, vol.52,fo.110,vol.56,fo.41. It is difficult to identify Parevākoṭ. Probably it was the contemporary name of a ridge between Neṭādrā and Pharping, the former in the possession of Makwānpur and the latter in the possession of Pāṭan. As the name suggests there was a garrison (kot) stationed there. Through the ridge perhaps passed the usual route linking Makwānpur and the Nepal Valley on the one hand and on the other Pāṭalung and Dhāding, both these in the possession of Gorkhā. Kavilāspur (also Kavilās) is a small village situated near the Trisūli. It is 10 miles to the north-west of Kāṭhmāṇḍu and roughly the same distance to the south of Nuwākoṭ.
to the Nawab of Bengal and Bihar had not been ignored. Mir Kasim had been for some time on bad terms with the British and for this reason had kept his troops mobilised. They were encamped at Bettia, a territory which had a common border with the Bārā district of Makwānpūr. It is reported that Mir Kasim had at that time come to Bettia to deal with the zamindar of Bettia. The Raja of Bettia, Jugalkiśorsīṁha, had fled to Tanahū. So it was apprehended that Mir Kasim would attack Tanahū. But Kanaksīṁha's invitation turned his attention in the direction of Makwānpur.

Mir Kasim's Commander-in-chief, Gurgin Khan, informed by Kashmiri and Armenian traders about the fabulous wealth of Nepal, persuaded the Nawab to send an expedition to that country, assuring him that its conquest would provide him with an opportunity to consolidate his position in the comfortable vantage-ground of the Hills from which

2. Ācārya, 'Tanahūko Sen-vaṁśa', p.73.
3. The orientalized name of an Armenian, Khojah Gregory Arrathoon, who was previously a cloth merchant of Hooghly. He came to limelight when appointed in 1760 Commander-in-chief as well as War Minister of the Nawab. He is credited for many excellent reforms introduced in his army and for manufacturing and casting guns and cannon. Suspecting him to have been in league with the English the Nawab got him murdered some time in early October 1763. Gregory Khan was then only thirty (Nandalal Chatterji, 'Mir Qasim's army', Indian Historical Quarterly, 1935, pp.258, 261, 'The downfall of Mir Qasim', Journal of Indian History, vol.XIII, pts. i-iii, 1934, pp.346-47; Mesrovb J. Seth, 'Gorgin Khan', Bengal past and present, vol.XXXIV, January-June 1928, pp.74-80, 'Armenians at Chandernagore', ibid., vol.XLII, 1931, p.18, n.1).
to renew his struggle against the English. Gurgin Khan had also another object in view. He wanted to try out the arms and ammunition manufactured by him and the troops trained by him. He had got intelligence from the Capucin missionaries then at Lhasa about the passes and entrances into Nepal. He had employed some men in his service to act as guides in the contemplated expedition and was inspired by them with the thought of conquering the mountain country. Accordingly at the end of 1762 Mir Kasim despatched Gurgin Khan to attack Mawkānpur with a huge army of nearly 30,000 men. Meeting no opposition in the plains they reached the foothills below the fort of Mawkānpur on Friday, 7 January 1763. At this point they came into conflict with the Gorkhalese troops who defended their position with such success that the invaders were unable to ascend the ridge and occupy the fort. They therefore consolidated their position in the valley of Harna and made dispositions for a siege. Hearing that troops of the Nawab had laid siege to Mawkānpur on Wednesday, 12 January, and also to the garrison at Duḍuva, Prthvīnārāyaṇ sent instructions to his men on Saturday, 15 January regarding the action they were to take. He also despatched reinforcements accompanied by Vamśarāj Pāre, Śrīharṣa Panta, Jīva Śāh, Nāharsimha Basnet, Keharsimha Basnet, Rāmkṛṣṇa Kāvar, Bāgyā Basnet and Durlabh Khatrī. They were also

1. HP, vol.51,fo.106; also vol.52,fol.62.
joined by Āśājīt Bhārārī. He had earlier been accused of deserting his colleague Devarṣi Upādhyāya who was killed in the course of fighting at Naḷdūm. He joined them without orders from Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ. The Gorkhalese troops went to Mākwānpur via Pharping and Nandarām Mahādeva, covering a distance of nearly 30 miles. They fell upon the enemy in three columns: Vamśarāj attacked them on Tuesday, 20 January from the side of Tāplākhār, one mile north of the Mākwānpur Fort; Nāharsiṇha Basnet and Keharsiṇha Basnet attacked in their rear; Nandubisu Panta led his column from the fort itself. The troops of the Nawab could not resist the onslaught of the Gorkhalese and ultimately had to withdraw after sustaining heavy casualties which included 1,700 dead. The Nawab returned to Patna after this failure. The casualties on the part of the Gorkhalese were by contrast very small. Two of their notable fighters, Nandubisu Panta and Āśājīt Bhārārī, were killed. Other casualties were between 25 to 30 dead and some 60 wounded. The Gorkhalese seized two small cannon, one big cannon, nearly 500 guns and considerable quantities of other arms and ammunition. These enabled Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ to form two companies of his army on European lines. The victory was a rich gain and a great achievement for him. It was the first occasion that the Gorkhalese troops had

2. Papers respecting the Nepal War, p.225; also HP, vol.2,fo.27.
6. Ācārya, 'Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ Śāṅkā jīvanīko pūrvārddha', p.75.
measured their strength with a foreign army of substantial strength and superior training. It was undoubtedly a great feat on the part of Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ's army, but far from praising his soldiers for their gallantry, he was at first angry that they had killed only 1,700 and let the rest escape. Later, however, seeing the great number of ovens and camps made by the invaders, he realized how numerous they had been and was exceedingly happy at the success achieved by his men.

Hearing that Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ was engaged in fighting in the east, in the Tarai as well as in the Nepal Valley, the Čauḍīśī kings decided amongst themselves that the time was opportune to disconcert him and by so doing save themselves from the destruction which seemed to them likely if he were victorious in his present campaigns and allowed to advance unchecked. They therefore sent their troops to invade Gorkhā. They crossed the Marsyāndī river and laid siege to Harmī, Dhuvākoṭ, Cyāṅgī, Bhīrkōṭ, Dyāurāḷī, Lakāṅ, all of which places belonged to Gorkhā and lay on its western perimeter. One of the features of this campaign is Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ's ability to decide quickly at a very short notice. He mobilised the entire population of Gorkhā, drafting all males from 12 to 60 in his army. They were sent under the command of Mahoddāmkīrtī and Śūrapratāp. They reached Lakāṅ on the morning of

1. HP, op.cit.

2. In all such sporadic attacks it was Lamjung which generally took the lead.
Sunday, 18 March 1763. In the engagement that followed the Cáubíśí troops were defeated and forced to retreat. The Gorkhalese pursued them, and there being no boat the Cáubíśí troops jumped into the Marsyāngdi in order to escape and the majority of them were drowned. The Lamjungite troops too vacated their post at Harmī which they had of late established, and retired to Rāginās in their own territory. The rest of the Cáubíśí troops were also ultimately forced to raise the siege they had laid.

As though these campaigns were not enough Pṛthvīnārayaṇ was also planning to march against the Banepā Valley to the east of Bhātgāū by the middle of 1763. He was engaged in secret correspondence with his agent in that district. A letter written by Pṛthvīnārayaṇ from Nuwākoṭ on Sunday, 2 July 1763 to the agent shows how the latter was persuaded to come over to his side by a royal grant promising certain holdings in Sāgākoṭ. The agent was also asked to enter into negotiations with the Bhoṭiyās in Panāūṭ, and to enlist the brothers and sons of a

1. In all accounts the date given is Śaka 1685 Caitra 9 Sunday, the Śaka year being erroneously written for 1684. Since Śaka year, a lunar year, begins on Caitra śukla 1 and Vikram year, a solar year, on 1 Vaisākh, the corresponding Christian dates for the New Year's days of Śaka 1685 and its equivalent Vikram 1820 were Sunday, 1 April 1764 and Monday, 9 April 1764 respectively. But Caitra 9 Sunday of Śaka 1685 or Vikram 1820 was not Sunday but Tuesday (19 March 1764). Being Caitra the Vikram New Year 1821 had not yet begun and henceŚaka 1685 was written to be equivalent to Vikram 1820 (Vikram year - 135 = Śaka year). Hence the correct Śaka year was 1684 whence the corresponding Christian date 18 March 1763.
2. HP, op.cit.
3. IP, vol.II,pt.iii,p.463 (Letter no.6, wherein the name of the agent is not mentioned).
4. I.e. Sāgā Fort, modern Sāgā, a place near Panāūṭ in the Banepā Valley.
certain craftsman resident in that area. In return the agent was promised nearly 300 sikkas, some gold bangles, a horse, a robe of honour and a post carrying remuneration, in return for the accomplishment of the assignment entrusted to him. The attention of the addressee was drawn to the shortness of the time and he was desired to act expeditiously.

After repulsing the Gāubīsī invaders, Śūrapratāp came back to Nuwākoṭ, bringing with him Yogī Bhagavatanāth whom he wished to introduce to Prthvīnārāyaṇ. The Yogī, who was said to be a Siddha, was treated by Prthvīnārāyaṇ with great respect. Śūrapratāp, who had by now earned a reputation for himself in the previous campaigns, was again sent with troops to lead the campaign against the Banepā Valley. The troops were also accompanied by Kālu Kapardār, Rāmkṛṣṇa Kāvar, Harivaṁśa Upādhyāya Adhikārī and other prominent officers. They were instructed to capture Cāukoṭ, Panāuti and Dhulkhel, all strategically important places within the dominions of Bhāṭgāū, with the express intention of

1. The person in the letter (q.v. p.231, n.3) is referred to as a Mijhār, an honorific title in Nepali used for craftsmen, e.g. Damā (tailor and musician), Kāmī (goldsmith and blacksmith), Sārki (who flays dead cattle, prepares leather, makes shoes and other leather articles), etc. Among other things Prthvīnārāyaṇ needed skilled craftsmen for his army. The Nepal Valley and its outskirts being famous for their arts and crafts and skilled craftsmen, and Gorkhā being comparatively poor in this respect, it is quite likely that Prthvīnārāyaṇ was eager to persuade skilled men to come over to his side. The Mijhār could possibly be a Kāmī and was perhaps expert in making weapons.
2. I.e. coins of India, which seem to have been valuable in Nepal.
3. Since Prthvīnārāyaṇ undertook campaigns against the Banepā Valley from October 1763 (vide pp.233-34).
4. One notices here Prthvīnārāyaṇ's attention to detail.
5. For the Yogī vide p.72, n.2.
6. A great saint, especially one who has attained beatitude, or who has acquired supernatural powers.
7. Quite possibly it was vacated by the Gorkhalese soon after its previous occupation in 1761 (vide p.219).
sealing up the Nepal Valley from the eastern perimeter. The Gorkhalese troops at first occupied the outskirts of Dhulkhel, driving back the troops of the Malla kings stationed there for its defence, but they were unable to gain possession of the stronghold situated in the heart of the town where the garrison held out for six months. Incensed at the inability of his men to break through Prthvīnārāyaṇ sent reinforcements under the command of Jaskarṇa Khatri, ordering him to capture first Dhulkhel and then Cāukoṭ and Panauṭī. But he too could not reduce Dhulkhel. Prthvīnārāyaṇ was still more angry with him, and then he sent his brother Daljit to attack Cāukoṭ. In the meantime Jaskarṇa deputed the three officers, Kālu Kapardār, Rāmkṛṣṇa Kāvar and Harivamāśa Upādhyāya Adhikārī, to march in three columns of 500 men each. The arrival of Daljit with further reinforcements strengthened the Gorkhalese already in the operation. They captured Dhulkhel in the early hours of Sunday, 23 October 1763. After heavy fighting the troops under the command of Daljit captured Cāukoṭ in the morning of the next day (Monday, 24 October). In their forward thrust the Gorkhalese also captured Panauṭī and Kharpu the same day. Shortly afterwards they captured Banepā and Sāgā on Thursday, 27 October, and Nālā and Rāṇikoṭ the following day.

1. It seems that the Malla kings had been united for some time in the past in order to check Prthvīnārāyaṇ's advances into their country.


3. The revenue of Dhulkhel was given to Rāmkṛṣṇa Kāvar (HP, vol.51, fo.221).
(Friday, 28 October), thus conquering almost the entire Banepa Valley.

In the attack on Sāgā the Gorkhalese troops came into conflict with some 500 Nāgās who had been procured by Raṇajitsimha to help Jayaprakāś. They were led by an ascetic Gulābrām of Banaras, whom Prthvīnārāyaṇ had appointed his priest during his visit to that place in 1743 and from whom he had received a sword as a mark of his favour. Believing that the success achieved by Prthvīnārāyaṇ was due to the miraculous power of the sword he had given him the ascetic had come after twenty years to demand his share in the spoils. Being refused he went over to Jayaprakāś and promised to help him by repulsing the Gorkhalese from the perimeter of the Nepal Valley. Accordingly he left Kāṭhmānu and returned shortly after with a band of armed Nāgās. They overpowered Gorkhalese guards at Sīdhulī. Then they scattered in batches to the seven villages in the Banepa Valley, which had just been occupied by Prthvīnārāyaṇ. The first advance batch of the Nāgās fell upon the Gorkhalese troops at Sāgā on the evening of the same day the latter had captured it (27 October), and were successful in driving them out. They also killed the Gorkhalese officer, Gautariyā Jāhāgīr Sah, who was...

2. All these places conquered by the Gorkhalese are closely situated in the Banepa Valley as will be seen from their relative situation: Bhatgūḍ to Sāgā 4 miles SE, Sāgā to Banepa 2 miles E, Banepa to Nālā 4 miles S and Dhulkhel 6 miles E, Dhulkhel to Kharpū 3 miles SW, Kharpū to Gāukoṭ ½ mile E, Gāukoṭ to Panautī 6 miles S. Rānīkoṭ is in between the Banepa Valley and Bhatgūḍ. The Banepa Valley being in the dominions of Bhatgūḍ, its conquest had now completely strained relations between Raṇajitsimha and Prthvīnārāyaṇ.
3. DU, Tr., p.32.
4. The ascetic is probably the same Siddha Avasthī mentioned earlier (vide p.147).
5. Nepalese accounts are confusing regarding this person, for he is mentioned to have been killed earlier (vide p.184).
stationed there. After this initial success the Nagas of this batch went on to Bhātgāū. But the remaining batches which were following the first were defeated by the Gorkhalese. All the Nagas were slaughtered to a man in the seven villages they had gone to. The leader Gulābrām could not be traced.

The Banepā Valley was a fertile region and it was also of commercial and strategical importance. Through it passed trade and commerce between the Nepal Valley and Tibet in the north and with the Kirāt in the east and the plains in the south. Its capture represented a rich gain for Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ. On account of the importance of its situation traders of the seven villages of this Valley and those of Bhātgāū wrote to the Gorkhalese officer stationed there and asked for permission to settle in Banepā and trade from there. When he was informed of this proposal Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ replied that he had information that goods were entering the Nepal Valley but that he would consider the proposal provided they accepted him as their master. It has already been noticed that Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ did not hesitate to win over to his side by bribery or other dishonourable means any person whom he considered likely to further his plans.

1. Ācārya, 'Sṛī Sṛī Jayaprapakṣa Malla', p. 56; also DU, Tr., p. 32; HP, vol. 50, fo. 42; IP, vol. I, p. 126, col. 1, vol. II, pt. iii, p. 431. HP, vol. 52, fo. 118, says that 5,000 Nagas marched up to Panautī where they were slaughtered by the Gorkhalese troops. The number perhaps is an exaggeration. The seven villages mentioned in all the Nepalese accounts are apparently Sāgā, Banepā, Dhulkhel, Khaṛpu, Nālā, Cāuoṭ and Panautī.

2. Vide pp. 231-32.
At the same time an approach was made to Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ by a resident of Pāṭan. It seems that the person concerned was a close friend of a Gorkhalese officer whom he had asked to convey to Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ his desire to come over to his side in return for protection. When this approach was reported to Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ he acquired information that the person concerned held great influence in the Nepal Valley. He was interested to press the matter further. In his reply he pointed out that he was prepared to offer protection to the applicant as to any other person of high standing in Pāṭan on condition that they would take action to undermine the position of the then king of Pāṭan and prepare the way for the offering of the kingdom to himself. Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ was well aware that the nobles of Pāṭan had the power to enthrone and dispossess a king more or less at will, and saw in this approach an opportunity to use the factions in the kingdom to his own advantage.

While the places in the Banepā Valley which have been mentioned were being captured by the Gorkhalese, other troops of Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ occupied Pharping and Bisaṅkhu, on 2 and 4 November respectively. Both towns were in the kingdom of Pāṭan, the former lying approximately 6 miles south-west and the latter some 4 to 5 miles to the south-east. Some of the troops pressed on to capture Jaulākhal, a near suburb of Pāṭan in the direction of Kīrtipur. But they were compelled to withdraw before a counter-attack from Pāṭan. The occupying force was probably

1. IP, op.cit.

very small as we are told that they withdrew before a mob who pelted
them with stones and brickbats. Nevertheless Prthvínarāyaṇ maintained
his pressure on Pāṭan, and the following year, on Tuesday, 7 August,
he captured Cobhār and Pāgā, the former being an important ridge a few
miles to the south of Pāṭan. It appears that at this point Prthvínarāyaṇ
had succeeded in capturing most of the important outposts of the three
kingdoms in the Valley. The Malla kings were now more or less confined
to their capital cities and a few villages which lay close to them.

Elated by his success which included military, strategical
and commercial victories, Prthvínarāyaṇ now decided that the moment had
come for a second assault on Kīrtipur. As had occurred so often in his
campaigns an auspicious day had to be found. The royal astrologers,
Kulānanda and Rāmkṛṣṇa, declared that there was no auspicious day
available and for that reason they opposed the attack. Another astrologer
however was in favour of it, as was the monk Bhagavantānāth. Prthvínarāyaṇ
therefore decided to press on with the attack and instructed Bālkṛṣṇa
to search out an auspicious day. Śūrapratāp, the King’s brother, was
appointed to command the troops. He was supported by Daljit Sah, Jīva
Sah, Tulārām Pāṭre, Śrīharṣa Panta, Prabhu Malla, Vīrabhadra Basnet and
several others. Prthvínarāyaṇ kept Vaiśarāj Pāṭre with himself. The attack
was launched on Kīrtipur on Sunday, 17 September 1764. As the town was
surrounded with walls, the attackers had to bring in scaling ladders

1. HP, vol. 51, fo. 221.
op. cit., mentions the Śaka year 1685 instead of 1686.
which they attempted to climb under volleys of stones and arrows showered down on them by the defenders. It appears that there was a wrangle between Śūrapratāp and Śrīharṣa Panta as to who should climb the ladder first. Śūrapratāp had put the ladder in position and Śrīharṣa attempted to climb it only to find himself seized by the legs and dragged down by the irate prince. Śūrapratāp then proceeded to climb the ladder himself only to fall wounded when he was struck by an arrow in the left eye. The Gorkhalese casualties at the walls were very heavy. Daljit Šah was seriously wounded by a sword blow on his shoulder. Jīva Šah, Vīrbhadra Basnet and many others were so gravely wounded that they had to withdraw from the battle. In time the Gorkhalese ranks broke before the constant and gallant defence of the inhabitants of the town and they were compelled to withdraw to Dahacok. Thus the second attempted assault on Kīrtipur failed. But Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ was not daunted. He reformed his troops and attempted to obtain by siege what he had failed to gain by a direct assault. He was able so to dispose his troops that they were not exposed to attack from Kāṭhmāṇḍu and Pāṭan.

1. HP, vol.51,fo.107. Also Father Giuseppe, op.cit.,p.318, who says that the wound was cured by Father Michael Angelo, a Capucin missionary of the Nepal Valley. The Capucin Mission had been permitted by the Malla kings of the Valley to reside and preach in their kingdoms since 1714. For the activities of the Mission vide Lévi; Le Népal,vol.I,pp.79 ff; Petech, op.cit., pts.I-VII (in progress); C. Wessels: Early Jesuit travellers in in Central Asia; P.C. Roy Choudhury, 'A forgotten mission to Tibet', Vigil (18 February 1956). Ācārya, 'Śrī Śrī Jayaprakāś Malla',p.60, says that Śūrapratāp went to Patna the following winter for the treatment of the wound and came back fully recovered but one-eyed.

2. HP, ibid.

3. Father Giuseppe,ibid.,p.317.
At this desperate juncture the Malla kings at last determined to mount a joint enterprise against Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ. The first objective was to be Nāldum. They collected troops and despatched them to recapture that important outpost. The Malla army was accompanied by 1 Bāghāsimha, chief of the Nagarkotīs. Initially the venture was completely successful and the Gorkhalese were driven out of Nāldum and another village nearby. When he heard what had happened Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ consulted Vaṁśarāj Pāre, and in accordance with his advice despatched troops from Dahacok under the command of Tulārām Pāre, Prabhu Malla and Harivamśa Upādhyāya Adhikārī. They encountered no resistance in the way and were able quickly to reach Nāldum by way of Simbhu, Ṭhamel and Sākhu. They managed to kill Bāghāsimha who mistook them for Malla reinforcements. The main body of the Malla troops were unable to offer a sustained resistance and were ultimately forced to flee. Thus Nāldum was regained for Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ who was so pleased with the victory that he distributed rewards among the troops who had taken part in the successful action. 2 He did not however allow his pleasure to keep him from pressing forward while the enemies were on their retreat, and shortly afterwards Marikhu 4 was also entered.

1. It seems that the inhabitants of Nagarkot were the only hillmen in the army of Jayaprakāś at this time.

2. Simbhu, the western and Ṭhamel, the northern residential areas of Kāthmāndu. One notices how Jayaprakāś's defence was so weakened as to let the Gorkhalese pass unchecked through so close quarters of the capital itself.

3. HP, vol.50,fo.180, where however only the month and the year, Śaka 1686 Vikram 1822 Āśvin, are mentioned. The Vikram year is wrongly written for 1821. The month corresponds with 14 September-13 October 1764.

4. HP, ibid. Quite probably, the place was vacated and had to be recaptured later after the occupation of Kīrtipur in 1766 (vide p. 249).
At this stage Pūthvīnārāyaṇ found his position threatened by internal discord, the settlement of which called for the exercise of considerable ingenuity. After the campaign against Marikhu had succeeded he observed that his brothers were showing signs of disaffection and had ceased to work on his behalf with their previous enthusiasm. Śūrapratab in fact soon broke away and went to join Pūthvīnārāyaṇ's traditional enemies, the kings of the Gaubīṣī, who on their part were very happy to welcome him. So deeply had disaffection established itself among Pūthvīnārāyaṇ's brothers that he was forced to the conclusion that he could rely only on the Khas and Magar tribesmen.

The defection of Śūrapratab was a serious blow to Pūthvīnārāyaṇ who was given to understand that the person who had succeeded in winning his brother over was Siddhinārāyaṇ Sāhī, King of Kāśkī. Pūthvīnārāyaṇ was forced to take measures to bring his brother back. He sent Saktivallabh to pacify him and induce him to return. But he found that Śūrapratab was willing to come back only on his own terms which included the handing over to him of three of Pūthvīnārāyaṇ's men. Pūthvīnārāyaṇ had no option but to agree. Śūrapratab returned and demanded

1. From HP, op. cit., fos.180-81, it appears that Śūrapratab first went to Tanahū, and since its king had some time back committed suicide, the Prince then went to Lamjung and Kāśkī. It is however difficult to say who was the king of Tanahū who had then committed suicide. It could not be Trisuktarm, Sen who is seen alive in 1768 (Bid. 275), although historians do not agree over the date of his death. Jñāvalī, op. cit., pp.117-18, mentions 1764 as the year when he died, whereas Acārya, 'Tanahūko Sen-vamsā', p.74, says that he died in or after 1769. Acārya also says, ibid., that Śūrapratab defected after 1769, which however is mentioned in HP, ibid., to have taken place after the occupation of Marikhu and before the capture of Luṭikot some time in 1765.
at once that these three men, Śrīharṣa Panta, Virbhadra Upādhyāya and Harivaṁśa Upādhyāya Adhikārī, should be handed over to him. Apparently, the Prince's aim was to punish and publicly disgrace the king's favourites. The original cause may be found in the wrangle between Śūrapratāp and Śrīharṣa Panta in the course of the second attack on Kīrtipur in 1764. Pṛthvīnāraṇyaṇ agreed to comply with the demand but immediately took steps to nullify it. He despatched Harivaṁśa on a pilgrimage to Puri. Virbhadra was actually handed over to Śūrapratāp but Pṛthvīnāraṇyaṇ had already planned to secure his release. The plan was typical of Pṛthvīnāraṇyaṇ's cunning. He sent his priest Śrīharṣa Miśra to call on Śūrapratāp about the time when he was ending his hour of worship. Śūrapratāp enquired why the priest had come and when the latter told him that he had come to ask something the Prince assured him that he would grant him anything he asked for. Śrīharṣa Miśra asked for Virbhadra Upādhyāya, and as the vow had been made at the end of his worship hour, Śūrapratāp was morally bound to honour it or to commit an act which would be repugnant to all pious Hindus. The third victim Śrīharṣa Panta was at the time stationed at Nāldum, and refused to be handed over to Śūrapratāp. Pṛthvīnāraṇyaṇ therefore had to take him by force. Once he was handed over to Śūrapratāp, Śrīharṣa Panta was forced to undergo the public disgrace being carried round the town of Nuwākoṭ in a cage.

1. HP, op.cit.
It appears that this act of vengeance satisfied Śūrapratab who then accepted the post of officer in command of one of PṛthviNārāyaṇ's armies. He was sent to capture Luṭikoṭ (Bālāju), an important stronghold two miles north of Kāthmāndu. The post was defended by troops of Jaya-prakāś but one of his ministers, Śrīkṛṣṇa Pāṭhak, defected to Pṛthvi-Nārāyaṇ who sent him to Śūrapratab who used him to open the way through the defence of Luṭikoṭ. The post was captured on Friday, 10 May 1765.

The unrest in Pāṭan was at this time working up to a climax. There had been revolution and counter-revolution there but matters had been becoming worse for some twenty years. From 1745 the ministers of the state had been so powerful that they could do what they liked. They murdered their king Rājayaprakāś, probably in the summer of 1757 and enthroned Viśvajit, an 18-year-old grandson of Viṣṇu Malla. Two years later however he was treacherously murdered. The reason for this act being a charge that he had committed adultery with the daughter of one of the ministers. The throne was now offered to Jayaprakāś who accepted it. He was however deposed two years later in 1762, probably during July of that year, and replaced by Raṇajitśimha. Raṇajitśimha however soon

---

1. HP, vol.52, op. cit. Two dates for the capture of Luṭikoṭ are given: i) Śaka 1687 Jyeṣṭha 1 Friday (HP, ibid., fos 110,118; also IP, vol.II, pt. iii, p.431) corresponding with Friday, 10 May 1765, and ii) Śaka 1687 Asvin 1 Friday (HP, ibid., fo.181) corresponding with Friday, 13 September 1765. It is however difficult to fix the correct date as both have the same week-day which also corresponds with the same week-day for the two Christian dates.

2. For his successor Viśvajit Malla is seen reigning in Pāṭan in September 1757 in the course of the joint action of the Malla kings for the defence of Kīrtipur (vide p.210).


became unpopular, and the ministers expelled him during the monsoon period of 1763. Jayaprakāś was angry with the ministers firstly because of the murder of his brother, although once time his competitor, and secondly, more seriously apparently, because they had offered the throne, which he deemed to belong to him after the death of his brother, to Rāṇajitsimha. To pacify him they offered the throne a second time, but once more they failed to give him their support and deposed him in December 1763 or January 1764. The throne was now vacant and it appeared that there was no candidate of the royal line who was likely to satisfy them. The position of the people of Pātān at this time was grievous on account of the blockade imposed by Pūthvīnārāyaṇ. The ministers whose sole ambition seemed to achieve power for themselves under cover of appointing first one and then another man to the throne were far too busy with their own plan to pay any attention to the plight of the populace.

This sorry and sordid situation played directly into Pūthvīnārāyaṇ's hands. Realizing his opportunity he increased the tightness of the blockade on Pātān. Food and other essentials were so scarce that famine conditions had been reached, and Dhanavanta, its Chief Minister,

1. HP, vol. 55, fo. 38; Ācārya, op. cit., pp. 54-55.
2. Vide p. 163.
3. HP, ibid.
4. Nepalese accounts are confusing regarding the offers and the time when they were made by the ministers in Pātān for its throne. For all variant accounts vide HP, vol. 50, fo. 4, vol. 55, fos. 38, 68; Wright, op. cit.; Ācārya, ibid., pp. 51, 53, 54; Jhavāli: Nepal upatyakāko madhyakālin itiḥās, pp. 171-73, 191-92, Pūthvīnārāyaṇ Sāh, pp. 123-26. The probable dates when such offers were made have been fixed with reference to the date of enthronement of Tejnarsimha Kalla which took place on 2 May 1765 (vide
who had been earlier disgraced by Jayaprakāśa, invited Pṛthvīnārāyaṇa to accept the throne. In this offer he had the support of his colleagues. They hoped to make Pṛthvīnārāyaṇa a nominal king and by offering the kingship to him ease the prevailing scarcity of essential commodities. Pṛthvīnārāyaṇa however was prepared to relax the blockade only if the Gorkhalese were permitted to enter freely into Pāṭan. The ministers were unwilling to allow this. Pṛthvīnārāyaṇa therefore was in no great hurry to accept. He knew that he was dealing with treacherous men, and that if he took up his residence in Pāṭan he might be exposing himself to assassination. Consequently he compromised by sending his brother Dalmardan Śāh in January 1764 to act as his deputy. Pṛthvīnārāyaṇa hoped that once Dalmardan was there he would contrive to introduce Gorkhalese into the Valley. The ministers for their part still hoped that they would be able to bring about relaxation of the blockade.

The situation with regard to Dalmardan's short stay in Pāṭan is not clear. It appears that in order to ingratiate himself with


2. Some Nepalese accounts mention that Jayaprakāśa, for the apparent reason that he did not accept the deposition peacefully, caused one of the ministers of Pāṭan, Bhiṅkhvādhan, to commit suicide, and having induced the rest to visit Kāṭhmāṇḍu, seized them and disgraced them in public, the details of which have already been discussed (vide p. 206). What seems likely is that Jayaprakāśa was not on peaceful terms with the ministers in Pāṭan particularly owing to their support of Rājya-prakāśa. As the Malla kings were only fitfully friendly towards each other, Jayaprakāśa may have been almost always preoccupied with retaliation. The ministers of Pāṭan were the main instruments for creating disorder. Of them at least one, Dhanavanta, was on friendly terms with the Gorkhalese (vide pp. 193, 246-47).

the ministers and appear to identify himself with the interests of the populace he made a show of hostility towards Prthvīnārāyaṇ. This plan succeeded to the extent that the ministers declared him king. This seemed to have awakened suspicion in Prthvīnārāyaṇ who was only too ready to suspect treachery, and eventually the matter came to a climax. The ministers dismissed Dalmardan in April 1765 after sixteen months of kingship, and it was with great difficulty that he managed to escape and rejoin Prthvīnārāyaṇ. It appears that Prthvīnārāyaṇ's policy was deliberately to reduce Pāṭan to a stage of famine, and as it was to avert this danger that the ministers had enthroned Dalmardan it is not surprising that they turned against him when they saw that the blockade was more rather than less severely maintained.

The next move was to appoint Tejnarasimha, a distant connection of the royal house of Pāṭan, to the throne. The date of his enthronement is 2 May 1765. He was a cotton merchant by profession, and the ministers had hoped that he would find some way of easing the scarcity of cotton. The move was however unsuccessful. Prthvīnārāyaṇ took very stringent measures against any who attempted to smuggle food into the Valley. He ordered his pickets not to allow essential commodities and other commodities to reach Thāṅkoṭ and Citlāṅg as he believed that once they reached there they would ultimately find their way to the

1. Father Giuseppe, op.cit., p. 315.
2. Ācārya, op.cit., p. 58, says that the ministers declared Dalmardan king when Jayaprakāś and Raṇajitsimha sent their men to Pāṭan to arrest him by force.
4. Ācārya, ibid.
Valley. Brahman smugglers, who according to Hindu practice could not be punished by death, were imprisoned. Members of other castes were ordered to be publicly beheaded on the main roads leading into the Valley, presumably to deter other smugglers from making further attempts. Prthvīnārāyaṇ was so strict that even the children and women who supplied the inhabitants of the Valley with cotton were not spared.

Prthvīnārāyaṇ further tightened the siege over Kīrtipur and ordered his troops to attack the Malla garrison at Bhaṅgigu where a post had been established in defence of Kīrtipur. In the skirmishes that ensued many of the Malla troops were killed. Several prominent officers were captured and sent as captives to Nuwākoṭ. Among them was Vīrnarsimha, the son of Pāṭan's Chief Minister, Dhanavanta. Prthvīnārāyaṇ forced him to write a letter to his father asking him to come to Nuwākoṭ to surrender. Out of affection for his son Dhanavanta came to Nuwākoṭ and surrendered to Prthvīnārāyaṇ. Later he helped the Gorkhalese troops

1. IP, vol.II,pt.iii,pp.463,467 (Letters nos. 5,9).
3. Jñāvālī, op.cit.,pp.142-43. But the place Bhaṅgigu mentioned here is perhaps Murikhu (otherwise Marikhu) where according to Ācārya, op.cit., p.64, Vīrnarsimha was arrested while fighting for Jayaprabhā and from where he was taken as a hostage to Nuwākoṭ. If Murikhu is the place, then the story of his arrest and his release on the surrender of his father to Prthvīnārāyaṇ seems to have taken place some time during April 1767. Moreover, Ācārya, ibid., says that Prthvīnārāyaṇ offered ministership to Dhanavanta and gave to him some lands and villages in Pāṭan as emoluments for the post, but the incumbence and emoluments were to come into effect only when Pāṭan came under Prthvīnārāyaṇ's possession. Since Dhanavanta is seen later in the service of rāyān, it is quite likely that Prthvīnārāyaṇ, when assured of loyalty in future, released him shortly afterwards. Even in the past Dhanavanta had helped the Gorkha (vide p. 193). After the conquest of the Nepal Valley by Prthvīnārāyaṇ perhaps both Dhanavanta and Vīrnarsimha were in his service. We see Tribhuvan, son of Vīrnarsimha, serving Rana Bahādur Šah, Prthvīnārāyaṇ's grandson, in 1799 (vide HP, vol.60,fo.169).
to enter Kirtipur secretly. Utterly exhausted by the siege laid by the Gorkhalese for nearly seven years and unable to stand the strain of the scarcity of water, salt and other necessities of life, the people of the town were now on the point of breaking. Hitherto they had ignored the promises made by Prthvinarayan guaranteeing them of their lives and property if they surrendered, but when the Gorkhalese troops had entered the heart of their stronghold, they were left with no option but to surrender. They surrendered on Wednesday, 12 March 1766. Prthvinarayan was then at Nuwakot. In order to make a show of liberality he even

1. Father Giuseppe, op.cit., p.318. But according to Acarya, op.cit., p.61, the persons who opened the main gates of Kirtipur for the Gorkhalese to enter and occupy it were Taugh Dhan and Sakhvā. They were the officers in charge of the defence of the town sent there from Patan. But instead of saving it they prevailed on its headmen to surrender.

2. Sanskritasandesa, year 1, no.8, p.13; HP, vol.50, fo.27, vol.52, fo.47.

3. Acarya, ibid. Being situated on a ridge, wells in the town generally dried during the spring. During the drought the people had to go down to low-lying areas to fetch water. But since the Gorkhalese had tightened the blockade, the fetching up of water was apparently dangerous.

4. Various dates have been given for the capture of Kirtipur, namely i) Saka 1687 Caitra 3 Wednesday (HP, vol.52, fo.110; IP, vol.1, pt.iii, p.431), corresponding with Wednesday, 12 March 1766; ii) Saka 1687 Caitra 3 Friday (HP, ibid., fo.119) which works for Saka 1687 Adhika Caitra 3 Friday, corresponding with Friday, 14 March 1766; iii) Nepāl Saṃvat 886 Adhika Caitra sudi 3 (HP, vol.50, fo.27), corresponding with the Christian date in ii); iv) Saka 1687 naṣṭa Caitra sūkla 9 (Acarya, ibid., p.84), corresponding with Wednesday, 19 March 1766; v) Pauṣa kṛṣṇa 10 of Nepāl Saṃvat 887 (Regmi: Modern Nepal, p.79), corresponding with Thursday, 25 December 1766, which apparently is incorrect. Since the Saka New Year begins on Caitra sūkla (sudi) 1, the year 1687 is in all cases erroneously written for 1688, presumably with regard to the equivalent Vikram year which was then 1822 (Saka year + 135 = Vikram year). Being Caitra the Vikram year then had not ended and hence the Saka year 1687 was written to correspond with the Vikram year. What seems most likely is that Kirtipur was captured on Wednesday, 12 March 1766 and occupied the following Friday (14 March).
established an endowment for the worship of a Caitya (Buddhist monument) in Kirtipur. Two days after the surrender (Friday, 14 March) he sent Śūraprātāp to occupy the town. When he arrived there he ordered all the males of the population above the age of 12 to assemble next day in the fort to do honour to their new king, though Pṛthvīnārāyaṇa was not there in person. When the people had assembled Śūraprātāp treated them with savage cruelty. The principal inhabitants were executed and he ordered his troops to cut off the noses of the majority of the remainder. Furthermore, he burnt down the fort and houses that were in it. It is said that Pṛthvīnārāyaṇa was angry with the people of Kirtipur for the wound that made Śūraprātāp one-eyed, and in retaliation he ordered him to cut off their noses and lips, a fact which is clear on Father Giuseppe’s evidence, who further says that Father Michael Angelo, a Capucin missionary then at Paṭan, went to Śūraprātāp to intercede on behalf of the people. The story of cutting of the noses has also been narrated by a contemporary poet Lalitavallabh who was also one of the principal priests of Pṛthvīnārāyaṇa. Kirkpatrick, who went to Nepal in 1793, had also seen such men whose noses had been cut off on that occasion. It is also said that the Bhoṭiyās, who were ordered to cut off the noses, cut off the ears and heads besides. Pṛthvīnārāyaṇa had them murdered on

2. HP, vol.50,fo.27, vol.52,fo.47.
charge of the excess committed by them.

After the fall of Kārtipur Gorkhalese troops began to capture one after another of the remaining places in the territory of Jayapraṅāś. They encamped at Marikhu (also called Murikhu) and Jitpur, where Hari Khārkā and Jayanārāyaṇ, a priest, were holding out. The Gorkhalese arrested them. As Jayanārāyaṇ was a Brahman the Gorkhalese were prevented by the Hindu religion from decapitating him, so they imprisoned him in chains at Kārtipur. Hari Khārkā, a non-Brahman, who could be either a Khas or a Magar, was decapitated. The Gorkhalese plundered Marikhu and occupied the fort there. Soon afterwards they captured Ṭokhā and established a post at Gajḍol. The revenue of Ṭokhā was given to Śrīkiṣṇa Pāthak, the minister of Jayapraṅāś, who had defected to Prthvīnārāyaṇ. The Gorkhalese also captured Gokarna, Gāgu and Sākhu.

While some of Prthvīnārāyaṇ's troops were engaged in the siege of Kārtipur and the others were stationed in the eastern sector

1. HP, vol.52, fo.47.
3. HP, vol.51, fo.221, where Marikhu, Jitpur, Ṭokhā, Gajḍol, Gokarna, Deupāṭan, Battīsputali, Gāgu, Sākhu and Dolakha are mentioned to have been captured by the Gorkhalese after their seizure of Kārtipur. Gokarna, Gāgu and Sākhu could have been possibly captured then. According to a letter written by Prthvīnārāyaṇ (Letter no.8, pp.67-68), Gāgu seems to have been captured some time early in 1767. Dolakha was already captured (vide p.188). But the capture of Deupāṭan and Battīsputali, the residential areas quite close to Kāthmāṇḍu and not of easy access for the Gorkhalese, seems doubtful. According to Acārya, Marikhu (i.e. Marikhu) was captured by the Gorkhalese after Jayapraṅāś applied to the British authorities of the East India Company in Bengal for help with arms to repulse Prthvīnārāyaṇ (Acārya, op.cit., pp.63-64).
of the Nepal Valley, the Cabus named again to attack Gorkha in the rear. They made assaults on a number of places on the western perimeter of Gorkha. Prthvinaraay, could ill afford to raise the siege of Kirtipur, so he had to recall troops from the Banepa Valley. Leaving some of them in charge of the defence of the newly conquered places in that quarter, he sent the rest under the command of Vasaraj Parre and Sthihera Panta to check the Cabus invasion. They threw back the invaders in complete disarray. They took possession of Salimp on Wednesday, 14 May 1766 without any engagement, established a garrison at Cihanq on Monday, 25 August and captured Lakha Jung on Friday, 18 September. Vasaraj Parre brought as captives some prominent enemy chiefs whom the Gorkhalese had arrested in the course of fighting. Notable among them were Parath Bharr, and Kufjar Bharr. Suffering defeat at many points the Cabus troops eventually had to retreat.

There is a letter written by Prthvinaraay to one Pandit Rajivalocan of Kaski, assuring him of Gorkhalese help to Kaski in return for Kaski's help in the action to be undertaken against Gagu and Sakhu. The letter mentions a Kaji (i.e. minister) who appeared to have been displeased with Prthvinaraay. Rajivalocan was requested to exercise his good offices to pacify the Kaji and win him back. The evidence on

---

1. He subsequently joined the service of Prthvinaraay and took an active part in the extension of his kingdom (vide Letter no.15, p.78; IP, vol.I,p.11).
this matter however is confused, The Kājī's defection may have taken place in 1765 before the capture of Luṭikoṭ. This incident was mentioned earlier, and it may be that it is this same incident which is referred to in this letter to Rājīvalocan. Nevertheless one must take note of the fact that this letter was given the month and the day of the week and not the year when it was written, a usual practice of Prthvīnārāyana. From the calculation based on the month, the tithi and the day of the week the possible date could be stated to be Māgh badi 9 Saturday, Vikram year 1822, Śaka year 1687, i.e. 4 January 1766 A.D. The sequence of events is clear. On 4 January 1766 Prthvīnārāyana wrote to Rājīvalocan asking him to pacify the Kājī and secure the help of the King of Kāskī in capturing Cāgu and Sākhu. The Kājī seems to have been pacified and come back to rejoin Prthvīnārāyana who then sent him to occupy Kīrtipur on 14 March 1766. The capture of Cāgu seems to have taken place afterwards, i.e. before 1 March 1767, though whether the King of Kāskī assisted in the campaign is not clear. This dating is confirmed by the existing of another letter which was written by Prthvīnārāyana from Cāgu in Vikram year 1823 Phālgun sudī 1 Sunday which corresponds with Sunday, 1 March 1767 A.D. The reference to Cāgu from where the letter was written suggests that Prthvīnārāyana had encamped after its capture.

It is not clear who the Kājī in question was. But it may be conjectured that he was Prthvīnārāyana's brother Šūrapratāp. Prthvī-

3. Letter no.8, p.68.
Narayan had four brothers, Mahoddānakirti, Dalmardan, who were Cautariyās, Daljit, who was at this time commander of the army, and Sūrapratāp, who was a minister, i.e., a kājī. Sūrapratāp had defected from his brother before and it may be that he did so again. There is no doubt that about this time relations between Pythvīnārāyaṇ and all his brothers were strained, and the way they could express their dissatisfaction best was to join the Gāubīsī kings who were always ready to welcome them. Pythvīnārāyaṇ, however, seemed able to pacify them when it suited him. This fact is supported by the information that one of the Gorkhalese commanders sent in 1769 to capture Bhātgāū was Sūrapratāp.

1. I.e. senior members of the royal family who were in a distant line of succession, and who were associated with the governance of the state. In Pythvīnārāyaṇ's time they were like Cabinet ministers senior in rank to their colleagues who were commoners.

2. Lalitāvallabh: Bhaktavijayakāvyam, verse 8, p.4.

3. Vide Letters nos. 11, 12, pp.70-74.

CHAPTER IX

LAST PHASE OF PṛTHVĪNĀRĀYANAṆ'S CAMPAIGNS (1767-75)

Pṛthvīnārāyana at this stage had high hopes that the way was open for the conquest of the Nepal Valley. The Malla kings were still mistrustful of one another and they had so alienated their peoples that their kingdoms seemed on the point of collapse and the population was in a mood to break away. The blockade which Pṛthvīnārāyana had imposed was now effective. Conditions approaching famine prevailed in all three kingdoms and the morale of all sections of the Valley population was low. It seemed clear that no loyalty now existed between the people and the Malla kings, and that the people were in a mood to accept as king any one who was likely to improve conditions of life and give them peace and security. Pṛthvīnārāyana's policy of subornation was also bearing fruit. Persons of influence in the three capitals had been wooed to his side. From the military point of view the defence of the Valley had suffered a serious blow in the loss of Kīrtipur. The problem was now not whether the Valley kingdoms would collapse but when.

Jayaprakāś for his part was not prepared to surrender without a struggle. He personally was indefatigable in the measures he was prepared to take to maintain his position, but he lacked statesmanship and military skill. His intentions were good, but he had not found a means whereby plans for the defence of the Valley could be unified.

1. Vide Letters nos. 7,8,9, pp. 66-69.
Neither was he able to repair the low morale of his people. He was prepared to lead but he found it difficult to ensure that his lead would be followed.

The loss of Kīrtipur to Prthvīnārāyaṇa was a great blow to the Malla kings. It was a signal of the misfortune which was presently to overtake them. Their disunity had made their territories an easy prey for the attacker. They had precipitated their own fall by their constant domestic squabbles. With the loss of Kīrtipur they saw clearly that total extinction at the hands of the Gorkhalese king was imminent; but it was too late for them to repulse him. He was now too firmly entrenched. So they hurried to foregather in the temple of Guhyēśvarī to attempt to reach an agreement to mobilise all their resources and energies in defence of the Valley. There was no power in the Nepal Himalaya with which to conclude an effective alliance. Neither they themselves nor any of Hill kings possessed arms and ammunition equal to those of Prthvīnārāyaṇa. The Nawabs of Bengal and Awadh were also incapable of giving them assistance. The Malla kings knew that the only power capable of rendering effective assistance was the English East India Company who by defeating Nawab Mir Kasim of Bengal and Shuja-ud-Dawlah, Nawab Wazir of Awadh, at the battle of Buxar in 1764, had emerged as a great political and military power in northern India. So the Malla kings
sent two emissaries, Muktānanda, a Māithil Brahman minister of Jayaprakāś, and Rāmdās, a Fakir, to Edward Golding, English Commercial Agent at Bettia, to solicit assistance. The Nepalese emissaries reached Bettia on 5 April 1767. Golding, who was an assistant to Thomas Rumbold, Chief of the Patna Council of the East India Company, wrote next day to him at Patna, recommending that an expedition be sent against Prthvīnārāyan. In Golding's opinion such an expedition had a prospect of much advantage to the Company. He believed that if Prthvīnārāyan were successful in conquering Nepal, it was most likely that he would further encroach upon Bettia, a real apprehension to Golding because the Gorkhalese king had already encroached upon the Company's domains. Some recent corres-

---

1. HP, vol. 51, fo.107, wherein it is said that the Malla kings jointly decided to seek assistance of the English against Prthvīnārāyan. In Company records of Bengal the person who sought their assistance is mentioned to be the King of Nepal. The name Nepal though generally used for the whole region comprising the three states of Kāthmānḍu, Bhātgāū and Pāṭan in the Valley was also used in a narrower sense to denote only the territory in the Valley under the jurisdiction of Kāthmānḍu. Since the emissaries represented only Jayaprakāś's distress urging English officers for assistance, the Company records of Bengal have only mentioned the King of Nepal, i.e. Jayaprakāś to have been the person to seek their assistance. Kirkpatrick, op.cit., pp.268 ff, mentions that Ranajit-siha, King of Bhātgāū, applied for English assistance, which however is incorrect.

2. In Company records of Bengal names of these emissaries, of whom one is designated Vakil (envoy) and the other Fakir, are written as Muktān Unda and Rāmdoss, which are apparently anglicized spellings of Muktānanda and Rāmdās. HP, ibid., mentions only one emissary, a Māithil Brahman minister of Jayaprakāś, who was of Tirhut origin, but it does not name him. It further says that the minister was sent by Jayaprakāś to the King of Tirhut, the country in the neighbourhood of Bettia and Makwānpur, for consultations, and through the King of Tirhut sent a huge amount of money to obtain English assistance. In Bengal records the junior emissary is mentioned as a Fakir, a title used for Muslim mendicants, although Rāmdās, as the name suggests, was a Hindu and not a Muslim. Mendicants, whether Hindu or Muslim, were at this period often employed by native rulers for diplomatic purposes. Rāmdās, possibly one of the several Gosaī traders in the Nepal Valley, was sent to the Company which was itself a trading company.
pandence alleged to have passed between Pthvînârâyaña and the Phâujdârs (native subordinate officers of the Company) of those domains also aggra-
vated Golding’s fears. The letters are lost but one can presume that they
represented Pthvînârâyaña’s demand for some villages which were occupied
by the Company and which he claimed by virtue of his possession of
Makwânpur with which the frontier of Bettia was contiguous. Moreover,
Golding was doubtful if the rulers of the Hills would be capable of
holding out on their own against Pthvînârâyaña, and he was alarmed that
the advance likely to be made by Pthvînârâyaña would interfere with the
Company’s scheme of fir cutting which had been going on for some time in
the past in the Hills near Bettia. In Golding’s view Nepal commanded
"a vast extent of country and the hills on the other side of it" and the
opening of communications with China by way of it would be a valuable
acquisition to the Company. In any case it was certain that before long
the British would have to oppose Pthvînârâyaña. Golding reckoned therefore
that it would be prudent to attack him before he consolidated his strength
and that the time was opportune as they would not be involved in financial
loss, as Jayaprakâś had promised to defray the expenses incurred.

On 20 April Thomas Rumbold sent to Harry Verelst, the
Governor and President of the Calcutta Council of the East India Company,
a copy of the letter which Golding had written to him from Bettia. At

1. The question of the ownership of these villages was indeed raised later. But it was resolved after some negotiations between the Company and the Nepal Government (vide India Office Records, Home Miscellaneous Series, vol. 545, no. 545, Political Communications, 21 March 1764, no. 61).
3. Ibid., Appendix, p. 537; Select Committee Proceedings, 21 July 1767.
the same time Rumbold wrote to the President that Nepal had been besieged for a long time by Pṛthvīnārāyaṇa, and that the King of Nepal [Jayaprakāś] had made repeated solicitations" for protection. Rumbold also reported that a Nepalese Vakil was on his way to meet him, and enquired whether he might give him some encouragement on his arrival at Patna. Rumbold expressed his deep concern at the interruption of the lucrative trade with Nepal. He was certain that a small force would not only be sufficient to raise the siege laid by Pṛthvīnārāyaṇa but also to reduce him to obedience. The latter, Rumbold observed, was very apprehensive of English assistance to Jayaprakāś, and had written to him of late for permission to visit him at Patna and had requested protection for himself. The communication from Rumbold induced the Select Committee to promise protection to Jayaprakāś.

The Select Committee entirely agreed with Rumbold's opinion that lucrative trade might be carried on "by opening a free communication with Napaul"; but they were eager to have this effected by providing relief to Jayaprakāś by mediation rather than by force of arms. In reply to Rumbold's communication they directed him on 30 April to write to Pṛthvīnārāyaṇa asking the latter to raise the siege at once, withdraw his troops from Nepal and stop molesting Jayaprakāś with whom the Company were on terms of amity. Rumbold was furthermore directed to make it clear to the Gorkhalese king that if he did not comply with their remonstrance, "the honor and the interest of the

Company" would compel the English "to treat him as a declared enemy". The Select Committee also informed Rumbold that in case their remonstrances were not effective, they had ordered Capt. George Kinloch to return "with all expedition" from Tippara to Monghyr and proceed from there to Patna, and to obey orders as seemed to Rumbold necessary to establish peace and tranquility in Nepal and promote "free intercourse and uninterrupted trade". At the same time Rumbold was also authorised to exercise his discretion in regard to the assistance needed should Kinloch arrive "too late for the purpose required". Col. Richard Smith, Commander-in-Chief of the Company's Army, was also informed of the decision. To the Select Committee an expedition seemed likely to contribute "much to the Riches & Welfare of the Country", and was "the most convenient and expeditious Method of furnishing the proposed Relief to the Rajah [Jayaprańska]". The Commander-in-Chief was instructed to issue such orders to the Brigades as would least interfere with those already given by the Company Government itself.

Rumbold replied to the Select Committee on 28 May, reporting that as ordered by the President he had written to Prthvīnārāyaṇ, and was expecting a reply shortly, but he said he doubted whether an offer of mediation would be accepted by Prthvīnārāyaṇ as he had already nearly completed the conquest of Nepal. Actually, Prthvīnārāyaṇ ignored

1. Capt. Kinloch had been sent some time ago in an expedition against the Raja of Tippara. He was ordered to march via Monghyr probably for the reason that the route by way of it was then the shortest cut to Patna from Monghyr.
the remonstrance. He did not reply to Rumbold's letter, and instead intensified his campaign against the Nepal Valley. Prthvīnārāyaṇ's conduct provided the Company with an excuse to take action against him.

Once Kinloch reached Patna he got busy collecting intelligence from the Nepalese emissaries who had been sent to him. They told him that Jayaparakāś had been engaged in fighting with Prthvīnārāyaṇ for about five years during which period the latter had occupied ten principal cities and taken possession of all Jayaparakāś's country, except the towns of Kathmāṅdu, Bhātgāū, Pāṭan and Zeemy [Thimi], which were alone unconquered, but that all these places were closely blockaded. They said further that the distress of the people owing to near-famine conditions in the Valley would eventually force Jayaparakāś "to the necessity of opening his Gates" and "trusting to the Mercy of his Enemy" who was likely to accelerate his campaign as he had information that the English had agreed to help Jayaparakāś. The emissaries estimated the strength of the Gorkhalese army to be 50,000 soldiers, the greater of whom were employed in the defence of their own country. Never more than 20,000, they said, were employed in Nepal at any one time, but that as it was the season of cultivation almost all the troops were

1. It is incorrect. Prthvīnārāyaṇ had begun his campaigns against the Valley from 1742, occupying first Nuwākoṭ in 1744 and afterwards other places on the perimeter of the Valley.

2. Perhaps implying prominent places on the perimeter of the Valley which were however more than ten.

3. The number is apparently intentionally exaggerated as it may be apparent from other several inaccurate statements of the emissaries.
at the present time engaged in cultivating their land excepting for as many of them as were necessary to maintain the blockade. Their arms were mostly bows and arrows, swords and matchlocks. The emissaries assured Kinloch that for a month or three weeks there would be no obstructions on the march to Nepal, and that they would guide the expedition safely to the country through a road where neither hills nor rivers would impede the troops, and where drinking water would be available. At the same time they said that the march would be difficult towards the end of the monsoon when roads would be blocked by jungle growth. They made it clear to Kinloch that if the expedition was delayed until after the monsoon Pāthvīnārāyaṇ would by that time have occupied the entire country as the Nepalese people were only holding out in hope of immediate English assistance. The people, the emissaries stated, had been hearing for one year that assistance would come, and should it be further put off it was likely that they would abandon their king and come to terms with Pāthvīnārāyaṇ. There were many who had already joined him but at any sign of success on Jayaprakāś’s part they would return to him. The emissaries further said that about a month earlier Pāthvīnārāyaṇ had occupied two subdivisions of Lamboo [?] Bālembu and Tapey (sic), the chief sources of food grain for Jayaprakāś, and that this conquest had enabled him to tighten the blockade and further close communications. In consequence the entire populace of the Valley, some 60,000 souls, would "soon be reduced to any Terms by Famine".

On 4 July Kinloch submitted the above report to the President and pointed out in an accompanying letter that the rains would make no material difference to Prṛṭvīṇārāyaṇ as he had developed his strategy by building up lines of small forts and closely situated redoubts around the places blockaded wherein his troops were doubtless protected against the monsoon. Kinloch also submitted to the President a plan of Prṛṭvīṇārāyaṇ's strategical operations, and he observed that they betrayed "the Rudeness of the Work" and were "neither Plan, Perspective or Profit & altogether out of Proportion". He had previously forwarded a map drawn by Muktānanda, who had also drawn the plan of Prṛṭvīṇārāyaṇ's strategy, which showed how spacious and closely situated the redoubts were. From what the Nepalese emissaries had stated Kinloch was confident that there would be no difficulty in dislodging Prṛṭvīṇārāyaṇ from the redoubts.

Rumbold too examined the emissaries soon after Kinloch had examined them and he found that their statements agreed exactly with those made earlier to Kinloch. On 6 July he forwarded Kinloch's letter to the President, requesting further directions with regard to the intended expedition. Repeated accounts sent to Rumbold by Capucin missionaries in Bettia and in the Nepal Valley also confirmed the statement of the Nepalese emissaries that Jayaprakāś "was reduced to the last extremity of distress" and he would not be able to hold out

1. Extract of a letter from Capt. Kinloch to the President (Sel.Com. Pro.,op.cit.).
2. Extract of a letter from Rumbold to the President (ibid.).
without help beyond the beginning of October. All these considerations convinced Rumbold and Kinloch that an expedition was necessary and that though it would probably succeed in achieving its objective, they were under no illusion that it would be easy.

Rumbold next submitted to the President an account of stages of the expeditionary march from Patna to Nepal, mentioning the places where water and provisions were available, and where porters sent by Jayaprakāś would meet the English force. The following was the itinerary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From Patna to Hajipur</th>
<th>3 kos</th>
<th>Water and provisions to be obtained at these stages.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Darbhanga</td>
<td>22 &quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bawah (?)</td>
<td>7 &quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janakpur</td>
<td>12 &quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jelandbass (?)</td>
<td>6 &quot;</td>
<td>Water but no provisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rānībās</td>
<td>9 &quot;</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sīdhulī</td>
<td>9 &quot;</td>
<td>Water and provisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kharkotī</td>
<td>6 &quot;</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jhagājholi near Dumjā</td>
<td>6 &quot;</td>
<td>Water but no provisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dāpcā</td>
<td>10 &quot;</td>
<td>The Raja will supply the troops with provisions at Dāpcā.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panautī</td>
<td>6 &quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It was remarked by Rumbold that from Patna to Jelandbass the road was very good; from the latter point to Sīdhulī the way lay chiefly through jungles though cannon should be able to pass without difficulty; from

---

Sidholi to the Nepal Valley the road was excellent. It was also observed that on this route there was no river to be crossed and no hills to be passed. It was thought necessary to carry bullocks from Darbhanga to Dumjā where the troops were to be supplied with porters from Nepal.

The Select Committee were satisfied by the assurances of Kinloch and Rumbold that an expedition to the relief of Jayaprakāś could be undertaken without danger and with every prospect of success. They took note that Prthvīnārāyan had refused the offer of mediation and had not replied to Rumbold's letter. Accordingly on 21 July they sanctioned the despatch of an expedition to Nepal. In their letter to Rumbold they explained that they were concerned about the decline in trade and the scarcity of specie and hoped that the expedition would open up new avenues of "Trade and Stores of money to replace those annual Drains of Treasury we are directed to make for supplying the China Investment". They said that they were anxious that the expedition should not fail but they had every confidence in Rumbold's prudence and zeal and were sure that he would not allow himself to be deluded by false reports and exaggerated statements. Nevertheless they warned him that defeat would bring dishonour upon the British army and seriously undermine the reputation of the Committee itself. They stated finally that distance made it impossible for the Committee to be "competent Judges of the Degree of Credit to be allowed to the Reports of the

1. Sel.Com.Pro., 31 July 1767. There were however some rivers and hills on this route, of which Rumbold was ignorant; or perhaps due to over-enthusiasm he did not regard them as of consequence.
Vakeel and Faquir", and instructed Rumbold not to launch the expedition unless he personally was convinced that it would succeed.

The caution of the Select Committee is made manifest by the instructions they desired Rumbold to pass on to Kinloch, namely that should Jayaprakāś in the meantime have been forced to submit the expedition should return to a position in Bettia; and that if weather conditions or the dispositions of the enemy made success seem doubtful he should not press on into the country. Kinloch was instructed to arrange for the collection of such monies as would be necessary to defray the cost of the expedition, though he was to restrain his troops from pillage in order to win the affection and confidence of Jayaprakāś "by every Tie of Gratitude and Esteem". In his reply of 6 August Rumbold assured the President that every precaution would be taken to ensure the success of the expedition.

The Select Committee communicated on 25 September to the Court of Directors, India House, London, the measure they proposed to take in respect of relief to Jayaprakāś. They justified the necessity of the step, observing that a profitable trade had been carried on in the past between Bihar and "the rich country of Nipal", and that by this trade a considerable quantity of gold and other valuable commodities were imported into their provinces. They explained that the

2. Ibid.
advance made by Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ into the territories of Jayaprakāś had obstructed the usual channel of commerce, and that their provinces were deprived of benefits which they had previously enjoyed. They were the more concerned at the loss because it was a period of decline of trade and scarcity of specie. It was hence of the greatest importance that every channel of commerce should be made to flow freely and uninterrupted. But apart from this immediate purpose the Select Committee were none the less concerned with the threat to the security to Bettia. Considering all these factors they were optimistic that the expedition would reward them with "very flattering prospects". Their high hopes miscarried. The expedition failed.

Meanwhile Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ had encamped at Kīrtipur and was strengthening his siege operations against Pāṭan. He had occupied twelve outposts under the jurisdiction of Pāṭan and been pressing the inmates of the state to surrender. He had threatened that if they did not surrender within five days he would cut off their lips and noses. He was however diverted by the new threat from the English and had to take hurried measure to forestall their design. He avoided giving any direct answer to Rumbold's letter, but wrote asking for permission to visit him at Patna and for protection during his visit. The English Chief realized that the Gorkhalese king had not replied to his proposal.

1. Long, op.cit., p.539.
Deadlock was reached when Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ sent his vakil to demand the cession of the Bettia country on the pretext of its having formerly belonged "to his family". Rumbold reacted sharply. The expedition would no longer be delayed.

The exact date when this expedition was ordered to set out does not appear in the records of the East India Company. From Nepalese accounts however it seems that the expedition occupied Sīdhuli on Monday, 21 September 1767 from where it was repulsed by Kājī Vamśarāj Pāre and Śrīharṣa Panta on Sunday, 27 September. The English troops were forced to retreat leaving 100 sets of arms behind.

The exact strength of the English expedition is also not known. It appears that it consisted of 2,400 sepoys. It is also mentioned that Kinloch had ten battalions under his command, of which four companies were from the Patna Detachment. It is also apparent that the

1. The reference is to some villages now in Bettia and then in the possession of Makwānpur. By "family" Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ meant the house of Makwānpur with which he was related by marriage.
3. HP, vol.52, fo.119.
4. Letter from Kinloch to Rumbold, Sel.Com.Pro., 10 February 1768, p.100. HP, ibid., says that the Gorkhalese seized between four to five hundred guns.
expedition had 1,500 sets of new arms. In Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ's memoirs the English force which attacked Sīdhuli is alleged to have consisted of three to four platoons.

The English expedition had an initial success in taking Sīdhuli, the important pass which commanded the eastern gate of the Nepal Valley. Hearing of the loss Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ suspended his siege operations against Pāṭan and sent all his brothers and Vaṁśa Gurung, Chief of hunters, with a force under the command of his treasurer, Virbhadra Upādhyāya. They were ordered to save the fortress at Pāuvāgarhit, about 2 miles above Sīdhuli, at all cost, and counter the advancing English expedition. In view of the strength of the English army however Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ after a few days sent reinforcements under Vaṁśarāj Pāre, Śrīharṣa Panta and several other chiefs. Virbhadra Upādhyāya took up a position at Pāuvāgarhit to check the advancing column of the adversaries. Vaṁśa Gurung was sent to Dhungrebās to attack them in the rear. Meanwhile the reinforcements led by Vaṁśarāj Pāre had also joined the Gorkhalese troops. Finding himself intercepted at Sīdhuli, Kinloch had to retire to Janakpur. After one month he

2. DU, Tr., p.32.
3. HP, vol.51, fo.107. In Sel.Com.Pro., 12 January 1768, pp.33-34, Hariharpur and not Sīdhuli is first mentioned to have been captured by the English expedition. But in other accounts Sīdhuli is mentioned to have been the place captured by the English; and from where they were repulsed by the Gorkhalese (India Office Records, Home Miscellaneous Series, vol.515, p.544; Father Giuseppe, op.cit., p.320; also Petech, op.cit). What seems quite likely is that the expedition diverted towards Hariharpur, another route to the Nepal Valley, after it met with serious reverses at Sīdhuli. The field gun left by the English troops on a ridge of Sīdhuli is still there.
attempted however to march to Kāthmāndū by way of Mawkānpur. He captured Hariharpur situated on the route. But this was a diversion from the planned route and it is quite likely that Kinloch had little knowledge of the terrain and heavily forested mountainous region through which he now had to pass. He marched with more energy than foresight and soon found himself in difficulty. The country people were slow to bring food grain for his troops. The Gorkhalese had on one occasion attacked a few stragglers who were carrying food grains for the English troops. This caused such a panic among the porters and camp followers that they refused to carry provisions unless escorted by a protective force. Some of the porters decamped during the night leaving the baggage behind. Moreover, it was the rainy season. The Bagmatī river which flowed a few miles to the west of Hariharpur was a serious obstacle. Kinloch improvised a raft and a bridge but they were washed away during a torrential rainstorm. The river was impassable. The rain continued for several days. Kinloch was forced to encamp in the fort at Hariharpur. Provisions were very short. The soldiers who all along "had shewed a backwardness" in the course of their march began to mutiny and desert. They were however brought to order by the "Spirited Conduct" of Kinloch. Several of them fell ill. Beset with so many adverse circumstances, Kinloch found it necessary to withdraw. But the greatest disadvantage was yet to come. The Gorkhalese attacked his troops in the rear and

1. Ācārya, op.cit.,p.65.
drove them back in complete disarray. There were heavy casualties on the English side. Only 800 out of the total strength survived. The defeat of the English expedition was a rich gain for Pṛthvīnārāyaṇa. With the great number of guns, cannon and stores which the English troops had left behind in the course of their retreat he was able to form and equip three new companies, Sabuj, Vajravāṇi and Purāṇo Gorakh.

Rumbold informed the Select Committee of the failure and requested sanction for a fresh attempt. To the authorities it appeared that "to attempt without being supported by a strong Reinforcement would serve only to expose the Troops to the danger of perishing by Famine and the Sword". The military establishment of the Bengal Presidency had already been much reduced on account of detachments sent to the Madras coast in operation against Haider Ali and further reinforcements...

1. Letter from Rumbold to the President, 19 December 1767, Sel.Com.Pro., 12 January 1768, pp.31-34. Curiously enough, Nepalese accounts (DU Tr., p.32; HP, vol.51, fo.107, vol.52, fo.119) do not mention Kinloch but Hāḍī or Hāḍī who is alleged to have been repulsed from Śīduḷī. Mention however is made of one Hardy who was in charge of the Tarai area (Letter from Kinloch to Rumbold, 3 January 1768, Sel.Com.Pro., ibid., p.36; vide also "Statement of everything that has passed between the Nipaul Government and the English from first to last", India Office Records, Home Miscellaneous Series, vol.648, p.201). Quite possibly the person referred to was one Thomas Hardy, an Ensign of the Bengal Army (and hence designated Mr. in the Bengal Records). His name appears in Sel.Com.Pro., 4 September 1767. It is strange that the only possible Hardy (Alexander) in Hodson, op.cit., p.388, is not mentioned to have been sent in this expedition, although the name of Kinloch appears therein (pp.598-99). It is not likely that the Hardy mentioned in the Bengal Records referred to was a civil servant for his name does not appear in the "List of the Hon'ble Company's covenanted servants in the Bengal establishment, Bengal Civil Servants, 1760-83".

2. Barwell’s letter (q.v.) p.266, n.5.

3. HP, vol.51, fo.107, though there are variant accounts in regard to the names of the companies and the time when they were formed by Pṛthvīnārāyaṇa (vide p.307, n.1).
were also needed to be sent there. The Select Committee therefore resolved on 11 December 1767 to recall Kinloch and relinquish the attempt for the present. They attributed the failure to some misconduct on the part of Kinloch and in the forgery of the letters and informations given by the Nepalese emissaries. Rumbold was directed to make the strictest enquiry into the causes of the failure and to pursue at the same time "every reasonable means" to indemnify the charges of the expedition. The Select Committee nevertheless recommended that he should keep possession of the Nepalese Tarai bordering on Bettia provided that it did not entail any risk that the expense involved was less than the income gained. They also asked Rumbold to order the ten battalions with Kinloch to return. On 16 December the Select Committee also wrote to the Court of Directors announcing the failure of the expedition and explaining their reasons for suspending another expedition for the time being. At the same they wrote of the steps they had taken to keep possession of the Tarai to defray the earlier expenses and to hold an enquiry into the circumstances of the withdrawal.

Rumbold did not agree with the views which the Select Committee held in regard to the causes of the failure. In his letter of 19 December written to the President he explained the circumstances that had brought about the failure. In his view they were extremely bad

roads, want of provisions, unfavourable weather, scarcity of porters, flood and rain, and the attack of the Gorkhalese in the rear of the expeditionary force already weakened by sickness and desertion. To Rumbold the main causes of failure was the want of provisions though all sorts of "unlucky circumstances" had contributed. He did however admit that, in his zeal to have his master relieved as quickly as possible, the Nepalese Fakir had given "every flattering hope" and "too favourable an Account of the ease with which Troops might enter into the Napaul Country"; but he did not doubt the truth of the accounts given of the distress of Jayaprakāś, because it had been corroborated by missionaries residing in the Nepal Valley and Bettia. Rumbold also admitted that under those circumstances he was induced "to push on the Detachment so early in the Season". In spite of these facts he defended Kinloch for his fortitude and resolution. He also denied that the troops accompanying Kinloch were unruly and indisciplined.

In one of his letters to Rumbold from Parsā Fort in the Nepalese Tarai on 27 December, Kinloch stated that he had occupied some parganas (subdivisions) and forts in the Bārā, Parsā and Hilwal (sic) districts of the Tarai which belonged to Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ, and was confident that the newly acquired lands, which extended to the foothills and were more extensive than Bettia and consisted of large plains of rich and fertile soil, should yield an annual revenue of ten lakhs. Forwarding Kinloch's letter to the President on 3 January 1768 Rumbold stated

that the Tarai possessed by Kinloch was a valuable acquisition. Its loss had considerably affected Prthvīnārāyaṇ's source of revenue and supplies of food grain. Rumbold was of opinion that the inhabitants would readily submit to the Company Government. He was also confident that distressed by the loss the Gorkhalese king would gladly come to terms of the Company for the restoration of those lands. Their possession was advantageous to the Company in other respects as well. It would check future Gorkhalese incursions into the Bettia territories and be a means of securing the fir timber which grew in plenty in the adjacent hills. He urged the President to rescind Kinloch's recall as to do so might lead to the loss of the valuable region the retention of which would lead to the opening up of communications with Nepal.

The Select Committee were not impressed by Rumbold's representation. To them it appeared that Kinloch in the course of his operation had acted with indiscretion and disregarded his instructions. They held him personally to blame for the failure. Rumbold was again directed on 12 January 1768 to hold an enquiry, and was further enjoined upon to relieve Kinloch of his command and order him to repair forthwith to Patna. They also refused to sanction a second attempt, but instructed Rumbold to keep possession of the newly acquired lowlands in order to defray the expenses incurred during the expedition.

2. Ibid.,p.37.
Rumbold did his best to defend Kinloch and to induce the Select Committee to sanction another expedition. From the letter which he wrote to the President on 28 January it appears he went to Calcutta to argue his case and convince the authorities that a second expedition would succeed. His hope of doing so appears to have been strengthened by the letters written to him by Kinloch and Golding. He submitted those letters to the President pointing out the various factors which promised success in a fresh enterprise. Kinloch, who came to know of the likelihood of his detachment being recalled, had written to Rumbold from Bārā on 23 December 1767 saying that although there were no longer "the two great evils", the rain and the want of provisions, there were still some factors that seemed likely to militate against success. He stated that Prthvīnarāyaṇ had already 50,000 men in his command and had them stationed "in the large line of circumvallation" all around the Nepal country, and that as soon as he possessed the Malla capitals he would increase his army to four times its present strength, a possibility which to Kinloch seemed certain considering the "cruelty & severity" with which the Gorkhalese king dealt the people, as a result of which they had no choice but to serve him. To Kinloch the fall of the capitals of the Malla kings and the distress of their inhabitants were imminent if no assistance was rushed to their kings. Makwānpur had already been subdued by Prthvīnarāyaṇ and there was no power in the lowlands to check his march through them. Kinloch feared that under
those circumstances the recall of the English troops from the Nepalese Tarai would embolden Pāthvinārāyaṇ to push on further. The latter had already strengthened his army with the seizure of above one hundred sets of arms left by the English troops in the course of their retreat from Sīdhuli. He could thus prove a very troublesome enemy in the lowlands, and though his troops might be driven out of the plains they would entrench themselves in the passes baffling their enemies in extensive jungles and mountains. Pāthvinārāyaṇ was thus, Kinloch added, a great danger to trade and security. Nevertheless there were various other factors that promised chances of success. The possession of the lowlands and forts bordering on Bettia and extending to the foothills had considerably diminished Pāthvinārāyaṇ’s resources. Kinloch hoped that after he had repulsed Pāthvinārāyaṇ he would be able to form alliances with the neighbouring rulers of the Hills. They were the enemies of the Gorkhalese king and feared the latter’s growing power, and it was likely that they would support an English expedition. As the neighbouring rulers were themselves hill-men, an alliance with them would facilitate the progress of the expedition and help him to occupy passes and Hills and keep stocks of provisions at different places for the use of his troops. Kinloch estimated that it would take five days to reach the Nepal Valley from where he was at that time, three of them being through the Hills. At the same time he repeated his fears that without speedy English assistance the Malla kings
would not be in a position to hold out and that once PṛṭhviṆārāyaṇāṇsubdued them the hill kings would no longer be a match for him. He was requested an early decision to enable him to begin negotiations with the states hostile to Gorkhā.

Rumbold also submitted to the President a copy of the letter which Keer Sing had written to Kinloch at the time of the retreat to Janakpur. From the contents of the letter it appears Keer Sing had proposed cessation of hostilities between the English and his king. The identity of the latter is not mentioned. In the letter written by Rumbold to the President on 28 January 1768 the king is referred to as PṛṭhviṆārāyaṇāṇ and Keer Sing as his commander. On 8 January Kinloch wrote to Rumbold telling him that it would be easy to make allies in the neighbouring hills as the kings there were ready to align themselves with him. He expressed that they were all afraid of PṛṭhviṆārāyaṇāṇ whom they regarded as their common enemy and they would not come out openly in cooperation with the British unless and until an expedition were actually sent.

Rumbold's assistant at Bettia, Edward Golding, had meanwhile ingratiated himself with Trivikram Sen, King of Tanahū. The latter had expressed his willingness to allow English troops to pass through his

2. Probably Keharsīšha Basnet, one of the prominent Gorkhalese officers.
4. Ibid.
country, which bordered on Bettia, in an expedition against Prthvînārāyana, and suggested that they should also march by way of Parsā. Golding was confident that several other rulers of the Hills would follow Trivikrama in joining the English.

In the letter he wrote to the President on 28 January 1768, Rumbold reiterated the circumstances that had been responsible for the failure of the Kinloch expedition. To him Kinloch was "more unfortunate than culpable" as there was no doubt that the latter "had the service so much at heart, and during the whole of his Command behaved with becoming Spirit". For Rumbold the situation which accounted for the failure had now changed, and there was "a probability of success". The possession of Bettia and the lowlands belonging to Prthvînārāyana would guarantee plenty of provisions. The neighbouring rulers of the Hills were ready to join the English in a second expedition. He hoped that Kinloch would provide relief to the Nepal Valley, open up communications with it and dislodge Prthvînārāyana from the areas he now occupied. That the latter was apprehensive of a second English expedition was also apparent from the conciliatory letter which his commander Keharsimha had written to Kinloch. Rumbold was convinced that nothing but force would make Prthvînārāyana "relinquish his design on Napaule". The news that the Company troops were withdrawing had given the Gorkhalese king the opportunity to hold out longer than he could have done; and the recall of the Company's forces would only help him to reduce the Nepal

Valley. By subjugating other rulers of the Hills he would also create troubles for the Company in the Bettia and Tirhut countries. The failure of the Company to reduce him would embolden Prthvīnārāyaṇ to pursue his design, and terrorise other rulers of the Hills.

Rumbold made his plea as strongly as he could. He was confident of the success of a second expedition because Kinloch was now in possession of more detailed information of the terrain.

Rumbold's pleas did not entirely fail. The Select Committee exonerated Kinloch and revoked on 10 February their previous order in regard to him. They also gave thought to a second attempt to provide relief to Jayaprakāś, and accordingly desired Rumbold to collect intelligence, to report to them the number of troops required and recommend such measures as would ensure "the greatest probability of success".

It appears that Rumbold stayed in Calcutta to obtain the sanction of the Select Committee in regard to the second expedition. On 15 February he wrote to the President that should the authorities decide on a second expedition the reinforcements needed be one complete battalion, and five or six companies which he could spare from the Pargana Battalion of Patna. This force was necessary as Kinloch's detachment was "much Weaken'd by Sickness & desertion". Rumbold stated that the season was now more favourable and that plenty of provisions would be available at Bārā. He further asked for more

2. Ibid.
3. Ibid., p.73.
military stores and if possible a few more artillery men for the guns. He also stated that should Kinloch be in doubt whether the additional force would be "equal to the service required" he should be ordered not to proceed. Rumbold also submitted to the President some plans which Kinloch had sent to him. They showed the route Kinloch intended to take and contained particulars regarding roads and possible obstacles. Rumbold's purpose in submitting the plans to the President was that the latter after their perusal would himself "be able to form some judgment of the probability of succeeding in the Attempt".

The Select Committee, however, decided to postpone the proposed second expedition for the time being. The additional force required for the purpose could not be spared because the Secret Department at Madras had requested reinforcements from the Bengal Presidency. Nevertheless Kinloch was directed to remain with his present force to protect the newly acquired countries. In communicating their decision to Rumbold on 16 February 1768 the Select Committee expressed the hope that the possession of the newly acquired countries would defray the expenses of the previous expedition.

Thus ended the first phase of the encounters between the Company and Pərthvīnārāyan. For the Company the outcome of the ill-fated expedition was their qawwāla of the Tarai region bordering on Bettia, a part of which was annexed later to Bettia though the rest was

2. Ibid., pp.143-44, and pp. between pp.144-45.
restored to Pṛthvīnārāyaṇa. The conduct of the Company strengthened Pṛthvīnārāyaṇa's suspicion of the English, and the question of the ownership of the Tarai caused territorial disputes between the Company and Nepal Government which were to last for several years.

The final obstruction to Pṛthvīnārāyaṇa's assault upon the Nepal Valley seemed now to have been removed. Jayaprakāś's position had been considerably weakened by the failure of the English expedition. At this juncture religious superstition also came to Pṛthvīnārāyaṇa's aid. A violent earthquake took place on Sunday, 27 June 1767. Twenty-one violent tremors were counted during the period of twenty-four hours. The population of the Valley were terrified and felt that the calamity was a sign from Heaven presaging the destruction of their kingdom. They were also alarmed because owing to the scarcity of supplies including milk, honey, sugar, etc., the customary worship of Paśupatīnāth had had to be suspended. Pṛthvīnārāyaṇa was quick to take advantage of these circumstances. He set up an endowment fund in honour of the temple which permitted the customary worship to be resumed. The opportunity was clearly ripe.

He first moved against Thamel, one of the residential areas in Kāthmāndū, which was not more than a mile to the north of the royal palace Hanūmāṇḍhokā. This was on Sunday, 4 September 1768. Shortly

---

2. Wright, op. cit., p. 231; HP, vol. 55, p. 70.
3. HP, vol. 52, fo. 119.
afterwards he captured Luṭikoṭ (Balaju). Prthvīnārāyaṇ vacated Thamel. The regaining of Thamel was a great relief to Jayaprakāś and seemed to have filled him with false confidence; perhaps this was what Prthvīnārāyaṇ intended. The annual festivals of Indrayātrā and Kumāriyātrā were to take place about that time and because Prthvīnārāyaṇ had vacated Thamel Jayaprakāś did not suspend the festival celebrations. This act of carelessness gave Prthvīnārāyaṇ the opportunity he needed.

On Sunday, 25 September Prthvīnārāyaṇ sent his troops to capture the palace of Jayaprakāś. They converged on it from three directions: from the west via Bhīmsenthān, from the east via Tuḍikhel and from the north via Nardevī. Prthvīnārāyaṇ followed the northern wing of his troops. It was the midnight of the third day of the annual Indrayātrā and Kumāriyātrā festivals when the people had assembled in the square in front of the palace to celebrate. Jayaprakāś was present near the chariot of the Kumārī, a minor girl worshipped as the representative of the goddess Tulajābhavānī or Tulajā, the tutelar deity of the Mallas. The chariot was in the temple of the Kumārī which was situated immediately to the south of the palace, the only direction from which the Gorkhalese had not advanced. The congregation was taken

1. This place seems to have been recaptured at this time (vide p.242 for its first capture). There is a letter written by Prthvīnārāyaṇ from this place on Monday, 12 September 1768 (Letter no.10,p.69) which suggests that it was in his possession on that date.
2. Ācārya, 'Śrī Śrī Jayaprakāś Malla', p.65.
3. Perhaps then a residential area not covered by the modern Tuḍikhel area until recently a parade ground made by Bhīmsen Thapa, Prime Minister of Nepal (1804-37), but now a jumble of parks, memorials, etc., all closely partitioned and enclosed.
4. IP, vol.1, p.126,col.2
5. Ācārya, ibid.,p.66.
completely unawares by the advent of Pūthvīnārāyaṇ's troops. As the merry-makers were unarmed, and dazed at the unexpected presence of the enemy, they put up no resistance. Pūthvīnārāyaṇ seated himself on the throne which had been placed there for Jayaprakāś to occupy later in the ceremony. The Gorkhalese offered their customary salute to their King. The local people too followed suit, and the offering of a garland to Pūthvīnārāyaṇ by the Kumārī was regarded by them as a seal ratifying his kingship of Kāṭhmāṇḍu. Jayaprakāś fought back for a while, but seeing that defeat was inevitable, he escaped to Pāṭan with about 300 mercenaries. There he sought asylum of Tejnarṣiṇha. With the flight of Jayaprakāś the Gorkhalese had no difficulty in consolidating their position. They had to face only a nominal resistance. The total casualties on both sides did not exceed fifteen to twenty. Tulārām Pāṅe, one of the veteran Gorkhalese officers, died as a result of an explosion of gunpowder which Jayaprakāś had strewn to cover his escape. The Gorkhalese were occupying the precincts of the palace when the gunpowder which they had not noticed suddenly exploded. The death of Tulārām was a great loss to Pūthvīnārāyaṇ; but he was in possession of the palace and the conquest of Kāṭhmāṇḍu which took place in the early hours of 26 September was an accomplished fact. In order to win the sympathies of the people he allowed them to resume the celebration of their festivities, and deputised one of his brothers to preside over them.

Jayaprakāś did not remain in Pāṭan long. Its ministers, instead of responding to his call to fight back, succumbed to the overtures made by Prthvīnārāyaṇ's delegation consisting of Keharsimha Basnet, Dhanavanta and Bāhābal Rāṇā; and being assured that their lives and property would be protected they were prevailed upon to surrender. Seeing no hope of any help in Pāṭan, Jayaprakāś went to Bhatgāū accompanied by Tejnarsiha on 5 October. Pāṭan fell into Prthvīnārāyaṇ's hands without any encounter, on Friday, 7 October 1768. Shortly after the ministers went to him to invite him to be their king. But Prthvīnārāyaṇ knew how Pāṭan had been a hotbed of intrigues mainly because of the ministers. He determined to eliminate them before he assumed the kingship. He arrested the ministers and hanged all of them, except for one who being forewarned managed to escape to Banaras.

There are confusing accounts regarding the date when the ministers of Pāṭan were hanged by Prthvīnārāyaṇ. It is said that when they came to him with an invitation to be the king of Pāṭan, Prthvīnārāyaṇ treated them with courtesy and asked them to meet him the next day at Teku, the confluence of the Bāgmatī and Viṣṇumati rivers. The ministers returned to Pāṭan. One of them apprehended destruction at

2. Ācārya, op.cit., p.66.
3. HP, vol.52, fo.119.
4. Father Giuseppe, ibid., says that after Pāṭan came in his possession Prthvīnārāyaṇ treated the nobility of the state "with great attention, and proposed to appoint a viceroy of the city from among them". But after two or three months he arrested them by using "innumerable strate-gems", and eliminated active disaffection.
the hands of Pṛthvīnārāyaṇa and distributed all his property as gifts, presumably to prevent it being confiscated. Next day their fears were realized. When they reached the banks of the Bāgmatī river in response to Pṛthvīnārāyaṇa's invitation they were seized and hanged with the exception of one who avoided capture and was able to make his escape to Banaras. The wives of the deceased ministers were permitted by Pṛthvīnārāyaṇa to be satis. According to a Nepalese account the incident took place in April, for it is said that eight months after this incident Pṛthvīnārāyaṇa conquered Bhaṭgāū. The date of the conquest of Bhaṭgāū was 10 November 1769 and according to this date when the ministers were hanged comes to April 1769.

There is another reference according to which some Pradhāns (ministers or nobles) of Pāṭan were decapitated on Thursday, 19 February 1771. It is probable that the persons murdered on this date were the descendants of the ministers, i.e. Pradhāns, who were earlier hanged by Pṛthvīnārāyaṇa. He had to take this step perhaps for the reason that at that time he was busy with the plans for the conquest of the Cāubīṣī states and the descendants of the ministers of Pāṭan were probably intriguing to forestall his move.

1. Pṛthvīnārāyaṇa later confiscated the property of the ministers of Pāṭan but confirmed the gifts distributed (HP, vol. 52, fo. 46).
2. HP, vol. 55, fos. 69-70; also Father Giuseppe, op.cit.
3. HP, vol. 52, fo. 46; also vol. 55, fo. 70.
4. HP, vol. 52, fo. 120.
There are also confusing accounts as regards the date when Prthvīnārāyaṇ assumed the kingship of Pāṭan. There is a coin of 1768 in the name of his brother, Dalmardan Sāh. It is quite possible that Prthvīnārāyaṇ did not think it wise to risk his own life by going to Pāṭan for the royal investiture. Instead he appointed Dalmardan king of Pāṭan. This supposition is strengthened by the fact that from some time in the past Prthvīnārāyaṇ's brothers had been somewhat disaffected towards him and by this move he tactfully controlled their disaffection. Dalmardan had once before been king of Pāṭan. It is also likely that coins in the name of Dalmardan were struck to mark the occasion. But the latter's kingship was only temporary, for it is mentioned that Prthvīnārāyaṇ assumed the kingship of Pāṭan some time during the winter of 1768/69 and shortly after went there in state for the royal investiture. This fact is supported by a Nepalese account which assigns to Tejnarsimha Malla, King of Pāṭan, a regnal period of three years and eleven months, which calculating from 2 May 1765, the day when he was enthroned, comes to December/January 1768/69. It is further confirmed

3. Vide pp.244-45.
4. It is quite likely that Prthvīnārāyaṇ well understood the hazards of the division of the Nepal Valley, and a man who dreamt of uniting kingdoms in the Nepal Himalaya would have been the last person to allow Dalmardan to continue to be the king of Pāṭan. Once the situation became favourable he assumed the kingship of Pāṭan for himself.
7. Vide, p.245,n.3.
by a letter of Father Giuseppe, Prefect of the Kāṭhmāṇḍu mission, in which it is said that the Christian mission in the Valley was closed on 4 February by Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ after he assumed the kingship of Pāṭan. There is, however, a slightly variant statement in a Nepalese account according to which Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ entered Pāṭan as king eight months before the conquest of Bhāṭgāū, i.e. in April 1769.

Before Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ assumed the kingship of Pāṭan he had sent for the sons of the nobility and installed them as companions to his son, a position which was tantamount to holding them as hostages. He had also demanded that one other member of each of the families of the nobility should be sent to reside in Nuwākoṭ. The holding of these hostages was an insurance against active disaffection on the part of the families from which they had been taken. His entry into Pāṭan was now safe. After the investiture he left for Nuwākoṭ, leaving a governor to look after the Valley territories.

Now the only kingdom of the Nepal Valley to be conquered was Bhāṭgāū where the three Malla kings were awaiting their fate. For the time being however Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ was not in a hurry to reduce Bhāṭgāū. He was first mainly concerned with the consolidation of his strength and the establishment of peace and security in Kāṭhmāṇḍu and Pāṭan. Although Raṇājitsimha, King of Bhāṭgāū, had bought his safety so far

1. Petech, op.cit.,p.243; also Pt. I, Introduction LXVIII.
2. Vide p.283,n.3.
3. Father Giuseppe, op.cit.
at the price of neutrality, Prthvīnārāyaṇ was not unalert to the dangers likely to happen as a consequence of the assembly of the three Malla kings in one place. He had every reason to apprehend some concerted attempt on their part to retrieve their lost territories. So he made a demand on Raṇajitsimha for the refugees who were enjoying asylum in his palace and asked him also to surrender. Raṇajitsimha refused to comply with his demand. Jayaprakāś for his part had not yet lost hope of regaining his kingdom. He influenced the seven illegitimate sons of Raṇajitsimha, who were called Sātbaḥālyas, to side with him. The King of Cāudaṇḍī, Karna Sen, sent some Khas and Khambu soldiers to his aid. The Malla kings also prepared and trained some Murmīs who like the Khambus were an eastern tribe of the Nepal Himalaya, and whom heretofore they had not taken into military service.

Prthvīnārāyaṇ therefore determined to take arms against Raṇajitsimha and laid his plans for the capture of Bhātgaū. He first wooed the Sātbaḥālyas by promising them the throne and revenue of Bhātgaū, retaining for himself only nominal sovereignty over the kingdom. A few months after reaching this understanding Prthvīnārāyaṇ was alarmed by fresh troubles which had been created in the eastern

2. Ācārya, ibid. There is a letter written by Prthvīnārāyaṇ (Letter no.4, IP, vol.II,pt.iii,p.463) in which the addressee, who is unnamed, is required to capture horses and other presents sent to Jayaprakāś from Udayapur, i.e. by Karna Sen. As there are no year and the day of the week mentioned in the letter it is hard to calculate the date of its composition and relate the contents with the chronology of this period. It shows however Jayaprakāś's friendship with Karna Sen.
3. Wright, op.cit.,p.255.
extremity of the Nepal Valley by some soldiers in the retinue of Jayaprakāś. One day while he was inspecting some important outposts in that area, Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ was attacked unawares by their leader Bhavansimha who would have killed him had not Śrīharṣa Panta intervened to save his master. For this timely action Śrīharṣa Panta was nicknamed Bijulī ('lightning') Panta. Now Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ could no longer put off action against Bhāṭgāūī. He despatched his troops in November 1769 in two wings under the command of Śūrāpratāp and Vaiśarāj Pāre respectively. Jayaprakāś himself commanded his troops who were stationed on two fronts to intercept the invaders. The Śāthbahālyās pretended a nominal resistance and only fired blank cartridges. They let the Gorkhalese troops enter the city and passed their ammunition to them. Jayaprakāś managed to stop the attackers from entering the royal palace. Severe fighting took place, but after two days the Gorkhalese reached the precincts of the palace, though many of them were wounded by the cannon-balls fired from the cannon in front of the palace gate. Ultimately however at midnight they captured the cannon to a great disappointment of Jayaprakāś. He was still at the head of his troops, commanding them and urging them not to lose their nerve. He himself fought with desperate gallantry, but when he went inside the palace for his meal his soldiers got frightened, deserted their positions and withdrew to

2. Ācārya, op.cit.,p.68.
the inner courtyard in disorder. The Gorkhalese continued to force
their way towards the palace until finally they broke down the gate
and reached the inner courtyard. The three Malla kings were hiding in
a room close by. The following morning the kings attempted to escape
to a house adjacent to the palace. Raṇajitsimha and Tejnarsimha were
successful, but Jayaprakāś while trying to follow was seriously wounded
in his right foot by a bullet. In consequence he could not flee further.
and Raṇajitsimha returned with a great difficulty carried him to a safer
place in one of the rooms off the courtyard. The Malla troops were by
now completely exhausted. Only the Bhōtiyā mercenaries, who were in
the service of Raṇajitsimha and whom he had confined in a building
suspecting their loyalty, were clamouring to be let out to fight. But
he set fire to the building and destroyed them. Seeing no way of
preventing the invaders from occupying the inner parts of the palace,
Raṇajitsimha hung his turban from a window. This was a symbolic
gesture of surrender. The date was Sunday, 12 November 1769. The
struggle of the Malla kings was over. The last kingdom of the Nepal
Valley had fallen to the Gorkhalese.

1. The narrowness of the approach to the Bhātgāū Darbar, the smallness
of the gate and of the inner courtyard suggest that the forces involved
in the combat were not large.
2. Levi, op.cit.; vide also Lalitāvallabh: Bhaktavijayakāvyam, verse 42.
3. Wright, op.cit., p.55, fo. 70.
5. In all probability the Gorkhalese invasion took place on 10 November
and the victory was achieved on 12 November (vide HP, vol.vol.52, fo.
120; Lalitāvallabh, ibid., verse 16).
Śūrapratāp kept the Malla kings under surveillance in one of the rooms in the palace and sent the news of the victory to Prthvīnārāyaṇ, who was then in Kāṭhmāṇḍu. On receipt of the news Prthvīnārāyaṇ went to Bhatgāū. After calling on Raṇajitśīha, he went to the room where Jayaprakāś was lying, still in pain from his wound. Prthvīnārāyaṇ asked him if he wished to remain in a village outside Kāṭhmāṇḍu, as he was willing to allow him to do, but though defeated, Jayaprakāś’s sense of self-respect was as high as ever before, and he refused Prthvīnārāyaṇ’s offer and asked for permission to live in the temple of Guhyesaśvarī to pass the rest of his life in religious pursuit. Jayaprakāś said that it was chiefly owing to the betrayal by his Khas officers and nobles that he had been defeated. The only persons who remained loyal to him were, he said, the Brahmans of Tirhut. Hence he requested Prthvīnārāyaṇ to spare their lives and property. Jayaprakāś’s wishes were granted.

Then seeing that his condition was worsening Prthvīnārāyaṇ sent him to Āryagāţ, one of the ghāţs on the bank of the Bāgmatī river. Prthvīnārāyaṇ went there to see him. The next day he sentmessengers to ask Jayaprakāś if he wanted money and other things to distribute as gifts, a practice with the Hindus at the time of death. But Jayaprakāś was not of the metal to bend. He refused to beg anything. He died on Sunday, 19 November, leaving behind him his mother and daughter-in-law to the care of Prthvīnārāyaṇ.

---

1. Ācārya, op.cit., pp.69-70.
2. HP, vol.50,fo.26 (reverse).
3. Ācārya, ibid. HP, ibid.,fo.27, says that Jayaprakāś died after one hour of his arrival at the ghāţ.
Tejnarsimha remained silent and refused to speak. He was beaten severely and sent to Kāthmāṅdu, and imprisoned in the Lakṣāṇipur courtyard in the royal palace. He passed his days in silence and in worship. He died in chains some time during March/April 1771.

Prthvīnārāyaṇa was not vindictive with Raṇajitśimha. He told him that had he acted according to what was proposed nothing would have happened to his throne, as it was only on account of the presence of the other two Malla kings that he had been constrained to undertake the campaign against Bhātgaū. Prthvīnārāyaṇa further told him that since his chiefs and counsellors were not in favour of keeping him within the three cities in the Valley, he would request him to reside, if he wished, in some villages in the Banepā Valley, which he was willing to offer him free from revenue. Raṇajitśimha replied that he had no ambition to fulfil except to go to Banaras and live there for the rest of his life. In compliance of this request Prthvīnārāyaṇa provided the expenses for the journey, made arrangements for his maintenance for the rest of his life and sent him accompanied by his two queens, a son.

1. Lévi, op.cit., p.275.
3. Wright, op.cit., p.258.
4. According to HP, vol.55, fo.38, which assigns to him a reignal period of 3 years 11 months.
5. IP, ibid.; Jāvālī, op.cit., p.159.
called Avadhūtsimha and a minister Jogrāj Khatowta (sic). While passing through the Candrāgiri mountain from where he had the last glimpse of the Valley, Raṇajitsimha sighed with grief and cursing the Sātbahālyās all the time cried that the misery that had befallen him was due to them. He then bade farewell to the temples of the gods and goddesses of the Valley and left the country, never to return again. Nevertheless once he was out of the Valley and free from the influence of Paṭhvīnārāyaṇ he again cherished the ambition of recovering his lost kingdom. He tried to obtain help from the authorities of the English East India Company to whom he sent Avadhūtsimha and the minister to make overtures. But all was in vain. He died afterwards without

1. As far as is known Raṇajitsimha had only one legitimate son. His name was Vīrnarsiimha. It is not certain who this Avadhūtsimha was. He could have been one of the Sātbahālyās as we do not know the names of all of them. Or he would have been another illegitimate son of Raṇajitsimha not being one of the Sātbahālyās. We know of another son of Raṇajitsimha, Sarvajitsimha by name. He was with his father in the palace when the Gorkhalese troops were fighting their way in (Jhavālī, op.cit., p.158).

2. Syed Hasan Askari, 'A copy of Dastur-ul-Amal', Proceedings of meetings of the Indian Historical Records Commission, vol.XVIII, 1942, p.187; Kirkpatrick, op.cit.,p.271. It is probable that the minister was either a Khativaṇa Brahman or a Khativaṇa Khatrī Chetri.

3. Wright, op.cit.,p.256, says that there are several songs composed by Raṇajitsimha on this subject.

4. Wright, ibid.

5. Askari, ibid.; Kirkpatrick, ibid.
realising his hopes. With his death the Malla dynasty came to an end, though Avadhūtsimha made a vain attempt to regain his paternal throne by enlisting the support of some of the Caubāṣī kings.

Soon after the conquest of the Nepal Valley Prthvīnārāyaṇ shifted his headquarters from Nuwākoṭ to Kāṭhmāṅḍu. It was considered to be the fittest place for the capital of his country, which at this time comprised the ancestral state of Gorkhā and the newly conquered states of Makwānpur and the Nepal Valley. He appointed Keharsimha Basnet officer in charge of Bhātgāū though later he replaced him by Kālu Kapardār. Prthvīnārāyaṇ brought his family from Gorkhā to Kāṭhmāṅḍu. Meanwhile he arrested the Sātbahālyās, had the noses of some of them cut off and confiscated their property. Later he put an end to their lives. He permitted Jayaprakāś's mother, who was old and blind, to go to Banaras as she wished; but it is alleged that he took possession

1. With the death of Bhāskar Malla or Mahāndrasimha Malla in 1709 the regular line of the royal house of Kāṭhmāṅḍu had already come to an end. His successor Jagajījaya Malla was a distant relation. The regular line of the royal house of Pāṭan had broken long ago. Jayaprakāś was left issueless after the death of his son Jyotiprakāś in or after 1757 (Wright, op.cit., p.227). With the death of his only legitimate son Vīṃnarsimha in 1750 (HP, vol.50,fo.15; also Wright, ibid., p.199) Raṇajītisimha was also left without any rightful heir. After the death of Jayaprakāś and Raṇajītisimha the Nepal Valley, it can be presumed, would have been in further grip of domestic squabbles and the Malla kingdoms would have probably disintegrated. Raṇajītisimha was 67; Jayaprakāś was 53 (according to IP, vol.II,pt.iii,p.568, Raṇajītisimha was born in 1702, and according to Ācārya, op.cit.,p.38, Jayaprakāś was born probably in 1716). They would not have survived long. Prthvīnārāyaṇ only hastened the downfall of the Malla kingdoms.

2. Askari, op.cit.; Kirkpatrick, op.cit.


4. HP, vol.51,fo.222.

5. Wright, ibid.,pp.256-57.
of her diamond necklace before her departure. The widow of her grandson 1
accompanied her. In this way Prthvīnārāyaṇ eliminated all possible
contenders to the thrones of the Nepal Valley, though there were still
some Nagarkotiśis who refused to acknowledge him. Once it so happened
that while he was coming back to Kāṭhmāṇḍu from Bhāṭgāū they saluted
him without getting down from their horses. Regarding this as an insult
he decapitated them on the spot and on his return to Kāṭhmāṇḍu had all
the Nagarkotiśis hunted down and murdered.

After the conquest of the Nepal Valley Prthvīnārāyaṇ decided
to suspend further campaigning for three years. He directed his attempts
to strengthening his position by developing his financial resources,
reorganizing the military establishment and making adequate arrangements
for stores. He still desired to expand his dominions into the plains
of India. The situation however was difficult for him as certain British
officials continued to press the East India Company to take military
action against Nepal in order to restore Jayaprakāś to the throne of
Kāṭhmāṇḍu and to maintain and extend the timber industry they were
developing in the Tarai. One officer Logan by name assured the Company
that he would have every hope of success in a military venture against
Prthvīnārāyaṇ because of the assistance which he had been promised by
certain hill rulers including Kāṛṇa Sen, the King of Čaudanḍī. Fortunately

1. Father Giuseppe, op. cit., p. 322, wherein he also says that he met
them at Patna on their way to Banaras. But Lévi, op. cit., vol. II, p. 275,
says that Jayaprakāś's mother was robbed of her necklace at the frontier,
the person who robbed her and the place where she was robbed are not
mentioned.

2. HP, vol. 51, fo. 222.

for Prñhvinārāyaṇ the East India Company finally decided against committing its arm aid to an attack on the Himalayan kingdom.

In the past Prñhvinārāyaṇ had often endeavoured to incite the King of Kāśkī against the King of Lamjung by helping him to occupy places in the latter's territory. In this way he had brought the King of Kāśkī to his side. Lamjung and Kāśkī had a common boundary and disputes between them were frequent. In consequence relations between them had long been strained. So Prñhvinārāyaṇ was hopeful that the King of Lamjung would not interfere if he sent his troops to reduce Kāśkī.

In view of the hostilities which had existed, and still existed, between himself and Lamjung and Parvat, and of the difficulties of transport and communication confronting troops passing through the regions of higher altitude, Prñhvinārāyaṇ may have thought it better in the first place to push on from the south and reduce the smaller states which were scattered in the lower reaches of the Kālī (Kṛṣṇā) Gañḍakī

1. For the details of the territorial disputes between the Company and Prñhvinārāyaṇ and the decision of the Company not to send an expedition against him, the timer trade and the Logan Mission vide respectively A, B, and C.


2. Vide Letter no.6, p.65.

river rather than to risk immediate encounters with Lamjung and Parvat. The states he moved against were some distance from Lamjung and Parvat. He judged therefore that they would not be in a position to hold out by themselves without succour from their stronger neighbours. So in the beginning of 1771 he despatched troops to push on from the south as far as the Kālī (Krṣṇā) Gāndakī in the west. They were led by Kājī Vaṃśarāj Pāre, Sardār Keharsiśha Basnet and Sardār Prabhu Malla. It also appears that meanwhile the rulers of Tanahū and Lamjung had been appeased by Pṛthvīnāraṇyaṇ, for they sent troops to assist his armies. The Gorkhalese officers at first took up their positions at Bhaṇḍārīḍhik on the bank of the Setī river which formed the boundary between Kāski and some of the states in the Sapta Gāndakī region.

In the course of their forward thrust from Bhaṇḍārīḍhik the Gorkhalese officer had to fight with Kāski in the basin of the Setī. Here they achieved victory and were able to cross the Setī, whence they marched forward by way of Barsāmnī to attack Nuwākoṭ (the central). They were however defeated in the fighting that took place at Tekan Ār in the territory of Nuwākoṭ. Vaṃśarāj and Prabhu Malla retreated and took up a position at a place close to Tekan Ār.

---

1. Nepalese accounts only mention that Pṛthvīnāraṇyaṇ sent his troops to extend his kingdom up to the banks of the Kalī which presumably is implied by the Kālī (Krṣṇā) Gāndakī and not the Kālī (otherwise Mahākālī) the western limit of the Bālsī states.

2. I.e. the region of the seven (sapta) prominent tributaries of the Kālī (Krṣṇā) Gāndakī

At this point it appears that Përvëînărâyan sent other troops under the command of Keharsiîâha Basnet to attack Tanahû. The reason for this attack is not clear, but it may be that it was because the King of Tanahû had granted asylum to Šūrapratâp Šâh, Përvëînărâyan's brother, who defected shortly after the conquest of Bhattgû. Initially Keharsiîâha's expedition was successful. He captured in swift succession Mânûng on Thursday, 19 February 1771, Châng on the following day (20 February), Darucung on Saturday, 2 March, Mânnul and Pachhâiyá on the following day, Rãngrung and Jyâmire on Wednesday, 1 May 1771. The Gorkhalese surrounded Sur, the capital of Tanahû. In desperation its king, Kâmâridatta Sen, committed suicide. Hearing this King Mukunda Sen II of Pälpa, King Vîrmardan Sâhî of Lamjung and King Kîrtibâm Malla of Parvat became angry with Përvëînărâyan and united to repulse the advancing Gorkhalese troops. Kâmâridatta Sen who was issueless was succeeded by his brother, Harkumârdatta Sen. The latter compromised with Përvëînărâyan and allowed him to station his army in Tanahû. Përvëînărâyan with help from Harkumârdatta sent troops to conquer the lands in the Kâli (Kâšñâ) Gańḍakî region. Keharsiîha who was still in command conquered Rising and Ghiring and crossed the Kelâdî river. Battle was joined with the forces of Bhîrkoṭ at Kîhû (otherwise Kâhû), and with its capture the Gorkhalese conquered Bhîrkoṭ. At Grihâkoṭ (otherwise Grîmâkoṭ) the Tanahû troops deserted and joined the defenders, but

1. HP, vol.52,fo.120.
2. Ācârya, 'Tanahûko Sen-vaîśâ', pp.74-75.
the Gorkhalese slaughtered the deserters and captured Grihākoṭ on
Tuesday, 4 June 1771. The Crown Prince of Bhīrkoṭ fled. Next day (5 June)
the Gorkhalese laid siege to Kyāngmā. In the course of the fighting the
troops of Bhīrkoṭ suffered heavy casualties. Malhebār and Sekhāṅg were
also captured by the Gorkhalese the same day. Bhīrkoṭ ultimately fell
on Monday, 10 June, and Garahū and Pāiyū were reduced on the same day,
the latter as a result of a Gorkhalese victory at Dhūvākoṭ, a place

A little later hostile contact was made with the forces of
Lamjung. In the course of the resultant battle Keharśimhā captured the
Crown Prince and sent him as a hostage to Kāṭhmāṇḍū. At this point the
Gorkhalese advance seems to have halted for some time.

Vamśarāj and Prabhu Malla now joined Keharśimhā and encamped
together at Syāngjā. Meanwhile Cāubīsī troops under Kīrtibam Malla of
Parvat had assembled at Satahū in order to repulse the Gorkhalese. On
Monday, 16 December 1771 Vamśarāj and Prabhu Malla marched from one
front and Keharśimhā from another to attack Satahū. But victory lay
with the Cāubīsī troops. In the course of the fighting Keharśimhā was
killed and Vamśarāj severely wounded and taken prisoner. In all 500

1. HP, op.cit.
3. He was released by Kīrtibam at the news that Pratāpsimhā Sāh, succe-
   ssor of Prathvīnārāyaṇ, had sent to the neighbouring states informing
   them of his decision of suspending his campaigns for the coming two
   years (1775-77). Vamśarāj was murdered later in Kāṭhmāṇḍū in June 1785
   consequent upon palace intrigues (Acārya, 'Śrī 5 Rājendralakṣmī Devī',
   pp.12, 15).
Gorkhalese were killed in these engagements. Prthvīnārāyan appointed Daljit Śah, one of his brothers, as his minister in absence of Vaṁśarāj.

The Čaubīśī troops pressed hard in pursuit, and the Gorkhalese, now greatly reduced in number, retreated first to Bhirkot and later to Dhor. The latter place was surrounded by the Čaubīśī troops. Prabhu Malla, Raṇāśūr Pāre and a few other prominent Gorkhalese officers were captured in the course of the siege which lasted two weeks. Gorkhalese gunners were however able to release their officers on Wednesday, 22 January 1772. Nevertheless the Gorkhalese troops could not retain Bhirkot, Garahū and Pāiyū, and were forced to evacuate them the next day. On 24 January Atibal Bisṭa, another Gorkhalese officer with the expedition withdrew from Rising. Thus the entire territory was lost and the Gorkhalese retired towards Kāṭhmāṇḍū with whatever stores they had

1. HP, op. cit.
2. Ācārya, op. cit.
3. It is not known whether Dhor was earlier captured by the Gorkhalese. It seems that at this time the ruler of this state was not an ally of the Čaubīśī against the Gorkhalese (vide IP, vol.II, pt.iii, p.432; also Jñāvālī, op. cit., p.174).
5. The date of retreat from Dhor as mentioned in HP, vol.52, fo.120, is Śaka 1693 Māgh 2 Wednesday. Māgh 2 is erroneously written for Māgh 12. Māgh 2 was not Wednesday but Sunday. Māgh 12 which was Sunday also corresponds with this day of the week for the equivalent Christian date, 22 January 1772. Moreover, the Gorkhalese did not retreat to Dhor on Māgh 12 but earlier, for it is mentioned in IP, ibid., that the Čaubīśī troops laid siege to Dhor for 14 days, and on Māgh 13, as mentioned in HP, ibid., the Gorkhalese retreated from Bhirkot, Garahū and Pāiyū after holding out for a fortnight, and so the siege laid by the Čaubīśī was on Pauṣa 28, i.e. 8 January 1772, and not on Magh 12.
been able to save. Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ demonstrated that he had lost nothing of his old ferocity. Every soldier who had left his gun behind in the retreat was fined Rs 60 and debarred from further service. The amount was alleged to have been the cost of each gun. Besides, a fine of the same amount was also imposed upon every soldier for his inability to recover his gun.

Troops were sent from Kathmandu as reinforcements under the command of Kāḍī Śrīharṣa Panta and Dhāukalsimha Basnet. The retreating Gorkhalese troops crossed the Marsyāngdi and joined the reinforcements at Setīghāṭ. But they did not resume the operation. The first Gorkhalese expedition against the Cāubīṣī states was therefore a failure.

As has been noted above Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ succeeded in avoiding a direct clash with the East India Company. But he seems to have been afraid that the latter would negotiate with the rulers of Cāudanḍī and Morang to open up their country for the production of timber. Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ realised that if the British were permitted to penetrate Cāudanḍī and Morang it might be difficult to dislodge them later. He therefore determined to conquer these states before the negotiations with the British were complete. In this direction his armies were successful. On Wednesday, 26 August 1773 the Gorkhalese troops crossed the Dudh Kosi, occupied Rāvā, Cisaṅkhu and Dinglā and marched as far

1. HP, vol.52, fo.120.
2. HP, vol.51, fo.222.
as the Arun river. The commander of the Gorkhalese troops of this expedition was Rāmkṛṣṇa Kāvar. In the course of his march he received considerable assistance from an eminent Brahman, Harinanda Upādhyāya Pokhrel of Khārpā. This is a further example of the manner in which Prthvīnārāyaṇ's cause was served by Brahmans. Harinanda's elder brother Narottam, was a minister of Cāudāṇḍī and it seems both these brothers were persons of eminence in this state. For some reason relations between Karna Sen, the King of Cāudāṇḍī, and Harinanda became strained and the latter left the Court of Cāudāṇḍī and went over to the Gorkhalese taking with him what appears to have been a large sum of money which Rāmkṛṣṇa Kāvar used for the payment of his troops. The Brahman who knew the terrain well also provided invaluable intelligence with regard to routes and the position of possible enemies. In recognition of these services he was confirmed in the ownership of the freehold lands which had previously been given to him by the King of Cāudāṇḍī and was promised whatever other freehold lands he cared to have.

At the end of 1773 Amarsimha Thāpā, an officer under the command of Rāmkṛṣṇa Kāvar drove the defenders out of Majhuvā, Kalum and Mahadignā Pāuvā and in February 1774 occupied Cāudāṇḍī, the capital of the state. This was the first successful campaign of a young officer who was to achieve extensive victories under Prthvīnārāyaṇ's successors.

1. HP, vol.52,fo.120.
2. IP, vol.II, pt.iii, pp.466-67 (Letter no.8).
In the meantime Harinanda was assisting the officers of Rāmkṛṣṇa Kāvar, Abhimāṇśīha Basnet and Pārath Bhārārī. He supplied them with money and facilitated their advance by creating divisions between the Brahman and Khas settlers on the one hand and the Kirātas, the original inhabitants of the area, on the other. In consequence of his assistance Abhimāṇśīha and Pārath were able to press on into the Tarai and establish themselves at Ambarpur, the Tarai headquarters of the state. As a result of this move the Caudāṇḍī state was now wholly occupied by Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ’s troops, and it was annexed to Nepal on Saturday 16 July 1774. Its ruler Kāṛṇa Sen escaped to Morang. Meanwhile the troops under the command of Abhimāṇśīha and Pārath were reinforced by other contingents under Kīrtisimha Khavāṣ and Bāli Bāniyā. Together they pushed forward to the east along three routes. They crossed the Tamar river, captured Cāṁpur on Sunday, 17 July, and Vijayapur on 18 July. Thence they marched further ahead and captured Islimbā and Cāṁthāpu. Shortly afterwards these two outposts were in the eastern district of Ilām and were situated in the Singlilā range which now divides modern Nepal from the Darjeeling district of India. With their capture Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ’s domains in the east were contiguous with those of Sikkim.

2. HP, vol.52, fo.120.
4. HP, ibid.
5. Vide Letter no.15, pp.78-81.
Prthvīnārayaṇ's letter at this point contains certain instructions to his commanders to press on as far as the river Tisṭā which was at that time probably the border of the Bhutan state. He instructed them however to do nothing to provoke retaliation from the King of Sikkim, who, he felt, might be assisted by the Tibetan authorities if conflict developed. On the other hand he instructed his officers to defend themselves should Sikkim commit an act of aggression.

The inhabitants of the country which lay between the Arun and Tamar rivers were principally Limbus. The region was divided into ten parts, each being administered by a tribal chieftain. The Sen kings of Cāudanāśī and Morang seem to have held a nominal suzerainty over the Limbus and the rest of the Kirātī tribesmen. The Limbus surrendered to Prthvīnārayaṇ's armies mainly because they had so often been attacked and oppressed by the Tibetan ruler of Sikkim. Prthvīnārayaṇ granted some privilege to the Limbu chieftains which they enjoy till today. They were designated Subbās.

By the end of 1774 Prthvīnārayaṇ's armies were virtually in occupation of the whole area of central and southern Nepal between the Nepal Valley in the west and the Tisṭā river in the east. Negotiations regarding

1. Letter no.15, pp.78-81.
2. Vide p.81, n.1.
5. By these privileges they exercise some sort of authority in their lands. The authority is called Kipāṭ by which grant they enjoy a share in the revenue and preside over local councils which try local and communal disputes.
the possession in the Tarai from Makwanpur to Morang were however still unsettled, though negotiations were still going on in a somewhat desultory fashion between Prthvīnārāyaṇa and East India Company. This problem was not to be settled until the Nepalese Wars (1814-16). On 10 January 1775 Prthvīnārāyaṇa was taken ill and died leaving to his successor a kingdom which was roughly half the area of the present state of Nepal.
CHAPTER X

PŪTHVĪNĀRĀYĀṆ, SOLDIER AND STATESMAN

The opportunity for the original mounting and final success of Pūthvīnārāyāṇ's campaigns was provided by the lack of unity among the many states into which western Nepal was divided when he came to power, and by the chronic disharmony between the Malla kingdoms in the Nepal Valley. It is probable that had they been able to unite against him he would not have achieved his ambitions. It is noteworthy that whenever the Malla kings did agree upon joint resistance he was defeated. It also happened that whenever he was engaged in fighting in the east the Çaubīsī states attacked Gorkhā in the rear. Had their plans been thoughtfully executed it is likely that they would have been able to block his progress. But their plans were only rough-and-ready and lacked the organisation needed for success. Moreover, Pūthvīnārāyāṇ had little difficulty in sowing discord among them by appealing to individual ambitions and cupidity. His appeal to Ripumardan Sāhī of Lamjung on a sharing-of-spoils basis was accepted, and the mutual assistance treaty which the two entered into gave Pūthvīnārāyāṇ the time and security he needed to capture Nuvākot, the main gateway to the Nepal Valley. Lamjung saw the danger and renounced the treaty, but it was then too late. Pūthvīnārāyāṇ had achieved his immediate objective. At a later stage he bought off the King of Tanahū by a similar appeal
to self-interest. King Raṇajītiśhā of Bhātgaū was also often played off against King Jayaprabāś of Kāṭhmāṅḍu and this policy of division provided him with the scope to put into effect the plans he had in mind.

The situation in the Nepal Valley was and had long been chaotic. The three kings were jealous and suspicious of one another, and armed conflict between them broke out frequently. In the kingdoms themselves there was no trust or loyalty between the kings and their principal advisers. The position of neither monarch nor ministers was at any time secure, and the people suffered all the ills that can rise from unstable government. The official treasuries were depleted, and famine conditions were also liable to occur. The Malla armies were strong enough to defend the Valley against the armed raids of the Gorkhalese, but the Malla kings were unable to counter Ptīthvīnārāyān’s policy of attack by erosion and blockade.

Something of Ptīthvīnārāyān the man and the planning of his campaigns and the consolidation of his position there can be gleaned from his notes in the Divya upades and some of his letters. They show him to have been a man of courage and of immense determination and persistence. He often had to change his plans but he never lost sight of his main objective, the conquest of the Nepal Valley. He was an able tactician and strategist, a shrewd judge of both opportunity and danger, a cunning and often quite unscrupulous diplomatist, a natural though occasionally reckless leader, but above all a man of great ability. He
had the genius to know when to wait and when to go. His timing was seldom at fault. No detail was too small for his personal attention, and yet he was able to plan and sustain two or more campaigns simultaneously to defend in one place while attacking in another.

His ambition to conquer was fostered by his step-mother Candraprabhāvatī. She seems to have been a remarkably able and far-sighted woman, and the young Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ had full confidence in her wisdom. It was she who sent him while still a boy to live at the court of Bhatgāū. His residence there gave him valuable first-hand acquaintance with the Nepal Valley. He was attracted by its wealth and its fertile fields, and formed what proved to be an accurate assessment of its political instability. It was Candraprabhāvatī who arranged his marriage with the royal house of Makwānpur. The marriage was not the success she hoped, but his stay there gave Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ a knowledge of another and strategically most important area of central Nepal. It revealed to him the topographical details of the terrain he was later to fight over. Candraprabhāvatī too guided his first manoeuvrings for position with the local kingdoms of the Bāśī and Cāubīśī, as a result of which he was able to buy off Lamjung until after the fall of Nuwākoṭ.

One of Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ's first tasks after succeeding to throne was to strengthen his own state and army. Few details about the size and population of Gorkhā are available. The statement that it consisted of 12,000 households may be accurate, but it is quite probably

an overstatement; but even if accurate, it is clear that the population was small, and the number of men available for military service could not have been much in excess of 1,000, if as many as that. With so small a force at his command, internal loyalty and cooperation were essential for Pṛthvīnārayaṇ. He took advice regarding the reliability of the different tribes and clans that made up the population of Gorkhā, and concluded that the Khas and Magar possessed the qualities he needed. The two principal Khas families at the time were the Pāres and Basnets. The former was an old Gorkhā family traditionally numbered among the Cha Thar; the latter were comparatively newcomers to the state, possibly from other Cāubīsī states and Magarāt. Pṛthvīnārayaṇ also reappointed certain Magar officers, who had been dismissed by his father. In Divya upadeśa Pṛthvīnārayaṇ records how, to ensure friendly relations between the two Khas families, he arranged a marriage between Kālu Pāre’s daughter and Keharsimha Basnet, son of Śivarāmsimha Basnet. To effect marriage alliances between families whom he employed in his service seems to have been one of Pṛthvīnārayaṇ’s policies. It was in pursuance of this policy that he brought some of the Thāpās of the Nepal Valley to his side by getting Dambar Thāpā married to the daughter of Tulārām Pāre. The latter belonged to a collateral family of Kālu Pāre. Dambar Thāpā was a close relative of Jāsṛām Thāpā, a minister of Jaya-

1. Each of the companies raised by Pṛthvīnārayaṇ consisted of 100 soldiers (DU, Tr., p.33). But they do not appear to have been more than ten. In HP, vol.11, fo.224, it is said that after Pṛthvīnārayaṇ returned from Banaras he raised two companies, Sabuj and Vajravāṇī, and after the capture of Nwākoṭ three more, Barkandāj, Old Gorakhnāth and Rāmdal. Regmi mentions five, Śrīnāth, Sabuj, Gorakhnāth, Kālibakṣa and Vajravāṇī, which were raised in 1761 (Modern Nepal, p.62). Acārīya says that two companies were raised on European lines in 1763 (‘Pṛthvīnārayaṇ Śāhka Jīvanīko pūrvārdhā’, p.75), whereas Jhavālī says five (op. cit., p.135, n.1). Vide also p.269.
prakāś Malla of Kāthmāndu, who was arrested by a Gorkhalese officer and sent to Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ at Nuwākoṭ. The marriage between the two families further provided Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ with Thāpā assistants, whom he employed in his later campaigns against Nakwānpur.

Another piece of advice Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ received from his step-mother, and which he was wise enough to take, was to take his people into his confidence and attempt to carry their support in any important action he had in mind. This line of policy was obviously applied in two actions he took. The first concerned the appointment of his chief minister. His own inclination was to appoint Virāj Bakhetī; but being given to understand that Kālu Pāre was admired and respected by the people, he gave the post to him, a move he could never have regretted, for few monarchs can have been more wisely, loyally or courageously served by any officer than he was by Kālu Pāre. The second action was to increase the effective strength of his army. This he could achieve only by recruiting mercenaries who demanded higher pay than his own troops were receiving. He consulted the people and explained to them that if his campaigns were to succeed he had no option but to take mercenaries, who would join him only at higher rates of pay. Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ explained that though he would pay the mercenaries more than his own men, he would ensure that when he came to share out the spoils of victory, he would share them only with the people of Gorkhā. His explanation was understood and accepted; and thus, by wise and politic

action, he ensured stability of government at home and increased his army without resentment on the part of his people. Prthvīnārāyaṇ did not always behave so prudently after the death of Candraprabhuvaṭṭa, but the goodwill of his people, thus won in the early years of his reign, was with him through delay and even defeat, on to final victory.

Prthvīnārāyaṇ Śah as a Soldier

Prthvīnārāyaṇ's success was due in large measure to the fact that he was a better soldier than any of his adversaries. His first campaign, that against Nuwākoṭ in 1741, was unsuccessful, but he had the wisdom to learn the lessons of failure. He realised that he needed better military equipment, including modern arms and ammunition, a larger and better organised army, and a plan which would give him victory over more prosperous and numerous states.

The arms mission to Banaras was the first direct outcome of the defeat at Nuwākoṭ. He realised that money would be needed for the purchase of arms, so he ordered his treasurer and other officers to make available the entire resources of the treasury, and to raise money by borrowing from householders and from money-lenders. It is estimated that he was able to carry with him to Banaras about one lakh of rupees, a very considerable sum in those days. Later too he arranged to meet his financial requirements by floating loans from Brahman, Khas,

1. Prthvīnārāyaṇ Śāhko Jīvanī, p.2
Nagar and even Newār money-lenders.

The supply of weapons brought back from Banaras must have been large, though no details are available except that his luggage was so bulky that he was challenged at the frontier by customs officers, and had to fight his way through. He employed foreigners to instruct his troops in the use of these modern weapons. Mention is made of three Muslims who were taken into service for this purpose, and two Frenchmen who were employed to cast cannon and instruct his new artillery units. Traditional weapons however were not neglected. Artisans were mobilised to manufacture Khukurīs, swords, lances, bows, arrows, etc. It is said that he inspected their work himself. In this way he ensured that his troops were well-armed. The defeat of the Nawab and of Kinloch's ill-planned expedition was a godsend to Prthvīnārāyaṇ, as with the equipment that was left behind in the withdrawal he was able to make his army the best equipped in the Himalayas. His troops became accustomed to up-to-date weapons, and had a greater fire power than any of their adversaries, including the armies of the Nepal Valley.

Prthvīnārāyaṇ was the first prince of Nepal to organise and maintain a regular standing army. He recruited troops on regular pay, with promises of bounty if the campaign was successful. His reorganisation seems to have been in two phases. There was little or no

2. Vide Dutt, p. 32.
3. Papers respecting the Nepal War, pp. 80-81, 88.
4. Prthvīnārāyaṇ Sāhko jīvanī, pp. 25
organisation prior to the defeat at Nuwakoṭ. After his return from Banaras, he formed two regular companies, Sabuj and Vajravāni; and after the capture of Nuwakoṭ, three more, Barkandāj, Old Gorakh and Rāmdal. The Muslim musketeers were appointed adjutants in three companies. After the defeat of Kinloch, Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ re-modelled his army on British lines, dividing it into infantry and artillery. The former fought with traditional weapons; the latter were equipped with muskets and cannon. It appears also that he gave thought to the provision of cavalry units, and to this end attempted to send representatives to Tibet for instruction.

He also built up in his army graded cadres of officers and men. His senior officers, who were sent out on service as required, were called Umrāvas. They seem to have been a sort of General Staff. They did not receive regular salary as the junior officers did. Their emoluments took the form of grants of land and land revenue, but they received an allowance (bhattā) when on active service. It was their duty to defend forts, to mobilise troops from the land granted to them, and to equip the troops so mobilised. This cadre was a compromise between the new and the traditional. Their active service duties were modern, but other tasks assigned to them were feudal in nature. The insignia of

1. HP, vol.11, fo.224.
2. There are conflicting statements regarding the number and the names of the companies formed by him. For all such statements vide p.307,1-1.
3. Markham: Narratives, p.155. The weakness which Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ had for elephants also suggests that he was eager to utilize them to carry military stores during fighting, though there is no record that he actually did so.
the Umrāvas's office were a white turban, a sword and a shield which were presented personally by the king. The senior company officer was the Subedār. His qualifications were meritorious service in four or five engagements. Under the Subedār were seven Subalterns, commissioned officers, who had fought in two or three engagements. There were also sixteen non-commissioned officers. Officers and troops together formed companies about 100 strong.

Soldiers, whether commissioned or not, were generously treated in the matter of pay and allowances. It was a regular feature of Prthvīnārāyaṇ's organisation that no man should lose efficiency by worrying about the maintenance of his family. Many of them received grants of land and some of them annuities. A pension scheme was also arranged for the support of the dependants of a soldier who died in service. Sons were fully supported until they reached military age.

The use of mercenaries as expert instructors and auxiliary troops on regular pay has already been referred to.

Prthvīnārāyaṇ's military strategy was of a twofold nature: the holding of fortified posts by regular garrisons, and the operation of small mobile units, who could advance or withdraw at speed according to the requirements of the campaign and the terrain it was being fought in. There were outlying fortresses at places like Sallyān, Liglig and

1. HP, vol.9, fos.39-40, wherein it is also mentioned that the institution of Umrāvas was made extinct by Bhīmsen Thāpā, Prime Minister of Nepal (1804-37), who after having disbanded them transferred them to Regiments or Companies raised or reorganised by him, and appointed some of them as Kumedāns (Commandants) and Kaptāns (Captains).
2. Vide DU, Tr., pp.29,33.
Dhading, not to mention Nuwakot, the most important of them all. In some cases they were strengthened by trench employments and road blocks. Their purpose was strategic: to protect Prthvīnārāyan's rear while he was prosecuting his offensive against the Nepal Valley. The defence of the foothills against invasion from India was of the same kind. Smaller posts were set up along the main routes to maintain strategical control of the area and to enforce the blockade. The small offensive units, consisting of infantry and artillery, were constantly on the move. They were probably never more than company strength, and may often have been considerably smaller. Their composition of officers, non-commissioned officers and men made them effective fighting units, and their mobility and adaptability made it very difficult for their adversaries, who were schooled: in the warfare of the pitched battle, to know how to organise defence against them. In the course of a few years Prthvīnārāyan had organised a modern army and evolved a strategy ideally suited to mountain warfare; and the ill-organised, medieval armies of the Mallas, though much stronger numerically, ultimately were no match for them; nor could the larger forces from India cope with Prthvīnārāyan on his own ground.

Prthvīnārāyan Śāh as a Diplomatist and Negotiator

The brilliance of Prthvīnārāyan as a soldier was matched by his skill and ingenuity in diplomacy. He was a shrewd and quite unscrupulous negotiator and a man very skilled in intrigue. His assessment of

2. Vide...
his enemies' strength and weakness was almost invariably correct, and he knew precisely how to exploit the latter to the full. No ethical considerations of truth, honesty or the pledged word, ever deterred him from carrying through his plans.

His military conquest commenced with a well calculated piece of bluff, a mutual help treaty with Lamjung, which ensured the safety of his rear while he reduced the Malla stronghold of Nuwākot.

He frequently made use of Brahmans and astrologers as agents, knowing that their social and religious status gave them the right of entry into any court or household, and that messages delivered by priests were almost certain to be believed. He used Brahmans in his negotiations with the kings of Tanahû and Kāskī. The king of Tanahû was lured into captivity by his own rāj-guru, who unwittingly led him into an ambush. It was a Brahman who bribed the king of Kāskī to help in the campaigns against Cāgu, and there is no doubt that most of the information Pythvī-nārāyaṇ obtained about the situation in the Nepal Valley was supplied to him by Brahmans who were residents there. Much of the confusion in the Malla courts was organised and developed by Brahmans in the pay of the Gorkhā king.

He was a past master in all the arts of duplicity and subornation, and his tools included bribery, false promises, and even forgery. He split the court of Jayaprakāś Malla by forged letters, which

3. Vide Letter no. 6, p. 64.  
finally alienated the unhappy king from his ministers and from his mother. In advance of his descent into the Valley Prthvīnārāyaṇ, absolvent certain Brahmans from debts contracted there. He bribed two Sannyāsīs to help him in the Bhātgāū country, and some artisans to work for him in Banepā. When bribery and cajolery failed he could always resort to ferocious cruelty of which Kīrtipur is the most notorious example. Broken promises were so frequent that it is astonishing that people continued to trust him, but it seems that they did.

In international affairs he was no less deft. We have noted his skill in playing off the kings of the Bālsī and Cāubīsī against one another. His correct assessment of the policy of the East India Company and the delaying tactics by which he combatted it were brilliant. There are passages in the Divya upadesā which might have done credit to Machiavelli. He knew when to delay and when to act, when to make a generous gesture and when to betray. And he knew how to calculate a risk. All this, but on the other hand he knew how to inspire and sustain loyalty.

Prthvīnārāyaṇ Śāh as a Jurist and Administrator

The Memoirs reveal that Prthvīnārāyaṇ was interested in earlier legal and social codes and in Nepalese customary law. He stated that he intended to draw up a new code for his kingdom. He had studied

2. Letter no. 8, pp. 67–68.  
4. Vide p. 231–32.  
the code of Rām Śāh, King of Gorkhā (1609-36) and those of Sthitirāj Malla and Mahendra Malla who were kings of Kāthmāndū in the fourteenth and sixteenth centuries respectively. The structure of Gorkhā society was according to the caste system as interpreted by the Brahmans. The judicial system was largely based on Rām Śāh's code, which drew upon Hindu and customary law. The enlargement of his kingdom made Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ feel that it would be wise to draw up a revised judicial code and prescribe anew the duties of the various castes. It is not known whether he did prepare such a code, but Nepalese records make no reference to one. It seems however that he did take some action to amend the systems of justice and administration.

His Memoirs state that he wished the administration of justice to be impartial. He made the following definite proposals:

(a) the judicial officers (Dīṭṭhās) should be chosen from the ṭhakurīs,
(b) their assistants (Vicārīs) should be nagars, (c) a Pandit (Dharma-
    dhikār) should be attached to each court to expound the Dharmaśāstras
    and interpret customary law. He made a special point of bribery, saying
    the giver and receiver of bribes were both guilty of flouting justice
    and could without sin be deprived of both life and property.

The little information we have about administration and government suggests that he imported the system he had operated in Gorkhā. This was in part traditional and in part Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ's own

---

1. Vide Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ Śānko jīvanī, pp. 29-30, wherein it is stated that Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ had to resort to every cunning not permitted by the dharmaśāstras and as such for his part was not competent to administer justice. He had hence appointed Pandits to expound sacred and customary law.
2. Vide DU, n. p. 29.
innovation. The king was the head of the administration. All authority was in his hands. When the king was incapable of ruling owing to mental derangement, illness or infirmity, the senior queen was appointed regent. She ruled with the assistance of a Council of Regency, which itself however was only an advisory body. Collateral members of the royal family, who were known as Cautariyās, served the king as advisers or ministers. Junior administrative posts were held by officers called Kājīs, i.e. ministers. They were assigned both civil and military duties. At least two ministers were by custom in charge of foreign relations. They were drawn from the Basnet and Pāre families, i.e. Khas and Khatri families respectively. Their respective charges were India and Tibet. Other officers, junior to the Kājīs, were Sardārs (military commanders), Baksīs (pay master generals), Gurus (preceptors), and Josīs or Jāisīs (astrologers). In addition there were a number of counsellors. They were elders (Jēthā Būrḥās) belonging to the traditional families, Thar Ghar. Other officers included Umrāvas (commandants), Mīrs (army chiefs), Dvāres (frontier guards), Kharīdārs (foreign secretaries), Najīkīs (aides-de-camp), Dadās (personal attendants), the Khajāncī (treasurer), the Kapardār (keeper of the royal wardrobe and jewelry and manager of the royal kitchen), etc. All these officials and officers met together in a state consultative assembly.

1. This list which is reconstructed from Nepali material does not confirm in detail a comparable list drawn by Kirkpatrick in his book An account of the kingdom of Nepaul, pp.197-98.

2. Later known as Bhārdārī.
The king's authority had religious sanction because he was held to be an *avatar* of Viṣṇu. Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ's practice was however by no means always autocratic. Though at times he acted arbitrarily, he most often consulted his advisers, and sometimes the people too. There were a few checks on the arbitrary exercise of authority by the king. A ruling by the Dharmādhikār could not be ignored; and some ministers could by custom only be appointed if the people approved. It was not usual either for a king to ignore an astrologer's pronouncement of an auspicious date. The elders were also at times instrumental to check the king's autocratic tendencies.

Certain families, the Pārās, Basnets and Pantas and collateral members of the royal family, and some Magars, were given position of authority in rotation. The Memoirs lay down that as they had proved themselves loyal members of the state they should be immune from the death sentence. Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ held that if they committed a crime which ordinarily carried the death sentence they should be sent to the battle front. "If they come back alive, well and good and if they die, it is better that someone else should have killed them than that they should have been killed by the king himself."

1. GVI, p.32.
2. Vide *I.35*, n.9.
3. DU, Tr., p.28.
Prthvīnārāyaṇa Śāh's Trade Policy

Prthvīnārāyaṇa attached significance to the development of trade and commerce. One of the major considerations that apparently weighed with him in the capture of Nuwākoṭ and later of the region stretching from Pāṭībhanjyāng to Dolakhā was the control and monopoly of the trade that was transacted by the Newārs of the Nepal Valley with Tibet by way of Kerung and Kutī. By the capture of passes to the north and north-east of the Nepal Valley he aimed to deprive the Newārs of their traditional lucrative trade. His blockade was successful.

He issued coinage in imitation of the Mohars of the Mallas of the Valley (known as Mahendramallīs) and sent his coins to Tibet to buy gold as the Malla kings had done. This was an attempt to monopolise the Tibetan trade, but it did not bear fruit as he hoped. The Gorkhalese were not traders by occupation. He then concluded with Jayaprakāś of Kāṭhmāṇḍu an agreement of trade and alliance in order to share the commercial transactions with Tibet and to gain business skill and experience. But this too was a temporary phase. Prthvīnārāyaṇa did not remain complacent and when he saw that he could go ahead single-handed and that the situation was also ripe for his further campaigns he broke the agreement and resumed the plan of capturing other outposts on the perimeter of the Valley. Towards the end of his career he again sent his

Mohars to Tibet for the purchase of gold. His idea was to provide trading facilities for his people, and give them the monopoly of the trade with Tibet. But his plan was a failure. Troubles developed with Tibet regarding the circulation of his coins and they continued even after his death.

His aim was to exclude foreign traders from his country and maintain the policy of a closed frontier. He believed that merchants followed merchandise. He apprehended dangers from the Indian merchants and middlemen, especially Gosais and Kashmiri Muslims, who up till then had monopolised trade through Nepal to Tibet. They had been permitted by Mall kings to carry on trade with Nepal and Tibet and establish their business houses in Kathmandu. They also had business establishments in Lhasa. It appears Prthvīnārāyaṇa fully understood that there might be political dangers from the side of India where the English East India Company was established as a military and political power. Consequently he determined to prohibit the movement of the Indian traders through his country, in case they were English agents. The effect of his policy can be seen from a reference to the George Bogle mission to Tibet. Bogle had been sent by Warren Hastings, the Governor and President of the Calcutta Council of the East India Company, to Lhasa to ingratiate himself with the Tibetan authorities and obtain their permission to trade. Meanwhile the Gosais and Kashmiri Muslim merchants who had been expelled

3. A Gosai had actually tried to procure English help for Jayaprakāś against Prthvīnārāyaṇa (vide p. 255, n. 2).
from Nepal met Bogle in Lhasa and sought the Company's assistance to continue their trade activities. Professedly ascetics, the Gosaṅís were revered in Tibet, a country where religion played a dominant role. Kashmiri Muslims were also favoured in Tibet, apparently because of their trade contacts with Ladakh, so called the little Tibet. Bogle was very much concerned by the interruption and decline of Bengal's trade with Tibet consequent upon Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ's conquest of the Nepal Valley and his policy of the closed frontier. The easiest trade route to Tibet from the provinces of Bihar and Bengal passed through the Nepal Valley itself. There were besides two routes: one the western via Mustāṅg and the other the eastern via Morang and Wallāngcung. But the western route was long and tolls were exacted at many intermediate places by the states of the Gauḍīsī. The route was regarded safe but the profit was negligible. The eastern route lay through Morang, a most unhealthy region, and traders were not willing to risk their lives. The English were forced to explore possible routes via Assam or Bhutan and Sikkim.

Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ was not opposed to trade. His aim was that his own people and they alone should conduct and monopolise trade passing through his country to Tibet. In some letters written to the Tibetan authorities towards the end of his career he said that he intended to establish factories at Kutī, Kirāt and at a certain place on the frontier between Tibet and Nepal where Tibetan merchants might purchase commodities from Nepal and Bengal. He said he would allow

1. Markham, op.cit., p.128.
2. Ibid., pp.58-59.
common articles of commerce to be transported through his kingdom but not glass and luxury goods. He made it a condition that the Tibetan Government should have no connections with the Firangis (Europeans) or Moghuls (Muslims), and that foreign merchants should not be admitted into Tibet. He also wrote saying that a Firangi, who had come to him on some business and who was then in his country, was being shortly expelled. Such heavy duties were exacted on goods brought in by foreign traders that they could not continue their activities and were forced to leave Nepal. But two Kashmiris were allowed to remain in Kathmandu. There was also one Gosāi who was Prithvīnārāyaṇ's favourite and whom he had sent as his envoy to Tibet.

Prithvīnārāyaṇ's Economic Policy

Prithvīnārāyaṇ's land policy was based on the principle of royal possession. As soon as he was established as king of the Nepal Valley, he declared all the land within the former kingdoms of Kathmandu, Bhatgau and Pāyan crown property. The personal estates of the previous kings he retained for himself. The remaining land in the Valley itself he allowed the previous owners to occupy subject to payment of revenue in kind which he fixed at one-fourth of the gross annual production. After two or three years he inaugurated a land survey of the Valley,

1. Markham, op.cit., pp.156-57
2. Ibid., pp.127,133.
and classified the whole area in four grades according to the crops produced and fixed the revenue in cash payable to the crown accordingly. He also levied revenue on the freehold land in the Valley and increased it later by one-sixth more than had been paid before. Land outside the Valley he parcelled out to his army as part of their total emolument. He was anxious to increase crop production and to effect this laid down an edict concerning irrigation and cultivation, even to the extent of having villages removed to other sites if the houses were built on arable land.

He also took steps to increase the resources of the state by fuller exploitation of its mineral wealth. As with arable land, villages were to be removed to other sites if the land on which they stood was suitable for mining.

As a further economic measure he prohibited the import of cloth, especially fine fabrics, from India. Indian cloth was popular in Nepal, and the purchase of it involved the export of gold and silver currency. It was this loss of precious metal that Prthvīnārāyaṇ determined to stop. The import of foreign currency into Nepal he did all in his power to foster, and to this end encouraged the export of indigenous commodities, including medicinal herbs and roots, provided they were paid for in cash. To ensure that the ban on cloth export did not cause hardship, he sent spinners and weavers into India to learn the technique

1. HP, vol.59,fo.72.
2. DU, Tr., p.31.
3. Ibid.
in use, and encouraged them on their return to set up indigenous industries.

National coinage was to consist of pure, or nearly pure, metal. His instructions to agents sent to purchase gold in Tibet are specific on this point. They were to take every care to ensure that the gold was not debased, though he was prepared to allow some alloy in large purchases. He was shrewd enough to realise the economic dangers inherent in a debased coinage.

Another measure PṛthvīšrŚyaṇ took to stabilise the national economy was the prohibition of tax farming. He foresaw the hardship it would cause to the peasants and the loss that would be suffered by the royal treasury. He declared that the collection of taxes and land revenue was a function of the government. He therefore set up offices for this purpose and made their accounts subject to annual audit.

As a paymaster he was generous without being lavish. He saw clearly that too great wealth would lead to luxurious living and the loss of those martial qualities he was anxious to maintain. On the other hand he took steps to ensure that crown servants, civil and military, were paid sufficient to enable them to uphold the prestige of their appointments, and guarantee security for their dependents.

It is astonishing that a king who had to devote so much of his time and thought to military campaigning and territorial expansion

---

1. DU, Tr., p.27.
3. DU, Tr., i.w.d.
4. Ibid..
should have been able to pay so much attention to trade and the national economy, or that a man of his humble origin and limited experience should have developed such practical sagacity. He did enough to demonstrate that his general policy of a closed-frontier was necessary not only on military and political grounds but that at the time it was of great benefit to the total economy of the state.

**Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ Śāh as a Hindu**

Śaivism seems to have been the original creed of the Śāh kings of Gorkhā. Their tutelar deities were Gorakhnāth, the legendary eponymous deity of Gorkhā, and the goddess Mankāmnā, a form of Durgā, the goddess of power. But being Hindus, the Śāh kings showed their devotion to other gods and goddesses of the Brahmanical Pantheon, e.g. Viṣṇu, Gaṇeś, Kālī, Rām, Hanūmān, etc. Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ also followed this tradition. His letters began with an invocation to Durgā. He seems to have been devoted to Gorakhnāth and mention has been made of one devotional song to him composed by Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ himself. Of his preceptors one was the traditional Miśra Brahman of Banaras, another was a Siddha of the Aghor sect, a third was Bhagavantanāth, a monk of the Nāth sect founded by Gorakhnāth, a fourth was a mendicant of the local creed called Josmanī. There were besides some Brahman preceptors.

3. Ibid., p.11.
of Gorkha itself. Prthvînārāyaṇ also believed in tantricism, performed Purāścaraṇ (a Brahmanical preparatory or introductory rite) before undertaking a major campaign. He had his own personal superstitions. He employed astrologers to select an auspicious moment for every campaign he launched. He also showed his respect to Buddhism. He honoured Muslim mendicants as well as Hindu ascetics.

It is also interesting that he was at first lenient towards the Christian missionaries and had given permission to the Capucin missionaries stationed in the Nepal Valley to preach in Nuwākot. He had also given to them timber for the construction of a church in the Valley. Later, after he conquered Pāṭan, he was still more tolerant towards them. Though the blockade he had imposed on the Valley was severe he had permitted them to get necessities into the Valley through the passes held by him. But when he had reason to believe that they were secretly endeavouring to supplant him he requested them to leave the Valley with their converts. They were not persecuted.²

Prthvînārāyaṇ was also lenient towards the Muslims. It was mentioned earlier that he had appointed three Muslims to train his artillerymen. He gave facilities to Kashmiri Muslim traders in the Valley whereas he had expelled Hindu Gosāi traders, and he invited some Muslim families to settle in a district of Gorkhā.

---

Though he was a Hindu and in many respects a devoted one some of his actions were by no means regular. In the interests of military efficiency he abrogated certain caste rules regarding food and clothing. It is said too that he ordered certain Brahmans to be decapitated, an act which the orthodox Hindu would condemn because Brahmans are by canon law immune from the death sentence. He behaved with astonishing severity to the Jāisī Brahmins. Some members of this caste were suspected of aiding Jayapraķāś in an attempt to arrest Prthvīnārāyaṇ's son, Pratāpsimha Śāh. He therefore demoted the whole sept and deprived them of the right to exercise their priestly function.

Extant evidence does not give a complete account of Prthvīnārāyaṇ's orthodoxy as a Hindu, but there is no doubt that his status as a Hindu was respected by a large number of Brahmins who lived in different parts of the country including those residents in the Nepal Valley. As has been mentioned above there is evidence to show that Brahmins proved most useful allies. It would not be true to say that Prthvīnārāyaṇ's conquest can be equated with a Hindu crusade in a non-Hindu country, but there is no doubt that his orthodoxy as a Hindu told in his favour when he came into conflict with peoples who practised Buddhism or other religions.

1. Vide P.222.
2. Vide P.196.
3. Vide Ibid.
Conclusion

Prthvinārāyaṇ today is honoured as founder of the present kingdom of Nepal. It is true that when he died its frontiers were narrower than they are now. But he laid the foundation for the conquest which was completed during the reigns of his son and grandson. Prthvinārāyaṇ ascended the throne of Gorkhā, one of the smallest principalities in the Gāubīsī area. When he died his kingdom stretched as far as Bhutan and within 40 years a large unified kingdom was in existence stretching from the Satlaj to the Tisṭā, and from the Himalayas almost to the Ganges.

The foundation of his success seems to have been his ability to pacify conquered peoples. This is particularly true in the case of the Newār inhabitants of the Nepal Valley. For generations they had lived in political and economic uncertainty, mounting in the 1760’s to famine conditions. What they longed for most was peace and stability. These Prthvinārāyaṇ gave them. The material prosperity of the Valley was soon restored. Newārs were permitted to resume their professions as traders and in due course they were admitted to the civil, though not military, services. There is no reason to suppose that the suppression which the Newārs suffered at a later date was any part of Prthvinārāyaṇ’s policy. The Limbus too he won over by accepting their traditional land system known as Kipat, an economic organisation of
of land ownership which still persists in the eastern districts of Nepal. To a considerable extent he confirmed local Limbu chieftains in their traditional status.

The main feature of Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ's policy both internal and external was that of the closed frontier. This policy was followed by his successors until the revolution of 1950 and even after that date it was relaxed only with caution.
APPENDIX A

TEXT OF NEPALI LETTERS OF PRTHVINARAYAN SĀH

LETTER NO. 1

श्रीदुर्गा

1. स्वस्तिश्रीगिरिराजेश्वरादि श्रीमन्माहेंद्रराजाधिराजश्रीश्रीश्री-
2. मत्युश्वीनारायणसहायदेवानां सदाक्षरि विजयनाम् -------
3. स्वस्तिश्रीबल्बाजैगत्यादि. श्रीहरिपदितकेवं जेठाजो-
4. ग. पूर्वक पत्रमिदं इहां कुसल तौहां कुसल चाहिय जेठिते परम
5. आनन्द होइ. आगे पत्र आयो अर्थ मालूम भयो. उप्रांत : ज्या [वि]-
6. नित गरि पठायाढी जोगे नित्य गरि पठायाढी. तर बलिक ढिलो
7. गरेत ढाडो गन्या काम हो वह ढिलो नगर. तांडाको जस्तो भ-
8. वर पाउँछी तस्तो भवर ढाडो पठारुः गर. उप्रांत म कु-
9. तिगाँ. र भोद्याइतूले स्वामोऽको भावणाइ त भयन भातार
10. भन्या दिन्छ. भन्या जुना पनि दिन तयार भया भाव-
11. माहेंद्र नमित्तदा म भासाको-जगातकसूम उठेर आउँदा
12. भोद्याले वामिपठामा. र म थामिङ्गो भोद्याङ्गि भे-
13. ले यति कोल्ट्या. कुन फुकन नाहिद्वा भाव गोल्दै भनि भे-
14. ले भनिरामपानाको छ भनि पठायाढी : अठार भन्या ए-
15. लिक कपट माळो. भन्दा हामि ठेवा स्वाभित्ती भनेर स्वप्न
16. गहरहायांू भनिपठायाँछ। जर्त। कृति फुकिन नारि
17. उहै स्वच्छलाई दिन्या भया। जनी। जाँट क्या होला। जर्तु
18. सुन घटिया नेव। पीतलको धुलो मिस्खाको हुन्छ।
19. तस्माही पनि नजर रामिका तेव। क्याकित्त स्वच्छलाई
20. त विवेन्त। तिमिले पेटमाहीमाते राजस्थ चाहिन्छ नकुटि
21. नफुकिन स्वच्छलाई सुका जपेँ। भन्या तनि जाँट। एति-
22. माही पनि क्याकित्त नपस्या पनिन। नकुटि नफुकिन घ-
23. नसमु [भया] पनि जाँट। परन्तु [तेति] सत्रको भास्वम
24. तेति रुपियामात्र भिजन्या भया तेि [तिति]कै रजेँ र सुन लेवि
25. नारि तृसि वांच पेँ रुद्ध जस्नाँर तोला मिलन्या भया
26. एकि बासामाहीक कृति फुकिन अठारस्म भन्या प[निन]
27. जाँट। परन्तु। वांच पेँ रुद्ध जस्नाँर तोला निसकन्या [भया] बाँट
28. अर्थ पल्लो छोडको कुरो हो। पेट रामिका गर पेँ कामत-
29. को भोके भोद्याको पाया भोद्या चर्द्दाँरु। तस्कर-
30. ति को काम पेट रामिका गर। परन्तु सुन जापना जर्त-
31. देखिक विरिवोइन्या भनि जापना इम्ती मित्र वुहिक परन्तु
32. ति गौरि पठाव। तिहै। वन्दोवस्त कन्यादेश तुन्ना [प]-
33. ति पठाईदेव। परि रुपिया पठाईदेव थेन-
34. ति सुना मिलन्या छ। भनि गणस्तुक पनिन विनिति
35. गौरि पठाव। भोद्यको क्या हकिम्ग छ स्व पनि दि-
36. त विस्तार विनिति गौरि पठाव सव।
37. उप्रात। इहै। हकिम्ग पुष्पमुक्त काठ पनि
38. सीहामाही पुमाइए। भर समाचार पनि
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39. शानंद छ. उप्रात. राहा त बँगे गर छो-
40. ढङ छैन. विधि विस्तार नराज वस्त्मा-
41. त बन्धभान पंडित कहतानु स्व संहि
42. तेहाँ चालिस पचास मुरि आन भोट
43. गयो भन्याको सुनिद त्यो कस्तो वा-
44. टोवाट गय निष्देद गरिराष विज्ञु कि-
45. मनिके मिति फाल्गुण सुदि ६ रो-
46. ज ५ मुकाम नुवाकोट माडि सुभूम

LETTER NO. 2

श्रीगौरवनाथ

स्वस्तिश्री गिरिराजभद्रामणिरनारायणप्रेयादिविविषिविस दानशि- विराजमानमानोत्तरश्रीश्रीमन्नाहाजिराजश्रीश्रीमन्नपृथ्वीनारायण- साहिदवानां सदासमरजयनाम

स्वस्तिश्रीरवीपमायोगमराजभारासामर्थ. इत श्रीदोल्ल्या देशावार प्रतापकेशु. आराश्रीपुर्वकपतिमिद्. यहाँ कुराल. तांहाँ कुराल चालिय. जेहिंते परमानन्द होइ. आगे यहाँको समाचार निको छ. उप्रात. तिथि प्रजापात होि. नालुम्पूर्भ मेहों शंकल भयो. तुमि मेरा हुहु भाव. तिथि नषु तिथि को म रह्सा गस्रंगा. पिछा दि आकी तरह गुर त ... को कुदुविष पर्यम दिक्नु तुमि नवायादिथितिथि जहोजात गस्रुला उप्रात गाल्हुज. तिथि दुग्गु चिलैंगु. हामिल्यूस सोभात भ मित्या र उनको रचा हामिले गरेको ५. विमिकिंक विज्ञु भाद्र वदि ५ रोज ५ मुकाम नुवाकोट सुभूम -----------------
LETTER NO. 3

श्रीमंगो

स्वस्तिश्रीगिरिराजचण्डवासरायणेश्वरीश्रीमत्यादिविविधविश दानकी—
विराजमानमानोन्नतश्रीमन्यहाराजापिराजश्रीश्रीमत्युवीनारायण—
साहित्यानां सदासमरित्विभिन्ना

भागे दोशाका देऊवानु प्रमाण प्रजाप्रति, शिष्मक महेस धिंसा विज्ञा.
मेरे पात भन्ना भया. घर घर बस्नी रहु मेरा. भाराधुल ताहि. जाप
तनसंग मिल्न भाणा ठिंगा धन खिज. केहि हैणन. तुलाराम पंडेजेज विस्तार
गरि पठायाको छ. चाहो मिल्न जाव. रुपमोदि
श्रीरुलाराम पंडेजको यथायोग्य

LETTER NO. 4

श्रीमंगो

1. स्वस्तिश्रीगिरिराजेन्द्रादि श्रीमन्यहाराजापिराज श्रीश्रीश्रीम—
2. तपस्वीनारायणसाहित्यानां सदासमरित्विभिन्नाम्
3. स्वस्तिश्रीखर्चपंडेत्यादि श्रीहरिदेव पंडित श्रीमतुदुम्नि
4. उपाध्याके. नयोतित. प्रणाम. पूर्वक परेत हैदू. भागे
5. ईशाँको समाचार भलो छ उप्रात. सानु श्रीहावृज्ञुछ्यो
6. र मीरज्ञुछ्यो हजार सूपाका सुना रह्याको छ त्यो
7. वैशिष्ट नागर पठाइदेट. उप्रात. बाघाका भोद्मा रविकुला
8. भोद्माले अधि ता जगातिकं नमिन्द प्रामुख गद्या. प—
9. छिड़ हाम्रो नालिकुल वेर्दा. जैसै उठ्ठिक हरितलम पिए-
10. दया तस्फारण ति हाम्रा साध्युरा हुन. हाम्रे प्रजा हुन.
11. तस्नूल हाम्री तस्नूल गर्दी. तस्नूल गर्दी कटिका देखा-
12. दुर महादेवलु हाम्रो छुक्लानु. यो चबक मेद्वा. देखा
13. साध्युरा लाई राष्ट्रक फेरि धाम्धुम होला उप्रात. तैहिंसा
14. कुरो कहन चाँडो वुबिक उत्तरा चाँडो पठाउ उप्रात. तै-
15. हा हाम्रा रूपमले जुना मिलन्या भया याँहारा रूपमा
16. भमा का छू. यो उत्तरा चाँडो गरि पठाउ र रु-
17. पया पठाईखुला जति भन्थी तति रूपमा भया-
18. का छुन. विलिन्यु कमिप्तक. मुहुजबाँगी पत्रवा-
19. लाको गरि मिति भाद्र वदि १२ रोज ५ शुभम्

LETTER NO. 5

...........................................................

स्वस्तित्री अभुदसि प्रणानके आराध्यिमुर्त रत्नमिद्य आहां कुरकल ताहां
कुरकल चाहिद जेद्वो सनेंद होइ. आगे आहांको समाचार भलो छ.
उप्रात भेल भन्याका परदेसि मेरा इह धी आज जसी गरि हुं भेले
काम पुनमाव. आफनु रद्धी भनि काममहं. जानिंश ताहां चर्चागरिर
यो काम पुनमाव. आफनु पत पीठ रनि पुरुणा गरुला. उचो तिष्ठो
रनि गरुला दुरो पुरो गरि काम गर. उत्तरा चाँडो पठाव. कमिप्तक
विलिन्यु. शाल्वन शुद्दि २ रोज ५ मुकाम कामृथ्या शुभम्
लि. स्वस्तिकृति सर्वियियोग्य निकृलुणगणरिष्ट राजभारारामवृष्ट
श्रीराजीविहन्तप्रयत्नके प्रणामपूर्दक पत्रमिदं अहि कुश ताहि कृभम
वाहित्य पेशिते चित्त वान्नद होइ. प्रति भायो. पत्राय पितित भयो.
अहि अनाहको समाचार भलो छ उप्रान्त आवृदा जीवपक्षाका काज
हवसु भनि आगृह गरि पठाउनुभेचछै भलो भाज गरि पठाउनुभेचछ.
परसय मारा अहि दंगु संसुको काज लागृदा तहाका काज बलियो
गरि दुन्या छैन. तहावाँट काज गृहा पतावाह हामिले हेरिरहोइनो.
जो होइ भाजला काज गरिल। दोहोरो काज गरदा पतावाह बलियो
काज दुगोरह. उप्रान्त गोर्हा चिल्दि कास्किले अहि ठाँउँ कहदि जानु छ
भनि अनाह हामा धनिःसिं चित्ति गर्याँ भनि लेखनुभेचछ। तहि भाषा
पामा भलो चित्ति गर्नुभेचछ योगै हो। कास्किलाई छोटिग गोर्हाले
काहा जानु छ। गोर्हालाई छोटिग कास्किले पनि कहदि जानु छ। अहि
कास्किलाका काज भनु तापनि काहुल कास्किलाका काज भने गोर्हाको
बनला। अहि गोर्हावाह काज भनु तापनि काहुल गोर्हावाह काज भने
कास्किलो बनला। परसय गोर्हाको र कास्किलो रेखाऊँ गर्नु ठुगो हो।
अहि काज भनु तापनि काहुल होला। कामले लामु छोटो पनि
लेखि मात्र भाइको काज चणाईमै भाकाछि। उप्रान्त काजिका कविला
भामुन्या भनि आगृह गरि पठाउनुभेचछ। हामिले काजिका कविला भामुदा
त काजिका कविला बाढीदिख आपसिया हुन लागु र काजिका कविला
भामुन तथा। एक त काजि हामिलित अनुचित गर्या र जानामहा पत्ना
दोहो काजिको र काजिका कविलाको फाटो पन्न्या क्यन गरी भनेर
काजिका कविला जान दिउँ। तहि भाइको पामा हुनुहुन्छ। तपाई
पनि हुनुहुन्छ। अहिवाह भलामानिस पठाउँ। तहि काजिको भुकाई
संपादक अन्धा पठाइदिनमुखः, किमिकरिग्रहणः, माघ वद ९ रोज ।
७ मुकाम नुवाकोट माठी रुपम्।

LETTER NO. 7

श्रीदुर्गापुरायाम
स्वस्तिश्रीमन्महाराजाधिराजक्षेत्र शंकरा
आगे भागवति नृत्य लतिमन नृत्य के यो लिखि। भादगाँवङ्को सीखमुल
नागोसिदारं रोपनी १२ लेखः दिहिशेत गोर्नएको लेख मुरि ८००
दिहिशेतः भादगाँव सहरं रोपनी ५० लेखः मथसेतः माफः गरिवक्ष्याँः
शाझः जान्द्य गरः दरदस्तुर भेट वलाम अनु सैपक परला। यो दस्तुर
तिमिहले पनि चंद्रावनपरला। इति सम्बत १५२३ प्रिष्न वदि १० रोज
६ मुकाम नुवाकोट राजपानी रुपम्।

LETTER NO. 8

..................................................
आगे विश्वमुकः। भवानीशंकर पौड्याल। चामू पौड्याल। विशेषकर पौड्यालके
tिमिहमाथिः। नेपालका भाजूङ्गे टीजिक नेवारका दुःख हजार महिमलिः
छझ्न भनि लाँआँखाँधुः। ति सूपाथाधे। सिक्का १२० शिवानन्द पद्धतिििे
सर्कार लागुः। सिक्का १२० विरु बदृवाहिते सर्कार लागुः। फिरि
सिक्का १० विरु बदृवाहिते सर्कार लागुः। वापि भाजूङ्गे टीजिक
नेवारका दुःख हजार महिमलिवासः। माफः गरिवक्ष्याः। अवड्राघाँ जैको
दावा थभा नास्ति। संवत १५२३ फागलुङ्गा शुद्धि १ रोज १ मुकाम
चाल रुपम्।
LETTER NO. 9

श्रीदुर्गासहाय

स्वस्तिश्रीवर्धनरायणशास्त्री श्रीकृष्णप्रसाद के मुख्यपाठक के प्रादेशिक पत्रद्वारा इन्होंने गुरुजी को लिखते थे। इन्होंने समाचार भत्तो छ. उप्रान्त, तिमी भन्ना वह मनुष्य हूँ। तिमी र हामी बलासंग गर्न्यों इच्छा छैले थियो। हाम्रा काफिका। लेखे बढै वन्यो। अब, तिमी बढावाला र काफिकहरू पेट मिलाइ। काठमाडौंका तथा काज पुस्तक, तिमी दांभु। चाँगु। पात्र। काठमाडौं। पर्वतको वृंदा। वृत्ता। वर्षात्मक जनमानुषालको पुस्तालित माफ। गरिकस्तुः किमिकिक आचिकन वटि 9 रोज 8 मुकाम किर्तिपुर शुभम्।

LETTER NO. 10

स्वस्तिश्रीमन्नराजाधिराजकस्य स्वका

आगे रामकृष्ण उपाध्याय पौड्डेलका छिम्याकृ वन्या भन्दा। नेपालकृ। हिन्दु हामी प्रकाश निर्वाचन निर्णय। रामकृष्ण उपाध्यायको छिम्याकृ। ताह्र विश्वामित्र मिछलिपार गरियो हामी देशामाछाँ आ। जांहाँ तरी चैतिका छै ताह्र बछु। क्लिता मासीयालको हो भनिन्र। र विश्वामित्र मिछ्रको क्षेरो हो भनकन पनि क्षेरो दावा। पक्का नास्ति सम्बन्ध १५३५ भाष। शुद्धी १ रोज २ मुकाम लुटिकोट शुभम्।
LETTER NO. 11

श्रीदुर्गा सहाय

स्वास्थ्य और आरोग्य

लेखक कुल तौहार कुलचार्य सेविते परम्परा में होई आगे आदायको
समाचार भलो छ उपराम्न तेठा चौतरीया मदेशमा राजा हुन लाग्या
भनि तेठा चौतरीनै तैले कल्पित भनिन्स भनि तैसित तेठा चौतरीया
भणझा गर्न बोझद छू गरे त्यो कुरा यस्तो हो तेठा चौतरीयाको
विपिनलसु पत्र वीणा [पत्र]करहरले मेरा जुर्मा चढाई पठाउदा
उसै चिठिका बुझे तेठा चौतरीया त राजा हुन लाग्याहो जा समाचार
सुनाइ भा क्या भन्नु भनी तेलाई तेठी चौतारीन्तिव नुवाकोट छदा क्लीया
पठायाको मैले हो न्यायमिदेले बरायाको तेलके हुकुम मान्नीपछि तैले आफना
उनिले भनि गयाको पनि होईन जोर गंगा गद्याको पनि होइन तेघ
वापरमा चौतरीयाको बादी उनेका विपिनलसु पत्र छदछ उद्घिन घटिने
क्लीया पठायाको हो तेघ कुरामा तलाई दोषा छैन उने हुदादा हुनु तसिन
तकरार गर्न आया भनि मोहर देखाईदिसु आफि कायल हुनु उपराम्न
पुरस्वर्णाको सरामाम नपुग्या हो मागिप्ता। विजेत्क वक्तिक
कार्तिक सुदिक्त १२ रोज़ ३ मुकाम भादगाईँ।
LETTER NO. 12

श्रीदुर्गासहाय

स्वस्तिका गिरिराजकृष्णदामणि नरनारायणोत्तरदिविविधिविंशु दावसिविराजमानोनन्त्रिशीमन्द्राजाधिराजकुमारिश्रीमन्न्द्रोदामकीसिकाहदेवेश्वु
वदास्परिविजयिष्ठु शारिरपुर्वक प्रतिमंद ईहा कुसल ताहा कुसल चाहिये
आगे आहाको समाचार भलो छ उप्रान्त कहर वस्त्यात्मायी दगा गन्धा
ढबल गर्भसे गरे दगा गन्धा शाया कसाई मागलासू यस कुरामा कहर साचो
छ तेले तेम्याको कागत र मानीसमात पक्ष वालिछ पुस्त्यायो आफना
हात मुखे भनि गरी केही विरायाको छैन पाका करौन्ये तदि कुट्टो
छू कुट्टो भयाप्राण्त छुप लागी रहिु

LETTER NO. 13

श्रीदुर्गासहाय

स्वस्तिका परमहंसपरिवारज्ञककलवचक्रकापीशवश्रीश्रीश्रीश्रीमुहूर्त-नायकेदेवेश्वः लि.

...............................................................

अहैवाट एक जना जेठा बुद्धा र थर भरसमित कालु पेडेकन पठाईँछी । आहैँ,
आफ़नु कृपा भया जुलासमं बनला । उप्रान्त, दराइयतिना आफ़ना मानिस
आइयुगयायुमा । तसै विचमहहँ । चिदा गरी भनि तयार भयूँी । मलाई
विस्तृत भयों र ठील भयों। परम पलाई संच भयों र बिदा गरौं भन्दा लम्बुड़ौं। तनहुँल घाट घाट बिदे बंद गरि छेक्या र मुखो पनि छिन दिनेनौं। अनु पाट बन्द गरिरहस्याच्छू। तयो हुनाले शाहना मानिसका ठील भयो। उप्रान्त, पूर्वका काजलाई शास्त्रीबाद बस्नौ फटामयेगयो। शास्त्रीबाद रिकार चढाईलक मिरातको काज गेमागयन। शाहना शास्त्रीबादले अरुणा संघ लाग्नो हजार एक वरी काटियो। सबै वार शैर नदीवन्तौं वगी मन्यो। सय चाप बहान बच्चा पकडिया। बत्ती मिरात फते भयो। मिरात फते भयाको पणधि एक चढाई पताहाको पहुँचला। उप्रान्त, पर्बतले कास्कीको कट्टा भन्नाको हान्न। जना ४० पर्वत्या काटियार्छू। जना ३२ कस्तवाली काटियार्छू। पादूदुरमहै। पर्वतले ठाना दिराष्टेछ। पादूदुर फुटयाको छैन। भाकी लम्बुडै। कास्कीको कट्टा भन्नाको हान्न। जना ५० पर्वत्या काटियार्छू। जना ३२ कस्तवाली काटियार्छू। पादूदुरमहै। पर्वतले ठाना दिराष्टेछ। पादूदुर फुटयाको छैन। भाकी लम्बुडै। कास्कीको कट्टा भन्नाको हान्न। जना ५० भाकी लम्बुडै। कास्कीको कट्टा भन्नाको हान्न। जना ५० भाकी लम्बुडै। कास्कीको कट्टा भन्नाको हान्न। जना ५० भाकी लम्बुडै। कास्कीको कट्टा भन्नाको हान्न। जना ५०
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श्रीदुर्गाकान्त
श्रीमोरणनाथ १

स्वस्तिश्रीपरमहंसपरिवारककवरक्काशीर्वरश्रीमन्महाराजाधिराज-
श्रीश्रीश्रीश्रीरीमुण्डनायकदेवदेवेशु वदासमर्विधिपिन्दु.

स्वस्तिश्रीरीगिरिजचन्द्रधामप्रियान्तरायोंत्यादिविलोकित दाबली-
विराजमाणानानानान्तरश्रीमन्महाराजाधिराजश्रीमहाराजेश्वरीनारायण-
साहवहारसम्सरकृतूदेवानां सदासमरविबिन्नामु साधारणदर्शनवतु-
प्रणामपूर्वकप्रज्ञधयु.

यहां कुछलां चरणारचिन्द कोम कुशल ने हमारे उचार होला.
आगे यहांसे समाचार भलो ४. उपन्यास कपालसिद्ध शास्त्रीपर उपाध्याय
आईपुन्यास. पत्राये मुहम्मादी विधि विस्तार चिनत गया. युन्यो. नाति
पैदा भयो भन्दा युन्यो र बहुते हर्षे भयो. १ का कपाल सदा बहुते
होला भनि ड्रूम आधियेः. गन्या गराउन्या भन्याका १ श्रीनाथजी
चूँ. उनका कपाले जन्म भयोयुेयो. उनका इच्छाले लिनभयो. यो संवारें
भन्याको वस्त्ते छ. इच्छा १ श्रीनाथजीको ५. रन्थु जापना पाले
आश्रीबाईंद वक्त्य अस जन्म दा पनि जन्मनु. जन्म्याका पनि
चिर्चिवींत हुनु आश्रीबाईंद वक्त्य जापनु. उपन्यास. जुल्ला. जागरकोट.
संग या गन्या निशास बहुत राखन्या. भनि ड्रूम आधियेः. वडिया खेर
जोत्या मानिस हामा यतावाट जुल्ला गयका थिया. वाइवाट पनि
महतारा १ वुढायोक १ द्रिज जना जुमलिया यहै आईर्द्वारछ। गोष्टी
घुमलाको एकत्र गराउँ। भलामाणिलिन आउँ। भन्न भावा रे महारावाट
पति महेश्वर पन्थको छोरो वीरभद्र पन्थकमेत जना आठ दरा माखिस
घुमा जान्न। तेछार भएर्द्वारछ। तेछि बाटो पठाँझे भन्दा चौविनिले
मुख्य माखिस पति जमा देखिन्न। माखिस जान दिया पति सौगात त्यो
बाटो जमा देखिन्न। भन्नासनिता हामी उहै थोको बाटो गरि जान्न।
आफना माखिस पति ठाडीरावट घुमा पढाउन्ना। घुमा बाजरकोटसंग
हामो बनाईवक्स्त्या। बाकी सल्याना बाजरकोटलाई पति ठाडीरावट
माखिस आउछः पुत्रिना पति भलामाणिलिन आउछः। उप्रान्त। फिराका
काजलाई तरवार हुँद मकही पढाई गर्नेयो। फिराको अन्वेषण वर्त्ता
पहाड थोप जपत थियो। आफना नाशीवाले घौँ फलत्य भयो।
मथेरामाहर्सँ नकाई नदी पहाडमाहर्सँ साधा झोलो तजको नदीको शीघ्र
लाग्नो। माखिस काटन पाड़ैथेनु। भाग्नो। कति मोगलानातिर गर्नो। कति
सुषिरमिति गर्नो। अरु भार बहुल्लभें जना ५५ वेसि काटिया। बाकी
सुषिरमधु० हामो या हुन लागिरेछ। या वन्यावेशि फिराकावर
भागीजान्याकन पकरेर हामिलाई सौपिदिन्याच। या नकन्या अष्ट हामिले
सुषिरमसंग लडूनपन्नाच। सुखम आझाला। आफना नाशीवाले कत्त्ल
गरिला। उप्रान्त। अव मैले दाँडू जान्या हो कि राज्यानाककया हो।
भनि हुँद नाखेछ। हामो हुँद छाको त। राज्यानामहर्सँ ठोरो यादर हुँद्या
भया दाँडुमहर्सँ देर यादर हुँद्या भया पति राज्यानैमहर्सँ ककया हो।
राज्यानाले कति याद नगच्या त क्या गरुँहोला। यादर नगच्या भया
छाडैपिला। वाकी महदसित हिजैदेशि हामिले आफना पौकमहर्सँ
चढायकै छ। उप्रान्त। हामा विश्वामित्र उपाध्याय गुणगानन्द आचार्य
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स्वस्तितश्रीराजभारायामर्थ श्रीगभिमानसिंह, पारंधभद्रारि, कीर्तिविंदिष्ठ श्रवण. वजी वानिज्ञानके शास्त्रीय. नूतने पत्रमिदं अनाह कुसल..कूसल चाहिये. आमे आद्यको समराचर भलो छ. दुग्रात. पत्र आमो अर्थ मालूम भयो. चौदम्बा गंधु तुल्यावजनको विस्तार. शी. कुशिल्यावाट. फोज हिड्याको. तिजी मुखलये. गंधु जाको ब्रूजो. सिखु. श्रीग्रामका. सुवा. सुवाले मानन आयाको. सवे विस्तार विंति गाँरि पठायाही. विधि विस्तार. सुन्दर इलुम्ना. ब्राम्पु. गम्म. बजी हामो फौज पुनर््यो त. अव. त्यो जुग्गा
छोटूछैन। वलिया गरि। गढ़ तांहि वनाउनाछौ। वनाव। बाँकै।
इसलिम्बा। चाँडापु। सम्म हामो अम्बल भयापछि। कनकापूर्व। तिष्टापरिवर्त
पनि अम्बल गरिहालन्याः हो। घटिना देखौ आफूँले गराइकन। आमद हुन्या
वडिया देखौ छोडनाको प्रयोजन केहि होइन। अम्बल गर्नैहो। तर। इसलिम्बा।
चाँडापु। संघ गरिहन पनि। गुमिमले। हामिकेंग। पाँछु गर्न पत्यो। कटकु
गर्नामहा पक्षेन त। कनका हेरि बुखी तर्कु। इसलिम्बा। चाँडापु। लिदा।
गुमिम सकिन्दो मा। या तोडिहार्यो त। शारिर। तेलितमहा। पनि।
चटकियो त। मपेत छोडन्या होिन। हिंदुपाैगो संघ। तिष्टासम्म चाँड़ी
गरिहालन्याः हो। यो काज दुम्कु तांहि। पथाको छ। उप्रात। गुमिमढीको
हाति राख्ने छ गरे। त्यो हाति। माहुलाई लामिर। बृहाको माहुल
क्षाकन। यस ५१५ रूपेय गोनाकिन्दो हो। हाति चोरि त्यातन पटाहान्या
हो। माहुले। चोरि त्यात भन्या त। केहि वार्षि। ति। माहुलक। कुल कविला
त। हाँ। देखि महान्युनौ। केहि क्वोलि गाटिवामा दिक्न पनि। त्यो काम
गर। उप्रात देखि देखिन। गुमिमढी राखलाई पायापछि। क्वल मरिजान्या
थियो। पाणियन। केहि बुकिले कोहि सिपाहि क्वायेर। हजार बाढ़ यस
क्वोलि। गर्भिरोपाय क्वोलि। हुन्या भया। तेसुलाई परातन्याः हो। तेसो
भयापछि। क्वल सव मरिजान्य। त्यो काम। भामणा गराउ। उप्रात।
बमुरुपका तरियानिका दिम्पुरका तरियानिका। रुपायले तांहिर्
सिपाहिहौँ को रूह। र। तांहिर् लगाउ। रूह। उठाऊना गर। बाँकि हजार
२००१ रूपेया चुढाइ पठायापछि। आङ्गुमा। क्वचगरि पठायाको छ।
पुगला। बाँकि। इसलिम्बा। चाँडापुदेखि। घुँटो। गम्भ गर्न जानौ। कहिन।
गुमिम भाङ्गुमा एकाठारु। बनाईक। कृत्त्व गर्नी क्वोलि बाँझो गर।
गुमिमका। पुराना देखिन। गया। माथि तासा। संग बिन्न जाला। र
उपल्ला मुषा तिर। लासाका देसमधा चार। अंगुल पनि संघ चापतु छैन।
प्रजालाई दुष्रै दितु पनि छैन। बुषिमका। पुरानो देसमधा पनि। जानु
छन। विषेषृ। आरिवन बर्द ३० रोज ५ मुराम काठमाडौं। रुभम् ————
श्रीवालकृष्ण जैछि। वीरभद्र उपाध्याके। प्रणाम।
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