

LIFE AND WRITINGS OF PRTHVĪNĀRĀYAN ŚĀH

BY

LEELANATESHWAR SHARMA BARAL

Thesis submitted for  
the Degree of Ph.D.  
University of London  
1964

**CONTAINS  
PULLOUTS**

## ABSTRACT

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 Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ Śāh's memoirs (Divya upadeś) 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 Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ 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 Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ'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 Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ'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 Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ 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.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am most deeply indebted to my supervisor Mr. T.W. Clark, Reader in Bengali in the University of London, who guided me and instructed me in the preparation of this thesis. His valuable guidance and instructions have enabled me to undertake and plan this study. I cannot find words to express my deep gratitude for everything he has done for me. I shall ever remain grateful to him.

I am also deeply obliged to Pandit Bāburām Ācārya of Kāṭhmāṇḍu for his kind help. It was he who during my stay in Kāṭhmāṇḍu (1951-56) accepted me as his disciple and initiated me into Nepalese history. He has been for me an infinite storehouse of inspiration, and every time I have approached him, personally or by correspondence, he has been kind enough to give me details of information I needed.

Some other Nepalese friends, particularly, Messrs. Sūryavikram Jñavālī, Lalitjaṅga Sijāpati and Bhavānībhikṣu, have been very helpful to me. I am obliged to Mr. Harka Bahādur Gurung and Mrs. Khadeja Patel for their assistance in the drawing of the maps I needed. I am also thankful to Prof. A.L. Basham, Prof. J. Brough, Prof. C. von Fürer-Haimendorf, Dr. P. Hardy and Prof. L. Petech for their valuable suggestions. Members of the staff of the Library of the School of Oriental and African Studies, and the India Office Library have been very kind to me and have provided me with every possible facility in the course of my research work.

Finally, I should be failing in my duty if I did not express my sincerest thanks to the authorities of the Indian School of International Studies, New Delhi, who obtained for me a Rockefeller Foundation grant and sent me on lien to study in the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London. I am particularly thankful to Dr. A. Appadorai, Director of the Indian School of International Studies, who granted me an extension of leave to enable me to complete my work in London.

## TRANSLITERATION TABLE

अ	a	क	k	ड	ḍ	ब	b
आ	ā	ख	kh	ड़	ṛ	भ	bh
इ	i	ग	g	ढ	ḍh	म	m
ई	ī	घ	gh	ढ़	ṛh	य	y
उ	u	ङ०	ṅ	ण	ṇ	र	r
ऊ	ū	च	c	त	t	ल	l
ए	e	छ	ch	थ	th	व	v or w
ऐ	ai or āi	ज	j	द	d	श	ś
ओ	o	झ	jh	ध	dh	ष	ṣ
औ	au or āu	ञ	ñ	न	n	स	s
ः	:	ट	ṭ	प	p	ह	h
ः	ḥ	ठ	ṭh	फ	ph	क्ष	kṣ
ॡ	ḥ						

The system of transliteration followed in this thesis is that of Prof. R.L. Turner in his Nepali Dictionary, excepting the use of ai and au for the Nepali or NIA diphthongs ऐ (ॐ) and औ (ॐ). If not followed by a vowel the velar nasal ङ has been represented by ng, but if followed by a vowel it has been represented by ng, e.g. Lamjung, Gurung, but Jayamaṅgal, Gaṅgā, etc. Where established in English usage certain spellings, e.g. Nepal, Pandit, Patna, Calcutta, Lucknow, etc. have been retained without diacritical marks. Nuwākoṭ and Makwānpur are the spellings largely used by the Nepalese and in maps too, so w and not v is used. In Nepali orthography the retroflex nasal is not used in the word Kāṭhmāṇḍu and hence the subscribed dot has not been used.

LIFE AND WRITINGS OF PRTHVINĀRĀYAṆ ŚĀH

Abstract		2-3
Acknowledgements		4-5
Transliteration Table		6-7
Chapter I	Introduction	9-16
Chapter II	Translation of <u>Divya upadeś</u>	17-55
Chapter III	Translation of Pṛthvinārāyaṇ Śāh's letters (Letters nos. 1-15)	56-81
Chapter IV	Genealogy of the Śāh kings of Nepal	82-121
Chapter V	Early career of Pṛthvinārāyaṇ Śāh (1722-42)	122-140
Chapter VI	First phase of Pṛthvinārāyaṇ's campaigns (1742-46)	141-172
Chapter VII	Second phase of Pṛthvinārāyaṇ's campaigns (1746-56)	173-200
Chapter VIII	Third phase of Pṛthvinārāyaṇ's campaigns (1756-67)	201-252
Chapter IX	Last phase of Pṛthvinārāyaṇ's campaigns (1767-75)	253-303
Chapter X	Pṛthvinārāyaṇ, Soldier and Statesman	304-329
Appendix A	Text of Nepali letters of Pṛthvinārāyaṇ Śāh	330-345
Appendix B	Bibliography	346-352

CHAPTER I  
INTRODUCTION

The primary source materials utililised in the preparation of this thesis are ascribed to Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ himself. As far as can be ascertained none of this material is in the hands of Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ 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 Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ became king of Gorkhā, and 1775, the date of his death.

The secondary materials consist of a biography, Pṛthvī-nārāyaṇ Śāṅko jīvanī, a chronology of the Gorkhā kings, Gorkhāvamśāvalī, 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. Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ'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  
<sup>1</sup>  
 published version.

The text falls into two quite separate parts. The first is historical, and contains an account of the campaigns of Pr̥thvīnārāyaṇ 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 Pr̥thvīnārāyaṇ's 'advice' would seem to account for the title under which the whole document has been published, Divya upadeś. 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 Pr̥thvīnārāyaṇ's wisdom in the conduct of his own military strategy and internal policy.

---

1. The manuscript is held by a private family in Kāthmāṇḍu. 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. Pr̥thvīnārāyaṇ's letters

Seventeen letters which have been ascribed to Pr̥thvīnārāyaṇ are extant. Thirteen of them have appeared in three publications, Saṃskṛtasandēśa, Itihāsprakāś, and Aitihāsik patrasaṃgraha. Two unpublished letters have been studied in photograph. These thirteen are probably in the form in which Pr̥thvīnārāyaṇ composed them. Two others, published by Imānsimha Cemjong, 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 Pr̥thvīnārāyaṇ 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 Itihāsprakāś. 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. Pr̥thvīnārāyaṇ Śāhko jīvanī

The text entitled Pr̥thvīnārāyaṇ Śāhko jīvanī is held in Vīrapustakālaya (Darbar Library) in Kāṭhmāṇḍu and was published in 1963 A.D. It is a

---

1. Kindly supplied by Bāburām Ācārya.

2. Kirāt-itihās, 2d. ed., Gangtok (Sikkim), 1952, pp.56-57,60.

3. Vol.II, pt.iii, pp.462-63, 466-67.

biography which contains a detailed account of the initial phase of Pr̥thvīnārāyaṇ'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 Nuwākot̥ 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. Gorkhāvamśāvalī

This is a chronology of the Śāh family of Gorkhā. It covers only the early career of Pr̥thvīnārāyaṇ. The narrative begins with the foundation of the principality of Gorkhā by Dravya Śāh, an ancestor of Pr̥thvīnārāyaṇ, in 1559. This is the only date that the Vamśāvalī contains. The narrative ends with the death of Narbhūpāl Śāh, the father of Pr̥thvīnārāyaṇ. His death took place in 1742, though this date is not given in the Vamśāvalī. 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 vaṃśāvalī<sup>1</sup> which is without title, though Hodgson calls it Gorkhāvāṃśāvalī<sup>2</sup>. It covers the same period as the Gorkhāvāṃśāvalī 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 vaṃśāvalī 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<sup>3</sup> 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.

3. HP, vol. 52, fos.108-16, 117-23, vol. 55, fos. 78-86

obtained from the grandsons of Kulānda Dhakāl, 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.<sup>2</sup> 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 Śūrpratāp Śāh.

(iv) A short manuscript consisting of two folios only which<sup>3</sup> 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, Pāre, 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.<sup>5</sup>

(vi) There are two vaiśāvalīs,<sup>6</sup> the text of which are respectively almost identical with those associated with the names of Kirkpatrick and Wright. These vaiśāvalīs 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, fo.167; vol.55, fos.7-9,23, etc.

6. Ibid., vol.50, fos.1 ff; vol.52, fos.7-46,<sup>36-107</sup>; vol.55, fos.6,10(reverse)-14, 32-70.

(vii) Other notes make reference to coins of the Malla and Śāh 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 Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ 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 Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ 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 Śaka 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<sup>1</sup>. I found that the method adopted by Pillai was most useful in my own calculations. A check was also made<sup>2</sup> of the system operated by Petech but this proved less satisfactory than Pillai's.

---

1. Robert Sewell and Sankar Balkrishna Dikshit : The Indian Calendar, London, 1896; Robert Sewell : Indian Chronography, London, 1912; Dewan Bahadur L.D. Swamikannu Pillai : Indian Chronology, Madras, 1911.

2. Luciano Petech : Mediaeval history of Nepal, Rome, 1958.

## CHAPTER II

TRANSLATION OF DIVYA UPADEŚ

Obeisance to Gaṇeśa<sup>1</sup>. May the goddess Kālikā<sup>2</sup> help (us).  
 May the three times glorious Siva<sup>3</sup> and Goraṣṇāth<sup>4</sup> help (us). May the  
 five times glorious<sup>5</sup> Prīthinārāyaṇ<sup>6</sup> help (us). A speech of the most  
 glorious<sup>8</sup> grand monarch before spiritual and religious priests, members  
 of the traditional<sup>9</sup> families, relatives, councillors and his personal  
 male attendant Surathisiṁ Rānā<sup>10</sup> and all those whom people everywhere  
 regard as wise elders, during his last visit to Nuhākoṭ<sup>11</sup> after the  
 conquest of Nepal of the three cities and the kingdom of the Lord of  
 the Hindus (Hindupati)<sup>13</sup>.

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 Pāṁḍuvās<sup>14</sup>. I was  
 married in Makuvānpur<sup>15</sup>. The bride was not handed over and so we went  
 to Makuvānpur with a view to bringing the bride back and seeing Nepal<sup>16</sup>  
 as well. After our arrival we made a demand on Dikbanda Sen namely that<sup>17</sup>

Quarrel with  
Digbandhan Sen,  
Prince of Makwānpur!

we would return with the bride provided he gave  
us the one-tusked elephant and the Navalāṣī  
diamond necklace,<sup>18</sup> 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 syāṣus<sup>21</sup>  
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  
Candrāgiri I enquired which territory was Nepal. Thereupon they pointed  
out to me Bhādgāu,<sup>24</sup> Pāṭan and Kāṭhmāḍāu<sup>25</sup> 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 to conquer  
the Nepal Valley

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 Nepāl I began to finger my moustache which  
was just as good as saying I wanted to become king of Nepāl 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,<sup>29</sup> 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

Consultations with  
military officers  
at Dhāding regarding  
invasion of Nepal

35

31  
32  
33  
34  
on the Cepyā embankment under cover of Liglig.  
They asked me their names. I wrote instructions  
to Raṇajit Basnyāt, Mānsim Rokāhā and Birbhadra

36

Pāṭhak 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 Nepāl had a desire to invade it. They agreed with  
my wish to invade Nepāl 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 Cāubisi frightened my elephants and attacked, they (the  
military officers) would make the Cepyā river flow with blood. We then  
rose from our secret consultations and went to Gorṣā. On arriving there

Meeting with  
maternal uncle,  
Prince Udyot Sen  
of Pālpā

37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
I met my maternal uncle who had been to visit  
Goraṣnāth. The meeting took place after he had been  
there. He had come to Gorṣā after his visits to  
Nilkaṇṭhā and Pasupati by way of Deughāṭ. I told him I had returned  
from Makuvānpur and having seen Nepāl 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 revela-  
tion during the Paṁcarātri and in his opinion it seemed that as we were

the reincarnation of the Pāṇḍuvās Nepāl would not be overthrown without another Kurukṣatra. He further pointed out that Lamjun 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, Ṣas, Magar and Ṭhakurī 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 Ṭhakurī 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 Ṣas was like using an Arab or Turkish horse, and that therefore to his mind the employment of the Ṣas would be expedient. He left after giving me instructions pertaining to various other matters. I followed those and accordingly went to Ripumardan Sāh,

Treaty of friendship  
with Ripumardan Sāhī,  
King of Lamjung

King of Lamjung. Our meeting took place at the  
ford across the Cepe river. Kālu Pāḍe 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 Pāḍe  
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 Bāisi

and Caūbisi would say. I found out that they also liked Kālu Pāḍe. They suggested that if he were appointed minister, he would certainly maintain cordial foreign relations and could be trusted to conduct business pertaining to home affairs. I had been on the point of appointing Birāj Bakheti as minister. But it was clear that Kālu Pāḍe possessed superior intelligence. That is why ministership was conferred upon him. Then I

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

wished to bring about a union between the Pāḍes and Basnyāts. I proposed to

Kālu Pāḍe the marriage of his daughter

with Kehersimha Basnyāt, son of Sibrām Basnyāt, and had it brought about also. Thus I effected a union between the Pāḍes and the Basnyāts. So when I had made the Pāḍes my shield and the Basnyāts my sword I undertook the invasion of Nepal.

I stationed Raṇajit Basnyāt, Mānsimha Rokāhā, Birbhadra Pāṭhak in the Gautānko birāi under cover of Liglīg. 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.<sup>59</sup> She took out from the inner fold of her garment something 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, Kulānanda, 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<sup>60</sup> 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 Simalcāur ridge, which was in the form of a square. Actually my whole heart was set on Nuhākoṭ.

Desire for the conquest of Nuwākoṭ

at Śincyāt on the pretext of cultivating land. I went regularly to the shrine of Indrāyeni at

the confluence of the Betrābati for prayer and worship, and crossed it by boat. In reality I meditated on the Goddess of Sallyānkoṭ and

Indrāyeni Bhāirabī. The Mahāmaṇḍal is, so to say, the co-wife of Nuhākoṭ. There was a Gyāmi Rānā at the Māhāmaṇḍal. I sent him a

Failure to persuade the Gyāmi Rānā of the Mahāmaṇḍal to come to his side

message to say that he was the Gyāmi of us all, and urged him to leave the Māhāmaṇḍal and come to me. He refused saying that he was indeed

mine, but that as he had taken the salt of Jayapragās 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 Indrāyeni. I heard somebody say that the

Conquest of Nuwākoṭ

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 <sup>the</sup> 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  
 Sibapurī and consolidated our positions there. Parāsurām Thāpā gave me

Intrigues of  
 Parāsurām Thāpā

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 Bāīsi and Caūbisī to attack me in the rear. I came to know  
 of this and enquired of his whereabouts. I heard that he was living in

Slaying of  
 Parāsurām  
 Thāpā's brother

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

Espionage in Nepal  
 and wooing of the people  
 to the east and west of it

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  
85  
friendly relations with the emperor of the sea of the south. But he is  
86  
very shrewd. He has been keeping Hindusthānā under his control and is  
87  
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

Defensive ; strategical places on the frontier. Put road blocks on the  
strategy ; different routes. One day (his) army will come (to attack).

Do not be aggressive. Rather allow it to enter. There will be heavy  
88  
fighting in the lower foothills. Treasure enough for five to seven  
generations will also be got. Our boundary will also extend as far as  
89  
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  
90  
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, Pālum, Dāpcā and  
91  
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.<sup>92</sup> I

Desire to draw  
up a social code

have also seen the social code drawn up by King<sup>93</sup>

Jayethiti Malla. I have also seen the social code<sup>94</sup>

drawn up by King Mahindra Malla. I had a desire that should God grant I<sup>95</sup>

also would draw up a code on similar lines for the twelve thousand<sup>96</sup>

Desire to cause to open  
trade routes through  
the Nepal Valley

(houses). I had a desire to close their routes<sup>97</sup>

in the east and west and bring the route

through Nepāl into operation and prescribe

a code for the peculiar duties to be performed by the various castes<sup>98</sup>

Opinion about  
the people of  
the Valley

themselves. This region of the three cities I find<sup>99</sup>

to be a cold stone. There is much outward show but<sup>100</sup>

nothing else. One who takes water from a well lacks<sup>101</sup>

in intelligence and is not brave either. There is outward show and

Preference of Dahacok  
to the three cities

nothing else. I had a desire to construct<sup>102</sup>

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.

103 104

Do not permit Indian traders to go beyond God̄ Prasāh. If

---

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

105

When We conquered the three cities, the Kirāyat yielding an income of

---

Economic measures		nine lakhs (of rupees) and the kingdom of the Hindupati Our clothing consisted of <u>Cyāgā</u> and <u>Pāgā</u> 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
-------------------	--	--

106

107

108

109

---

Collection of revenue by the Government itself		is called the treasure of the king is his subjects. Do not farm out the revenue.
--	--	--

110

Collection of revenue is a function of the government. So set up

111

government offices and audit their accounts annually. Do not permit

---

Austerity to be observed by soldiers and others		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
---	--	--

112

afford amenities of life, my sword will resound in all four corners of <sup>113</sup>  
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 <sup>114</sup>

high or low, and for the thirty-six communities. They must not abandon

Traditional observance of  
duties by each caste  
and community

their caste observances. They must be  
loyal to the salt of their lord. Do not  
deprive the descendants of Kālu, the

<sup>114a</sup> Kavardār, of Kavardārship. <sup>115</sup> Do not remove the descendants of Sivaram

Basnyāt from their responsibilities for foreign affairs in the south.

Do not remove from the descendants of Kālu Pāḍe their responsibilities <sup>116</sup> <sup>117</sup>

for foreign relations with Bhoṭ. Let the Pāḍes, Basnyāts, Panthas,

Authority to be  
given in rotation

relatives, councillors and Magars enjoy authority <sup>118</sup>

in rotation. These are my loyal servants, true

to my salt and bound by obligations to me. Do not kill them yourself

The way to deal  
with defaulters

<sup>even if</sup> 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 your-

self should kill them. That is why the king should not kill his servant

Maintenance of justice

at home. He should pass sentence with complete

justice. He should not allow injustice in the

country. Those who threaten justice are those who have bribed and take bribes.

Bribery to be  
completely eradicated

country. 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.

119

The essential thing required by a king is soldiers. Provide them with home and land. They will manure and irrigate it. In this way

Military reorganization

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  
120  
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  
122  
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-  
123  
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  
124  
tribes only: Śas, Magar, Gurum and Thakuri. One unit should not consist of men of only one tribe. Life will become very hard when fighting takes  
125  
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.  
126  
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 Gurūms 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

Imposition of ban on the entry of outsiders	of the Śas and Bāhuns of the east and west 129 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

Importance of the Umrāvas	Thums to high executive authority and have confirmed 130 them in it. I have given them drums and standards as 131 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, Liglīg 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 to be led into disloyalty by anyone's favour or obligation to anyone. Keep them loyal to their salt.

Pure coinage : 132 Ensure that the coinage issued from the mint is pure. In the Court appoint a Thakuri to the post of 133  
134 Diṣṭhā after trying him. Try a Magar and appoint him as Bicāri. Keep one 135

Judicial system : Paṇḍit in each Court and conduct its business in 136  
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, 137  
hermits, Sannyāsis and Brāhmaṇs. Disburse the 138  
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.

Arable land not to be left uncultivated :

Once he [Rañajitsimha Malla of Bhātgaū] rendered me assistance. He sent for me but later on he betrayed me. After that with great

Betrayal of Rañajitsimha Malla : difficulty I ensured safety of my rear and besieged Nepāl. He called naked ascetics from the south to help Jayaprakās Malla. I did not let them enter Nepāl but

Slaying of the Nāgās : slaughtered them inside the seven villages. Nabāf Kāsmeri Śān invaded Makuvānpur. I defeated [his army] with six

Defeat of Nawab Mir Kasim of Bengal : score swordsmen, routed him and came back after driving him beyond our boundary. Hādī Sāheb

Defeat of Hardy : invaded Siduli Fort with three or four platoons. There I defeated him, captured some flint-lock guns and returned. Three

Appointment of three Muslims as Adjutants : Muslims from Laṣanāi had come to Nuwākot 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, Seṣ Jarbar, Mama Taki Bheṣārsim as Ajitans. Thus I had my soldiers trained as riflemen.

According to the [history] books of Nepāl, it appears that it was to be under the suzerainty of the Turks, Magars and Mugals. 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 Mugals I disbanded

Formation of Companies : 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

Stationing of Companies  
at each fort :

equal of one thousand men. Station one Company <sup>151</sup>  
at each fort and divide them among the Garṣās

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

Austerity measures :

forgetful of their duties in rooms full of

paintings and where there are music, drums and

<sup>152</sup>

Sitārs. There are great temptations in music. Wealth also is spent  
lavishly. It is they who carry away secrets of the country also. Conse-  
quently enemies will intrigue. Let none indulge in musical exercises.

Policy of the  
closed frontiers :

Let none permit the movement of these people into  
the Hills. Well, you may call one or two for the

<sup>153</sup>

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]. <sup>154</sup>

Textual annotations

1. The Hindus commence every undertaking, whether religious or secular, with an invocation to Gaṇeśa, the god of wisdom and obstacles, and the son of Śiva and Pārvatī. Gaṇeśa has the power to remove obstacles and is hence invoked at the commencement of all sorts of compositions with the usual formula svasti śrī Gaṇeśāya namaḥ.
2. Otherwise Kālī, a name of Durgā, the goddess of terrific power. Durgā, the daughter of Himavat and wife of Śiva, is also called Umā, Pārvatī, etc., and is the mother of Kārttikeya and Gaṇeśa.
3. 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 ṣ is often substituted for the palatal sibilant ś
4. Written for Gorakhnāth, the legendary eponymous deity of Gorkhā (vide GVI, pp.41 ff). In Nepali orthography the cerebral sibilant ṣ was usually substituted for the voiceless aspirated velar kh.  
 There are evidences to believe that the Śāh kings of Gorkhā were primarily devotees of Śiva (vide IP, vol.I, p.40, col.1; GVI, 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.
5. 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 Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ'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 of 1768 Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ's name appears with two śrīs, presumably to conform to the practice of the Malla kings of the Nepal Valley. In all Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ's letters his name appears with three śrīs excepting in one where it has five (vide letter no. 3). The use of five śrīs (śrī 5) for the names of the Śāh 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 (Baṛā Gurujyū) appeared with six śrīs as is also the practice when addressing one's parents in letters.

6. Erroneously written for Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ.
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.I, 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. Nārāyaṇdās Arjyāl, Gaṇeś Pāre, Sarveśvar Khanāl, Bhagīrath Pantha (modern Pantā), Keśava Bohrā and Gaṅgārām Rānā, who were members of these families, had rendered signal assistance to Dravyaśāh in conquering Gorkhā in 1559. Of these the first four were Brahmans 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 Cāutariyās (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 Surattasiṃha Rānā, a Kapardār (keeper of the royal wardrobe and jewelry and manager of the royal kitchen) during the time of Pratāpsimha Śāh, King of Nepal (1775-77), as mentioned in the Hodgson Papers (hereafter abbreviated HP), vol.51, fo.91.
11. Misspelt for Nuwākoṭ. There are two famous Nuwākoṭs in Nepal. This under reference is the eastern, 20 miles north-west of Kāṭhmāṇḍu, situated

on a ridge towards the south-west extension of the Dhaibung mountain. Prthvīnārāyaṇ captured it in 1744 (vide p.166) as a first step to entering the Nepal Valley. His last visit to Nuwākōṭ perhaps took place in 1774 (Divya ūpadēś, hereafter abbreviated DU, Text, p.1,n.7. References to the translation are mentioned as DU, Tr.).

12. These are Kāṭhmāṇḍu (Kāntipur, Kāṭhmāḍāū in Nepali), Bhāt-gāū or Bhād-gāū (Bhaktapur) and Pāṭan (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 Kāṭhmāṇḍu Valley.

13. The Sen kings of Makwānpur were so styled after Harihar Sen, who flourished probably in the last quarter of the sixteenth century (Sūrya-vikram Jñavālī: Prthvīnārāyaṇ Sāh, pp.130,131; also G.V.Y., p.79). The references here is to the Sen rulers of Caudaṇḍī and Morang who belonged to the collateral branches of the Sen house and they also used Hindupati as part of their titles. Prthvīnārāyaṇ conquered Caudaṇḍī and Morang in 1773 and 1774 respectively.

14. Prthvīnārāyaṇ 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 Sāhī (otherwise Raṇarudra Sāhī), who was also the eldest amongst all the legitimate and illegitimate brothers, was a person of importance.

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

15. Misspelt for Makwānpur. The territory of this state lay in the plains extending from the Citāun 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 Makwānpur was contiguous with those of Pāṭan and Bhāt-gāū (vide also S.C. Sarkar, 'Some interesting documents', Bengal past and present, vol.XLIII, pt.i, January-June 1932, p.49). Prthvīnārāyaṇ was married to Indrakumārī, Princess of Makwānpur, probably in 1736/37. He conquered this state in 1762.

16. It was perhaps according to the custom of Makwānpur that the bride was not sent with Prthvīnārāyaṇ 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 Makwānpur. He was younger than Indrakumārī (HP, vol.51,fo.100).

18. Navalākhī 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 Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ 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 Makwānpur, Hemkarṇa 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 Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ returned to Makwānpur to bring Indrakumārī. He remained there for one year. His brother-in-law, Digbandhan Sen, and Kanakśiṃha Bāniyā, Minister of Makwānpur, 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 Cisāpānīgarhī, flows past Heṭāūrā (15 miles from the source), then the north-western frontier outpost of Makwānpur. The river then takes a westerly course and joins the Nārāyaṇī 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 Pyūṭhānā (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, Bhānu Arjyāl and Kulānanda Dhakāl, were prominent in Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ's times. Astrologers are invariably Brahmans,

either Upādhyāyas or Jāisīs. The former are Brahmins par excellence, and the latter inferior since they are descendants of an Upādhyāya widow kept as a wife by an Upādhyāya Brahmin, or of an Upādhyāya girl kept by him as a wife without marriage. Previously Upādhyāyas and Jāisīs were equal in social grade. It was Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ who demoted Jāisīs to be lower in grade than the Upādhyāyas as a punishment for their intrigue against him. From then on Jāisīs were debarred from officiating as priests (vide pp. 195-96). So by profession they generally became Jāisīs, otherwise called Josīs or Jośīs (< Sk. iyotiṣa-, 'astronomer'). It is not known whether Kulānanda and Bhānu were Upādhyāyas or Jāisīs. But since they were astrologers they were called Jāisīs, the title denoting their profession rather than distinguishing their grade.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Both, atī, 'ascetic', and atit, '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. Śarasvatī, the goddess of learning.

30. Modern spelling Thānkoṭ, a hamlet situated near the foot of the Candrāgiri mountain. It is 6 miles south-west of Kāṭhmāṇḍu.

31. Modern spelling Kalherī or Kallerī, a ford on the left bank of the Būrhī Gaṇḍakī river and near the confluence of this river with the Triśūlī. It is situated on a ridge and about 30 miles to the west of Kāṭhmāṇḍu via Dhunībesī, and then formed Gorkhā's frontier with the territory of Paṭan, which lay to the south of the Triśūlī.

32. Modern spelling Dhāding, a village about 12 miles north-east of Kalherī, and about 30 miles north-west of Kāṭhmāṇḍu. This was part of the territory of Gorkhā since the times of Rām Śāh. It is nearly equidistant from Gorkhā and Kāṭhmāṇḍu.

33. Modern spelling Cepe, the river which formed Gorkhā's frontier with Lamjung. Issuing from Sirhāncok, north-west of Gorkhā, and flowing 16 miles west of it, the river later joins the Marsyāngdī 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 Darāūḍī river.

35. Raṇajit Basnyāt (modern spelling Basnet) belonged to the Śrīpālī Basnet clan of the Khases. Many members of this clan were in Pṛthvī-nārāyaṇ'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 Jaṅga Bahādur Rāṇā was Prime Minister of Nepal (1846-77). Nothing is known about Mānsīṃha Rokāhā (now also called Rōkā or Rokāyā) and Vīrbhadra 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 Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ was performed here (vide pp. 131-32).

as/ 37. I.e. Bāisī (wrongly written here Bāīs) and Caubīsī, 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 Gaṇḍakī 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; Jñavālī: Pṛthvī-nārāyaṇ Śāh, pp.16-20, Ācārya (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 Vaiśāvalīs. Thus although the numbers may have been greater or less, the terms Bāisī and Caubīsī remained traditional for these two groups. After becoming king of Nepal in 1769 Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ turned his attention to the conquest of these states, which he could not accomplish. They were annexed to Nepal during the regency of Rājendralakṣmī (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 Gorkhā formed by the Cepe river.

39. I.e. Gorkhā, the ancestral seat and capital of the Śāh kings of Gorkhā. It is 52 miles west of Kāṭhmāṇḍu by way of Nuwākoṭ 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. Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ was born from his sister Kauśalyāvātī and thus Udyot Sen was his maternal uncle.

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

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

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

44. A village near the confluence of the Kālī (Kṛṣṇā) Gaṇḍakī with the Nārāyaṇī river. It is 52 miles north-west of Kāṭhmāṇḍu. Here is an image of Śiva, called Mukundeśvar, set up by Mukunda Sen I, King of Pālpā, who perhaps flourished in the sixteenth century (Ācārya, 'Tanahūko Sen-vaṃśa', p.66). After the subdivision of Pālpā, Deughāṭ 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 Bhīṣmapañcak, the religious festivals lasting five days and nights during the dark fortnight of Kārtik (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 Čaubīsī. 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 Śāh, 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 Thakurīs claim to be of the pure Rajput origin and regard themselves superior to the Khases and Khatriīs, the latter progeny of Brahman fathers and Khas mothers (vide pp. 83, 84, 89). There is no ethnical evidence to support this claim. In features the Thakurīs 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 Pr̥thvīnārāyaṇ. 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 Pr̥thvīnārāyaṇ but in all probability Sāhī, the title of the royal house of Lamjung, a suggestion which is supported by the title Sāhī used by the descendants of this house even today (vide HP, vol.51, fo.94, where Sāhī is written for Virmardan, the son of Ripumardan; also IP, vol.I, pp.67-68). Pr̥thvīnārāyaṇ 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 Khatriī. He was sixth in line from Gaṇeś Pāre, one of the close associates of Dravya Śah, 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 Pr̥thvīnārāyaṇ 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 Gorā ('fair') Pāre; the latter being born of a Magar mother, and hence illegitimate, was of a dark complexion. Vamśīdhar was his real name. He was however nicknamed Kālu ('blackie') and thus his line of family became known as Kālā ('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: Śāntiparva, 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 Pr̥thvīnārāyaṇ (IP, vol.1, p.125, col.2).

55. The Basnyāts (modern spelling Basnet) became conspicuous in the time of Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ, the most prominent among them being Śivarāmsimha and his sons. Śivarāmsimha was the first Basnet to hold a high rank. He became a Sardār (military commander). He died in Sāgācok in the course of the second invasion of Cāgu in 1755. His second son Keharsimha (written here Kehersimha), who rose to be a Kājī, 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 Cāubīsī. Śivarāmsimha's third son Abhimānsimha became a Sardār. He was mainly credited with the conquests of the east, Cāudaṇḍī and Morang. Śivarāmsimha's fourth and the youngest son Dhāukalsimha (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 Cāudaṇḍī and Morang in 1773 and 1774 respectively. No doubt the Pāres and Basnets, particularly Kālu Pāre and Śivarāmsimha Basnet and their sons, played conspicuous roles in the realization of his ambition. In Nepalese accounts we have a galaxy of men such as Vaṃśarāj, Dāmodar, Raṇasūr (sons of Kālu Pāre); Nāharsimha, Keharsimha, Abhimānsimha, Dhāukalsimha (sons of Śivarāmsimha Basnet); Raṇakesar, Gajkesar, Karvīr, Raṇajaṅga, Raṇadal (sons of Dāmodar Pāre); Jaharsimha, Kīrtisimha, Bakhtavārsimha (sons of Keharsimha Basnet), etc., who served Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ and his successors in various capacities to build modern Nepal. Jaṅga Bahādur, the Rāṇā 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 Goplāṅg, Bhusuṇḍī, Choprāk, Āppīpal Bhanjyāṅg, Mīrkoṭ, Gāīkhure, etc. It lay between the Cepe and Darāūḍī 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 gāuṭāṅko birāi 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 birāi in this way, considering Gorkhā's vulnerability from the side of Lamjung. But an Abstract Noun (birāi) 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 √birāunu, a Verb, meaning 'to commit a mistake; to make land fit for agriculture', and hence gāuṭāṅko birāi means 'pasture-land made arable' (cf. gāuṭān < \*goṭṭhān < Sk. gosthāna-, '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 Ṭār in Nepali. On account of the tableland Sallyān has another name Sallyān Ṭār.

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

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

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

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

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

64. Shrine of the goddess Indrāṇī Bhairavī (written here Indrāyani 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 Kāthmāṇḍu, 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 Gyāngmī) is a branch of the Rānā Magars to which Jayanta Rānā, the person referred to here simply as Gyāmi Rānā, belonged. Narbhūpāl Śāh 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 Jayaprakāś Malla, King of Kāthmāṇḍu (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.

67. Misspelt for Jayaprakāś Malla.

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 jeṭhī 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 (Prṭhvīnārāyaṇ Śāhko jīvanī, p. 42) suggests that Dalmardan went into the action described in the text without his brother's knowledge and achieved distinction by decapitating Śaṅkhamāṇi 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 jeṭhī 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 Śaṅkhamāṇi Rānā. (vide p. 166).
72. In 1744 (vide p. 166). Prṭhvīnārāyaṇ however does not mention his first unsuccessful invasion of Nuwākoṭ which took place in 1742 (vide pp. 144-45).
73. I.e. Kakanī and Śīvapuri. 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 Kāṭhmāṇḍu. The highway to Nuwākoṭ passes through it. Śīvapuri, which Prṭhvīnārāyaṇ 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 Triśūlī river, and are joined by lower ranges to Maṇicūḍa mountain and Mahādeva Pokharī in the north-east of the Valley.
74. I.e. Paraśurām Thāpā, the minister of Raṇajitsimha Malla, King of Bhātgāū (1722-69). For some time a close ally of Prṭhvīnārāyaṇ, Paraśurām 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 biṣi ('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 Jayaparakāś Malla and the Čaubīsī kingships was Gorkhā (vide also Prṭhvīnārāyaṇ Śāhko jīvanī, p. 28).

77. I.e. Pokhrā, the place situated on the western bank of the Setī Gaṇḍakī river (also called Pātālgāṅgā). This place is celebrated for its lakes. It is about 30 miles west of Gorkhā, and was then in the territory of Kāskī, one of the Cāubīsī kingships. in the Cāubīsī.
78. I.e. Jhāgal 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 koṭā sān (modern spelling koṭākhān) which is a compound of koṭ, 'weapon', and khān, '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 Pokhrā was then a flourishing market-place, it is quite probable that Jhāgal Gurung carried the fish, apparently a delicacy for the hill-people, pretending to sell it and thus keeping his identity and mission secret.
81. Vide pp. 191-93.
82. Vide Letters nos. 2,3,5,9; also IP, vol.II, pt.iii, p.463 (Letters no. nos. 2,6).
83. The narrative ends here and what follows was perhaps written later as it relates not to campaigns but to Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ'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 Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ 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. Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ 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. Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ 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. Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ was always suspicious of the East India Company because of their assistance to Jayaprakāś against him in 1767 (vide pp. 254 ff).
87. I.e. Hindusthān (India), so called because of its being the land of the Hindus ( < Hindu + sthāna- , '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 Bhīmsen Thāpā (1804-37) the Nepalese dreamt of extending their frontier to the Ganges (Ācārya (ed.): Purānā kavi ra kavita, 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 Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ 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 Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ 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 Kāṭhmāṇḍu. For Candrāgiri vide n.23. Mahādeva Pokharī, 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 (pokharī) 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. Pālunḡ, a ridge (elevation 8,490 ft.) having the hamlet of the same name, is 35 miles south-west of Kāṭhmāṇḍu. Through this passes the Trisūlī river. Dāpcā is a strategical 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 Kāṭhmāṇḍu. 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 Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ when he advanced towards the Valley after the occupation of Nuwākoṭ (Kirkpatrick, op.cit., p.140).

92. He seems to be the first king of the Bāīsī and Caubīsī to have introduced a code for social and administrative reforms. This code is known as Rām Śāhko thiti (q.v. GVI, pp.25-33, 39-40). By this he introduced administrative and judicial systems, pañcāyat (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 niyā 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: Nepāl upatyakāko madhyakālīn 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 ṭol (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 Śāh (1777-1804) and Rājendravikram Śāh (1816-46) did prescribe their codes which however were largely based on Rām Śāh's code (vide HP, vol.60, fos.159-64, vol.59, fos.62-65).

96. During Rām Śāh's time Gorkhā 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 Gosāīs (Hindu mendicants) carried on their trade with Tibet. The western route was perhaps the trade route to Tibet via Mustāng (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 Sāhko jīvanī, p.30). Some Brahmans 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 Brahmans and Khases. Ṭhakurīs and Gurungs were the minorities, although his brothers and some others, all of whom were Ṭhakurīs, were none the less associated with his campaigns. Having become the master of the new regions comprising the states of Makwānpur, the Nepal Valley, Čaudaṇḍī 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 respects: 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 hygenic and so they suffered from diseases. Their poor physical state made them mentally unhealthy. Pratāp Malla, King of Kāṭhmāṇḍu (1641-75) had constructed some panālīs (artificial reservoirs fed by water running in from a canal) (T.W. Clark, 'The Rānī Pokhrī Inscription, Kāṭhmāṇḍu', 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 Kāṭhmāṇḍu. It controlled routes to Tanahū and the Nepal Valley from that quarter. Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ laid special emphasis on strategy and since he had still to deal with the Cāubīsī, and danger from Tanahū 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 Kāṭhmāṇḍu 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 Pāṭan had a tradition of being a constant source of troubles to its kings, Bhātgāū was a place where subjects were oppressed, and Kāṭhmāṇḍu always gave troubles to the ministers. Therefore he preferred Kāṭhmāṇḍu 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 Kāṭhmāṇḍu in the Tarai district of Parsā which owes its name to the shrine of Pārasnāth (a name of Śiva) (Ācārya, 'Bhagvān Pārasnāth', Śāradā, 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 Pratāpsimha Śāh used to reside here during the

winter (Hamilton, op.cit., p.196). Kinloch occupied it during his retreat from Hariharpur 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 Rānā Prime Minister Candra Shamsher constructed in 1927 another easier route, partly by railway and partly by track, from Bīrganj to the Kāṭhmāṇḍu Valley.

105. I.e. Kirāt, the land of the Kirātī (in pedantic speech Kirāt) tribesmen of the Rāī and Limbu septs. The land stretches from the Sun Kosī 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) Naulākḥ Kirāt is mentioned as a synonym of Mājḥ Kirāt (central Kirāt, i.e. the region between the Sun Kosī 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 Śāh 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 Rānā 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. 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 Pāṭan 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 barna (varṇa), 'community' is wrongly made for the caste, and that of jāt (jāti), 'caste', for community. In Hindu society there are four varṇas (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.

114a. i.e. Kapardār.

115. The post of Kapardār (keeper of the royal wardrobe and jewelry and manager of the royal kitchen) was introduced by Rām Śāh 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 Khārka, who was mentioned for the last time in the invasion of Bhātgaū in 1769 (HP, vol.51, fo.221). He was father of Ravisimha Khārka who was alive when B.H. Hodgson was British Resident in Kāṭhmāṇḍu (HP, vol.74, fo.101).

116. There is no documentary evidence of the descendants of Śivarāmsimha 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.I, 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 Bhoṭ 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 Bhoṭ are Chākṛā Bhoṭ, Mustāng Bhoṭ, Manāng Bhoṭ, Lārke Bhoṭ, Rui Bhoṭ, etc. These are in central Nepal and west of Rasuā beyond which the regions inhabited by the people of Tibetan origin are not called Bhoṭ, e.g. Helmu, Solu, Khumbu, Pharak, etc.

117. For the Pāḍe (modern spelling Pāre or Pāṇḍe or Pāṇḍeya), Basnyāt (modern spelling Basnet) and Magar vide notes 51, 55 and 48 respectively. The Panthas (modern Panta) are either Brahmans or Khatrī Chetrīs (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 Śāh 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. Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ was quick to realize the importance of military strength unlike Rām Śāh 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. Subedārs were governors of provinces. Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ 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 Paḡarī (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 Paḡarī meant higher ranks, e.g. commissioned officers. Army lists of this period (vide HP, vol.71, fos.29-32) distinguish between Paḡarī and Huddā, two groups of ranks. In the former there were excepting in Letar (? Artillery) Company, Kaptān (Captain), Kummedān (? Commandant), Subedār, Kharīdār (otherwise Khardār), Mejar (Major) Ajīṭan (Adjutant), Kotyā (otherwise Kote) and Jamādār. The Letar had two more, Vicārī in place of Mejar who was above Jamādār, and Vaidya (Physician) below Kotyā. Ācārya (ed.): DU, p.29, thinks that the seven ranks mentioned in the text are in this order: Jamādār, Sārjang (Sergeant), Nisān (Ensign), Ajīṭan (Adjutant), Bhāṭ (Minstrel), Purohit (Priest) and Bājānāikyā (Bandmaster). But in the Nepalese accounts of Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ's time we find references only to Umrāva, Sardār, Ajīṭan, Mīr, Bhāṭ, Nagarcī (Drummer), Bānādār (Musician), Huddā and Sipāhī.

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 Huddā which means corporal senior to the private. In all probability the Huddās were non-commissioned officers, for in HP, vol.71, fos. 71-77, Huddā meant junior officers below Jamādār, i.e. Havaldār, Amaldār, Khalāsīs (coolies), Pīpās (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 Gorkhā, and also probably by those of Lamjung and Kāskī. Earlier in Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ's army we do not find them holding any prominent ranks. That is why perhaps he did not mention them along with the Bāhun, Khas, Magar and Thakurī 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 Makwānpur, Cāudaṇḍī 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 Śāhko 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 Nuwākot (the territory under Kāṭhmāṇḍu) from the east, and Dhāding guarded it from the invasion of Tanahū 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 murīs or measuring 240 ropanīs. In the Hills the land is measured in terms of the gross annual produce of crops. 1 ropanī = 4 murīs, 1 murī =  $72\frac{1}{2}$  sq.yds. 1 ropanī of land produces about 800 lbs. of crops in one year. In Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ'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 khāngī (< 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 birtā (freehold land).

132. According to a treaty made by Mahendra Malla, King of Kāthmāṇḍu (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. Kāthmāṇḍu made a great deal of profit out of this transaction. The privilege, rather monopoly, of supplying coins to Tibet was also subsequently shared by Bhātgāū 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 Kāthmāṇḍu and Bhātgāū, Jayaprakāś Malla (regnal years 1735-68) and Ranajitsimha Malla (regnal years 1722-69), became debased. When Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ conquered Kāthmāṇḍu 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 Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ, 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. Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ 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

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 Diṭṭhā.

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 Ṙṭhvīnārāyaṇ'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 Ṙṭhvīnārāyaṇ mentions both together.

139. The name of Raṇajitsimha Malla does not appear in the text. But from the context it is clear that Ṙṭhvīnārāyaṇ refers to him. At first an ally of Ṙṭhvīnārāyaṇ, Raṇajitsimha later on turned hostile to him realizing his intention of conquering the Nepal Valley. It was not Raṇajitsimha but Jayaprakāś who had sent for some naked mendicants to drive away Ṙṭhvīnārāyaṇ from the Valley, though from what Ṙṭhvīnārāyaṇ says it is probable that Raṇajitsimha 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 Siddiq. It is difficult however to reconstruct the third name since it ends in -sim [? simha], a title not used in Muslim names. Viqār Siddiq could have been vulgarised as Bheṣārsim. 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, Tilaṅgā, a name conventionally used for rifleman. The British officers of the East India Company trained their riflemen first of all

in Telaṅgānā in South India. Hence they were called Tilaṅgā by the Indians. The word was also used by Pr̥thvīnārāyaṇ for the riflemen (Ācārya (ed.): DU, p.30).

146. From the statement of Pr̥thvīnārāyaṇ 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 Pr̥thvīnārāyaṇ 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 Pr̥thvīnārāyaṇ 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 Holī). 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 PṚTHVĪNĀRĀYAṆ ŚĀH'S LETTERS

LETTER NO. 1<sup>1</sup>

This letter brings my due respects to Hari Paṇḍit.<sup>2</sup>

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 Kutī;<sup>3</sup> and that the Tibetans<sup>4</sup>

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

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

3. Modern spelling Kutī, a pass (13,009 ft.) into Tibet, called Nylam or Nilam in Tibetan language. It is roughly 90 miles in the north-east of Kāṭhmāṇḍu by way of Sākhu. It was occupied by Pratāp Malla, King of Kāṭhmāṇḍu (1641-75), and from then on formed the frontier of the kingdom of Kāṭhmāṇḍu with Tibet. Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ 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 Kutī (Perceval Landon: Nepal, vol.II, p.36). Nepal's present day frontier is at Kodārī, nearly 27 miles south of Kutī.

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;<sup>1</sup> that no agreement having been arrived at you left (them) and came to the octroi post at Khāsā<sup>2</sup> 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 Dhebās.<sup>3</sup> 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 ( $2\frac{1}{2}$  tolas = 1 oz.).
  2. South of Kutī and close to it. It is now in Nepal.
  3. Dhebā, 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<sup>1</sup>. 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<sup>2</sup> and Candrabhān Paṇḍit. I shall have approved what they will tell you.<sup>3</sup> 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.<sup>4</sup> 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 Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ captured Kutī. The day of the week corresponds with that of 28 February 1754.

1  
LETTER NO. 2

2

This letter brings my blessing. to the Pradhāns of the  
country of Dolaṣā.<sup>3</sup>

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.

4

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 Goraṣnāth.<sup>5</sup> If you do not come in spite  
of my having given you my word of honour, I shall confiscate your  
property.

6

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

1. IP, vol.I, p.91,col.2.

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 Jayaparakāś. It was captured by Pṛthvinārāyaṇ a little before the recapture of Nāldum in 1754 (vide p. 188).

4. A place on the eastern perimeter of the kingdom of Kāthmāṇḍu. It was captured by Pṛthvinārāyaṇ 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 Goraṣnāth 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 Pāṭan. Pṛthvinārāyaṇ had, as is apparent from this letter, captured them some time ago (vide p. 182).

to write to the wise.

Dated Nuwākot<sup>1</sup>, Wednesday, the fourth day of the dark fortnight of Bhādra. May it be auspicious.

---

LETTER NO. 3<sup>2</sup>

To the people of Dolaṣā 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<sup>3</sup>. Come to terms with him quickly. May it be auspicious.

Tulārām Pāde<sup>4</sup> also sends his greetings.

---

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

2. Sāṁskṛtasandeśa, 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, Hanūmāṇdhokā. (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<sup>1</sup>

This letter brings my due respects to Harideva Paṇḍit<sup>2</sup>  
and Jamadagni Upādhyā.

News here is good.

There is with Ohābjyu Junior, and Māujamjyu,<sup>3</sup> gold to the  
value of one thousand rupees. Ask them for it at once and send it to me.

At first the Bhoṭiyas<sup>4</sup> of Khāsā and the Bhoṭiyās<sup>5</sup> of Rabigu<sup>6</sup>  
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 Bāburām Ācārya of Kāṭhmāṇḍu (Nepal).
  2. No further references to these persons are known. Probably the senior addressee was Hari Paṇḍit 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  
 1  
 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  
 2  
 Bhādra. May it be auspicious.

---

1. Earliest coins of Prthvīnārāyaṇ, 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 Prthvīnārāyaṇ 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, 'Śrī Śrī Jayaprakāś  
 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 Prthvīnārāyaṇ'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.

'The/  
 740)

1  
LETTER NO. 5

2  
This letter brings my blessing to Abhudsi Pradhān.

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.

3 4

You who are known as Bhamḍels 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.

5

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

---

1. Aitihāsik patrasaṅgraha, p.23.

2. ? Abhyudayasīmha.

3. Text Bhamḍel, modern Bhārel, 'store-keeper, treasurer', not Bandya as queried by Lévi, Le Népal, vol.I, p.228.

4. Perhaps Abhyudayasīmha Bhārel was a resident of Kāthmāṇḍu which then was not conquered by Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ and hence the addressee is mentioned a paradesi (i.e. paradeśī), belonging to a foreign land'.

5. Kābhryā (modern spelling Kābhre) was captured by Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ on Śaka 1681 Māgh badi 9 Friday (= 11 January 1760) (vide p. 218). Hence in all probability the letter was written in the following Śrāvaṇa of Śaka 1682 whence the equivalent Christian date is 13 August 1760.

1  
LETTER NO. 6

2

This letter brings my regards to Rājīvalocan Paṇḍit.

Everything here is all right and I hope everything is well  
3  
there. If that is so I shall be very happy. Your letter has arrived.  
Its contents have been understood. News here is good.

4

You have sent your order for the operation to be undertaken  
5  
during the next Jīvapakṣa. It is good of you to send it to me. But  
6  
when we begin here our operations to take Cāgu and Sākhu, our plans  
there will not be prosecuted strongly. If operation is undertaken in

1. Aitihāsik patrasaṁgraha, pp.19-20.

2. There were two Gaureśvars associated with the court of Gorkhā:  
i) 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 Kāskī. 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 patrasaṁgraha, *ibid.*).

6. The two places in the north-east of Kāṭhmāṇḍu 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.

no/

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 Kāskī] there that if Gorkhā is in trouble, Kāskī 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 Kāskī. Kāskī also has nowhere else to go except Gorkhā. Although Kāskī 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 Kāskī. So to bring about an agreement between Gorkhā and Kāskī 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<sup>1</sup> 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.<sup>2</sup> 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.

2. I.e. Kājī, 'minister'. For the possible person vide p.66, n.1.

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 Kāji and send him here.<sup>1</sup> This is all I need to write to the wise.

Dated Nuwākot Valley, Saturday, the ninth day of the dark fortnight of Māgh.<sup>2</sup>

---

LETTER NO. 7<sup>3</sup>

To Bhagvati Ban and Lachiman Ban.<sup>4</sup>

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

- 
1. Most likely the Kājī is Pṛthvinārāyaṇ's brother Śūrapratāp Śāh (vide pp. 250-52).
  2. The date works for 4 January 1766 (vide p.251).
  3. IP, vol.I, p.90, col.2.
  4. Ban is one of the ten orders of the Śaiva sect traditionally alleged to have been founded by Saṃkarācārya (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).
  6. Misspelt for Bhādḡāū (modern Bhātḡāū).
  7. i.e. Gokarna, place to the north of Bhātḡāū and near Cāgu and Sākhu.

levies, <sup>1</sup>bheṭi and <sup>2</sup>salāmi. These two you will also have to pay.

Dated <sup>3</sup>Nuwākot, the Capital, Friday, the tenth day of  
<sup>4</sup>the dark fortnight of Pauṣa Saṁvat 1823. May it be auspicious.

---

LETTER NO. <sup>5</sup>8

To <sup>6</sup>Bhavānīśaṅkar <sup>7</sup>Pāḍyāl, Cāmu Pāḍyāl and Bireśvar  
Pāḍyāl of Bisamṣu.

We made a deed that you would pay us the 2,000 Mahindramali <sup>8</sup>  
which you owed to <sup>9</sup>Bhājudeu Ṭaḍhik Nebār of Nepal. Out of this sum  
<sup>10</sup>120 sikkās have been deposited in the royal treasury through Śibānanda  
Paṇḍit, 120 sikkās have been deposited through Biru Ṣaḍkā, and again

- 
1. A present in cash offered to the god or to a senior official at the time of interview ( < bheṭ, '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.
  5. Aitihāsik patrasaṅgraha, p.26.
  6. Nothing further is known about these persons who, as the names suggest, were Pāḍyāl (also Pāḍrel) Brahmans. They had perhaps helped Prthvīnārāyaṇ in his campaigns against the Nepal Valley.
  7. I.e. Bisankhu, a place to the south-east of Pāṭan. It is also known as Bisankhunārāyaṇ 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).
  9. Probably Kāṭhmāṇḍu.
  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 Mahindramalis to Bhājudeu Tāudhik. Henceforth none shall have any claim on that sum.

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

LETTER NO. 9

This letter brings my regards to Kīrtirājananda 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 Kāthmādāū. We have (as a mark of favour) exempted you from paying anything as pledged by you

(vide HP, vol.51, fo.107).

1. Perhaps Virbhadra Upādhyāya, 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. Sāmskr̥tasandēśa, year 1, no.9, pp.5-6.

5. Quite possibly a Brahman resident of Pāṭān (Sāmskr̥tasandēśa, *ibid.*, p.7).

6. Perhaps Kājī Dhanavanta, the Chief Minister of Pāṭān, who secretly introduced Gorkhalese force into Kīrtipur (vide pp. 246-47).

7. The persons are not known.

and your lands at Sāṣu, Cāgu, Pāṭan, Kāṭhmāḍāũ 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  
<sup>1</sup> fortnight of Āśvin. May it be auspicious.

---

LETTER NO. 10<sup>2</sup>

Royal grant of His Majesty the King

Yesterday we captured Dhandattyā Nebār,<sup>3</sup> a neighbour of  
 Rāmkr̥ṣṇa Upādhyā Pāudyal,<sup>4</sup> and handed him over to Biśvāmitra Miśra.  
 Today Biśvāmitra 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 Biśvāmitra Miśra.

Dated Luṭikoṭ,<sup>5</sup> Monday, the first day of the bright fortnight  
<sup>6</sup> of Bhādra Saṁvat 1825. May it be auspicious.

---

1. Kīrtipur was captured by Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ on 14 March 1766 (vide p. 247), n.4) and Kāṭhmāṇḍu 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 Kāṭhmāṇḍu. The day of the week of the letter works for that of 16 September 1767, a fact which supports our assumption.

2. Aitihāsik patrasaṁgraha, 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 Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ in 1765 (vide p.242).

6. The date corresponds with 12 September 1768.

1  
LETTER NO. 11

2

This letter brings my blessing to Abhimānsiṃha.

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.

3

I hear that the Jethā Cāutariyā is wrangling with you because you told his wife you were sorry that he (Jethā Cāutariyā) was going to be the king of the lowlands. The fact is this. An official letter of the Jethā Cāutariyā 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 Jethi Cāutārni 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

1. IP, vol.I,p.12,col.1.

2. Third son of Śivarāmsiṃha Basnet, a Gorkhalese commander (vide p.42, n.55).

3. I.e. Mahoddāmkīrti Śāh, Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ's brother who, it appears, was at this time hostile to him. Of Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ's brothers Mahoddāmkīrti and Dalmardan were Cāutariyās (q.v.p.112,n.1), the former being elder to Dalmardan was called Jethā (senior) Cāutariyā and the latter Kānchā (junior) Cāutariyā (Ācārya, 'Basnyāt patrāvalīko ṭippanī', 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. Keharsīṃha Basnet, elder to Abhimānsiṃha Basnet.

7. Feminine of Jethā Cautariyā, i.e. the wife of Mahoddāmkīrti Śāh. The modern spelling is Jethī Cāutārni.

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 Puraścaraṇa<sup>1</sup> are inadequate, ask for more. This is all I need to write to the wise.

Dated Bhādgāū, Tuesday, the twelfth day of the bright  
<sup>2</sup>fortnight of Kārtika.

---

<sup>3</sup>  
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  
<sup>4</sup>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.

LETTER NO. 13<sup>1</sup>

This letter brings my highest regards to His Holiness  
 Monk Bhagavantanāth.<sup>2</sup>

.....<sup>3</sup>                      .....                      .....                      .....                      .....

We shall send Kālu Pāṃḍe<sup>4</sup> from here with one senior elder  
 and (some) members of the traditional families.<sup>5</sup> He will arrive in due  
 course. By your blessing we shall come to an agreement with Jumlā.<sup>6</sup>

Your men arrived here after the Dasāi<sup>7</sup>. 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.

1. IP, vol.I, p.151, col.2.

2. A monk of a monastery in Rānāgrām in Sallyānā. 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, Kāṭhmāṇḍu, Banepā, etc. Bhagavantanāth seems to have been greatly revered by Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ. It was this monk who by his counsels influenced Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ from 1763. He became one of his most trusted political advisers (vide pp.75-76).

3. The text has details of Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ's titles.

4. I.e. Kālu Pāre, a Brahman officer and not the celebrated Kālu Pāre who was a minister of Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ (vide p.41, n.51; also pp.50, n.116). The Brahman Kālu Pāre 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 Bāisī.

7. Modern spelling Dasāi, 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 Katyām in the dominion of Kāskī. Some 40 men of Parvat were killed. Some 32 men of Kāskī 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 Mugjā. On another it advanced to attack Thāk which is in the dominion of Kāskī. Kāskī repulsed the troops of Lamjung from Thāk

---

1. For the land of the Kirātas vide p.49, n.105.

2. Text, Vallo Kirāt, <sup>i.e. Kirāt,</sup> '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 Limbuvān being mostly inhabited by the Limbus, other Kirāta tribesmen.

3. One of the states in the Cāubīsī (vide p. 123, n.1).

4. Locality unidentified.

5. Another state in the Cāubīsī. [It]lay between Parvat and Lamjung.

6. A place about 3 miles to the west of Kāskī.

7. Modern Mājā, a place about 15 miles to the east of Kāskī and about 25 miles to the west of Lamjung.

8. A place about 10 miles to the north-east of Kāskī and about 3 miles to the north-west of Mājā.

and 80 men of Lamjung were killed. Fighting took place at Mugjā also. Lamjung repulsed the troops of Kāskī. Seven men of Kāskī including ..... Sāh, King of Kāskī, were killed. Six or seven men of Lamjung were killed. Moreover, Kāskī is threatened with invasion. Our Kājīs Cautārās are marching to its <sup>2</sup> <sup>help</sup> with troops to Gorkhā. We shall be operating in the Rāginās area after the <sup>3</sup> 4th of Māśīr ..... <sup>4</sup>

---

LETTER NO. 14 <sup>5</sup>

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.

6

Śaśidhar 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 Sāhī (q.v. p.64, n.2).
  2. Modern Cautariyā, (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 Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ was siding with Kāskī 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 Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ.

1  
grandson and were very pleased. You further say that we shall always  
enjoy prosperity by the grace of the Lord Goraṣṇāth. It is the Lord  
Goraṣṇāth 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. 3

You advise us to show 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 Budhāthoki, have arrived here already.  
They have come to suggest (to me) a treaty of unification between  
Gorṣā 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 Caubīsī will not let even  
prominent persons pass through. Even if they let men pass through, they

---

1. I.e. Nagendra Śāh, eldest son of Pratāpsimha Śāh, who died in his infancy (Ācārya, 'Śrī 5 Rājendralakṣmī Devī', Rūparekhā, year 5, no.6, Kāthmāṇḍu, 1963, p.10).

2. The name is not mentioned in the letter but the space is left blank with a numerical symbol 1 which refers to the name Śrī Goraṣṇāth which is written at the top. For this practice vide p.59, n.5.

3. The use of high grade honorific expressions shows Prthvīnārāyaṇ's profound respect towards Bhagavantanāth.

4. States in the Bāīsī. Jājarkoṭ lay to the south of Jumlā.

5. Khas clans.

6. I.e. Gorkhā.

7. Implying the place, i.e. Sallyānā, where Bhagavantanāth lived, or any other place where he was then.

will not let them take presents with them. For this region they will go by our usual route through Bhoṭ<sup>1</sup>. I pray you to send your men to Jumlā from there and make Jumlā and Jājrkot favourably disposed towards us. One more point about this. Some men will go from here to Salyānā and Jājrkot<sup>2</sup> and some gentlemen will also go to Pyūṭhānā.

You kindly sent a sword for our successful invasion of the land of the Kirātas. All the territory of the Kirātas which lies in the midlands, the Hills and in Bhoṭ has been conquered by your blessing. Our boundary has now<sup>4</sup> extended as far as <sup>the</sup> Kankāī river<sup>3</sup> in the midlands, and the Sābhā<sup>4</sup> 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 Suṣim<sup>5</sup>. Some 85 odd were killed in the forests. Moreover, negotiations for friendly relations with Suṣim are afoot. If a treaty is drawn up (the King of) Suṣim will arrest the absconders from the land of the Kirātas 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 Bhoṭ, the northern territory of Gorkhā.
  2. Sallyānā, beside Salyānā (modern Sallyān) and Pyūṭhānā (modern Pyūṭhān) were the eastern states in the Bāīsī, Pyūṭhānā being the easternmost beyond which was the region of the Caubīsī.
  3. The river which flows to the east of Ilām.
  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<sup>1</sup> or stay in Śalyānā.<sup>2</sup>

We realize that although you may get more respect in Dāṅga than in Salyānā 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.

Our men, Biśvāmitra Upādhyāya and Gaṅgānanda Ācārya, have gone to Sukhim. Bṛhaspati Paṇḍit has gone to Purāṇīyā.<sup>3</sup> Kirīṭmālī has gone to Patna.<sup>4</sup> Bāikuṅṭha Upādhyāya has gone (to the Court of) Nabāb Sujāuddāulā.<sup>5</sup> We have had men stationed at all these places for some time now. Dinānāth Upādhyāya is already on his way to Calcutta.<sup>6</sup> He will reach there in a few days. Moreover, Bhim Giri's disciple, Rāj Giri, will go to Lāsā as well.<sup>7</sup> 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. Biśveśvar Upādhyāya and Śibā Ghimiryā are stationed there. We have also so far been humouring Kāskī. Our Bīrbhadra Thāpā is stationed there. Two Brahmans from Kāskī are here. Our relations with the rest of the Cāubisi are

1. Modern spelling Dāṅg, the district between Sallyānā and Pyūṭhāna.
2. I.e. Sallyānā.
3. I.e. Purnea. Probably Bṛhaspati was sent to the English Supravisor.
4. English Chief at Patna.
5. Nawab Wazir of Awadh.
6. President and Governor of the Calcutta Council of the East India Company.
7. After the conquest of the Nepal Valley Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ expelled the Gosāī and Kashmiri Muslim traders who carried on trade with Nepal and Tibet. Bhīm Giri and Rāj Giri, who were Gosāīs, seem to have been Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ'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 Upādhyāyā. This is all I need to write to the wise.

Dated Kāṭhmāḍā<sup>1</sup>, Friday, the sixth day of the bright fortnight of Bhādrapada. May it be auspicious.

---

LETTER NO. 15<sup>2</sup>

This letter brings my blessing to Abhimānsimha, Pārath Bhadārī, Kīrtisim Śavās and Bali Bāniñā.<sup>3</sup>

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 understood. We have come to know of all the details you have despatched to

183.

---

1. The whole land of the Kirātas, Vallo Kirāt and Pallo Kirāt (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 Kirātas was not conquered. Only Mārgaśīrṣa 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 Lalitjaṅga Sijāpati, a Nepalese now residing in Banaras (India). The letter is also published in IP, vol.I, p.13.

3. The Gorkhalese officers sent for the conquest of the land of the Kirātas.

us: your plan to make a fort at Cāudaṇḍa<sup>1</sup>, the despatch of troops from Kührilyā<sup>2</sup>, the arrangement of duties to be performed on all the three fronts and the receiving of submission from every Subā<sup>3</sup> of the Limbus and Śrṅgyā<sup>4</sup>. The extreme point to which our troops have advanced up to Islimbā and Cāmthāpu<sup>5</sup> 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 Kankā<sup>6</sup> in the west and the Tiṣṭā<sup>7</sup> 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 Suṣim 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 Kankā. If alarmed at the capture of Islimbā and Cāmthāpu, Suṣim annuls the treaty and is later on

---

1. I.e. Cāudaṇḍī, 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 Pṛthvinārāyaṇ in 1773.

2. A place situated on the left bank of the Tamar.

3. The title of the headman of the Rāī 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. śrṅga, 'top or summit of a mountain, peak, crag' (MW)).

5. Places to the north of Ilām and situated in the Singlilā range forming the boundary of Fallo Kirāt with Sikkim.

6. I.e. Kankāī (q.v. p. 76, n. 3), which then in its upper reaches also formed the boundary between Morang and Sikkim.

7. I.e. Tiṣṭā, 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 Tiṣṭā, the boundary of the Hindupati. Remember this is the duty which needs fulfilment there.

I hear that Buddhikarna 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 (Buddhikarna 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 Cāudaṇḍī.
4. The Tarai part of the newly conquered Cāudaṇḍī state. Ambarpur was the headquarters of the Tarai region of this state.
5. The Tarai part of Morang 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 Islimbā and Cānthāpu for further conquest. Should Suṣim attack, make one stronghold and make arrangements to destroy the attackers utterly. If you cross the original boundary of Suṣim, 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 Suṣim. This is all I need to say now.

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

Respects to Bālkr̥ṣṇa Jāisī and Bīrbhadra Upādhyā.

---

1. Sikkim was then regarded to have been a vassal of and subject to Lhasa (i.e. Tibet). Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ 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 Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ 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 Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ (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. Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ 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 Islimbā and Cānthāpu or across the Tistā.

4. The date corresponds with 5 October 1774. •

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

## GENEALOGM OF THE ŚĀH KINGS OF NEPAL

Sāi, Śāi, Sāhi, Śāhi, Sāhā and Śāh are variant forms of the title used by the Kalyāl rulers of the Karnālī region now in western Nepal. It is possible that Sāhi is derived from sāi (< Sk. svāmin) which the rulers of this region used as their title from the fifteenth to the seventeenth century. Sāhi, 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 Āṭṭīkā rulers of Bhīrkoṭ, Garāhū, Dhor, Nuwākot, Satahū, Kāskī, 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 Bhīrkoṭ, Garāhū and Dhor are called Khāns. Later on the rest of the Āṭṭīkā rulers took Sāhi as their title. The descendants of the ruling houses of Kāskī and Lamjung are as yet called Sāhis. The title Sāhi 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 Sāhi, 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., Trisūlī Gaṇḍakī, Būrhī Gaṇḍakī, Kālī or Kṛṣṇā Gaṇḍakī, Setī Gaṇḍakī, etc.

5. IP, vol.I,pp.67-68.

6. Seen in his letters (vide Appendix, pp.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', JRS, 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<sup>1</sup>. This distinction tended to disappear later. The royal house of Nepal today is called Śāh. Some descendants of the previous ruling houses of Jumlā, Jājarkoṭ, Achām, Dullū, etc., in the Karnālī region, also use Śāh as their family name. All the ancient ruling houses of the Karnālī and the Gaṇḍakī regions are called Ṭhakurīs, the tribe<sup>2</sup> being regarded as the seniormost Kṣatriya clan of Nepal. The commoner Ṭhakurīs who were earlier called Sāhīs do not generally write Śāh for themselves. Since in modern times rulers of Nepal and members of their family are called Śāh, 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 Śāh kings of Gorkhā. Nevertheless although they contradict one another in many places, they all agree in attributing the origin of the Śāhs 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 Rājās (Bāburām Ācārya, 'Śrī 5 Rājendralakṣmī Devī', Rūparekhā, Year 5, no. 6, Kāṭhmāṇḍu, 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 Ṭhakurīs. Next in social status are Rānās. Lower than the Rānās are Khases who are also called Chetrīs. The last are Khatrīs, being the issue of Chetrī concubines kept by Brahmans.

of these chronologies have been published. Some of them are in Kāṭhmāṇḍu in the Vīrapustakālaya (Darbar Library) and in the private library of the late H.H. Kaiser Shamsheer Janga Bahadur Rana, others in the private possession of individuals, Pandit Bāburām Ācārya and Sūryavikram Jñavālī,<sup>1</sup> 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 Śāh kings of Nepal were descended from the Sisodiyā Rajput clan of Chitor, later<sup>2</sup> of Udayapur. The earliest of the genealogies of the Śāh kings were composed in Sanskrit verses by Citravilās and Dharaṇīdhar Śarmā respectively, during the times of Rām Śāh, King of Gorkhā (1609-36), in whose court the authors appear to have resided.<sup>3</sup> Curiously enough, though these writers were contemporaries, they present two different versions of the origin of the Śāh family. The genealogy given by Citravilās gives the founder as Jillarāj,<sup>4</sup> 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,<sup>5</sup> Ayitavum, 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 Yaśobrahma onwards, whereas Dharaṇīdhar gives Śāh as the title of Pūrṇa and his son Rām.

4. There are various spellings of this name in the Nepalese accounts: Jillarāj, Jillarāī, Jillarāya, Jillarāye, Jilla, Jillaha, etc. Rāj, rāī, rāya, rāye, lex., 'king'.

5. Other spellings, Ajita, Ayutam, etc.

whose son Varavumba became king of Gadḥājambīra. In the latter genealogy<sup>1</sup> the name Jillarāi, who became king of Chitor, comes seventh in line from Ayitavum. Both Citravilās and Dharañīdhar, 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 Gaurīśaṅkar Hīrācanda Ojhā,<sup>2</sup> and the other in the Vīrapustakālaya, wherein although the names of the founders of the Śāh dynasty are different, and some names of the earlier kings mentioned by Ojhā are not found in the cognate Nepalese genealogy,<sup>3</sup> 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 Sisodiyā 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<sup>4</sup> chronology in Nepali is later than the two genealogies in Sanskrit referred to above, the initial half<sup>5</sup> 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 Gadḥagīr (lex., 'fort Gīr') from where a branch of Rajputs migrated to Fort Chitor. It could be Ajayameru, a city founded by Cāuhāns in Rajputana during the first half of the twelfth century (Bāburām Ācārya, 'Doṭīko aitiḥāsik jhalak', Hāmro Nepāl, year 1, no. 6, Jhāpā, Nepal, 1953, p. 13). Gadḥājambīra is perhaps Gadḥa Ajambīra, the latter derivable from Ajayameru.

2. Udayapur rājya kā itihās, vol. I, p. 87.

3. Sūryavikram Jñavālī: Dravya Śāhko jīvanacaritra, pp. 4-5, Parīśiṣṭa (kha).

4. IP, vol. I, pp. 137-43.

5. Ibid., pp. 141, col. 1, and 143, col. 2.

of a scientific analysis. In it the person from whom the Śāh dynasty of Gorkhā descended is stated to be one Narjīt of Ujīr [? Ujjain] in the country of Maḍuvār [? Mārwar]. 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 Moghal Emperor of Delhi, invaded Chitor in 1567 when Mahārāṇā Udayasiṃha<sup>1</sup> was ruling, and that Jayamal and Pattā, the two Rajput heroes, fought heroically for the Mahārāṇā. Jayamal was wounded by Akbar and died while<sup>2</sup> 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. Udayasiṃha 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 antiquities of Rajasthan, ed. William Crooke, hereafter abbreviated Annals, vol. I, pp. 383-84).

2. Cambridge History of India, vol. IV, Mughal Period, Cambridge, 1937, pp. 98-99; also V.A. Smith: The Oxford History of India, 3d. ed., p. 342; Tod, *ibid.*, pp. 380-82.

two successors ruled over Dullū and the twenty-third, Manirājā Sāhī, went<sup>1</sup> to Arghā from where his grandson Adidam Sāhī migrated to Nuwākoṭ. 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,<sup>2</sup> 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 Hīrā 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 Kalāi<sup>3</sup> in Soru Darā<sup>4</sup> of Jumlā. He lived in the court of Malāibham, ruler of Khāṛācakra. With the assistance of some Brahmans, Balirāj became king of Jumlā, which was then ruled by Jakti-simha of Jaktipur and comprised Jumlā, Sijā and Lāmāthārā. The genealogy mentions the year 1404 as the date when Balirāj established his capital<sup>5</sup> at Sunārgāū 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 Triśūlī 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 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: Sāvarni, 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: Āngirasa, 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 Prthvīnārāyaṇ does not mention the names of the first twenty-two successors of Hīrā Sāhī but only that of the twenty-third, Manirājā Sāhī, who migrated to Arghā. If we give an average of twenty years to each generation and make a calculation back

---

1. IP, vol.I, pp.103-9, 112-13.

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, Gāviṣṭhira and Paurvātitha (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 Paurvātitha (John Brough: The early Brahmanical system of gotra and pravara, pp.140-44).

4. IP, vol.II, pt.iii, pp.349, 361, 367.

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 Gorkhāvamśāvalī<sup>1</sup>, which begins from Dravya Śāh and ends with the death of Narbhūpāl Śāh, father of Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ, in 1742. It includes the early career of Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ 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 Gorkhāvamśāvalī 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, Koṭā, Bundī, 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 Sisodiyā clan, and that they obtained an augmentation of the praśasti of the Śāh kings from the Sisodiyā ruler of Udayapur. This praśasti included the title of girirājacakracūdāmaṇi (the crest jewel amongst the cycle of the kings of the Hills) which was also approved by the emperor<sup>2</sup> of Delhi when he was requested to do so by the Gorkhalese emissary.

---

1. Kāśī, 2009 V.S. (= 1952/53 A.D.).

2. G.V.Y., pp.33-38. The chronology means that girirājacakracūdāmaṇi 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 (Sūryavikram Jñavālī: Rām Śāhko jīvancaritra, p.21).

It is very strange however that no contemporary Muslim historian refers to this event,<sup>1</sup> 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<sup>2</sup> a number of social reforms previously unheard of in Nepalese society. It is possible that he himself adopted the praśasti to commemorate his<sup>3</sup> achievements.

---

1. Neither is there any mention in the accounts of Mewar about this emissary. Ojhā says that from the times of Mahārānā 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 G.V.Y., 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 Garhwāl (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 Jumlā) which seems to have been founded in 1470 (IP, vol.II, pt.iii, pp.391, 393, 398).

The Gorkhāvamśavalī 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 Itihāsprakāś<sup>1</sup>. There is a chronology in the Hodgson Papers<sup>2</sup> 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.<sup>3</sup> Nevertheless it is said that the chronology was sent to Hodgson from the royal palace of Nepal.<sup>4</sup> It cannot be definitely said which of the two, the Gorkhāvamśavalī 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

1. Vol.I, pp.121-22; vol.II, pt.iii, pp.419-25.

2. Vol.51, fos.15-107. 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 Kāthmāṇḍu 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- vali'), 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.96.

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 Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ 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 Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ, 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 Bhīrkot. Jayanta Khān, one of his four sons,

---

1. IP, vol.I, pp.121-28, 161-63.

2. A detailed account of events after 1813, particularly of Nepal's expansion into Kumāū, Garhwāl 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 Nuwākot to be its ruler. He was succeeded by Vicitra Khān and Jayadeva Khān. The latter's son took the title of Sāhī. Kulamaṇḍan, the successor<sup>1</sup> of Jayadeva Khān, became king of Kāskī. 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<sup>2</sup> of the names, all agree with the line of successors and the principal events from Yasobam Sāhā, i.e. Yaśobrahma Śāh<sup>3</sup> onwards.

By the end of the eighteenth century when the Śāh 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 Sisodiyā clan of Udayapur in order to establish their superiority over the other rulers of the Nepal Himalaya, since amongst the Rajputs clans the Sisodiyā is regarded as one of the purest and the superior. Another chronology composed in Sanskrit verses by Gaurīdatta<sup>4</sup> 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, Dharaṇīdhar, Bhīmsen Thāpā, etc.

3. The chronology names all the kings of Gorkhā from Kulamaṇḍan to Pṛthvinārāyaṇ 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 Pṛthvinārāyaṇ's step-brother (IP, op.cit., p.124, col.2), Ranasimha Sāhī, Pṛthvinārāyaṇ's illegitimate son (ibid., p.128, col.2). Vide also HP, vol. 74, fos.97-98, for this distinction.

4. HP, vol.26, fos.116-17.

reign of Gībānāyuddhavikram may have been compiled for the same purpose. While augmenting and closely following the chronology by Citravilās, 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 Jillarāj. But the author does not say where the kings from Jillarāj onwards were domiciled. Gaurīdatta seems to prefer the chronology by Citravilās to that by Dharaṇīdhar perhaps for the reason that the former described the origin as from the house of Chitor, which the Śāhs could use as a support to their claim, whereas the latter simply mentioned the ancestral home as being Fort Jambīra from where Jāi Khān, the ninth in line from Jilla, entered the Hills to settle subsequently at Lasarghā<sup>2</sup> 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. Jāina Khān in the chronology by Gaurīdatta.

2. Chronologers have mentioned Laṣarghā, Vāighā Laṣarghā, Sarghā and Arghā where the ancestors of the Śāh dynasty of Gorkhā are alleged to have settled (Dharaṇīdhar Śarmā, verses 19 and 20, IP, vol.II, pt.iii, p.574, Āthtikā Vamśāvalī, IP, vol.I, p.67, Gorakṣādhiśacampu, verse 31, IP, vol.II, pt.iii, p.603, IP, vol.I, p.98, col.1, p.121, col.1; HP, vol.51, fo.111; D. Wright: History of Nepal, p.276; IP, vol.I, p.142, col.1, respectively.

3. V.C.P. Hodson: List of the officers of the Bengal Army, Pt.II, p.602.

terminated and so he had to leave Kāṭhmāṇḍu. 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 Śāhs 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 Kāṭhmāṇḍu in 1802 as British Resident. Dr. Hamilton did not accept the Nepalese traditional belief that the Śāhs 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

---

1. An account of the kingdom of Nepaul, London, 1811. For further information about the author vide Dictionary of National Biography.

2. Kirkpatrick, *ibid.*, p.269.

3. An account of the kingdom of Nepal, Edinburgh, 1819. For further information about the author vide Dictionary of National Biography.

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 Kāṭhmāṇḍu after fourteen months' stay. He however remained on the frontier for two years collecting information about the country (Hamilton, *ibid.*, Introduction).

6. Hamilton, *ibid.*, pp.26,240.

claim the origin of the Śāhs as being from the Rajputs of Chitor or Udayapur belonging to the Sisodiyā clan. One of these is the chronology composed by King Rājendravikram Śāh,<sup>1</sup> (1816-47), son and successor of Gīrbāṇayuddhavikram Śāh. It is in fifteen Sanskrit verses and forms an introduction to his Rājakalpadruma, a Sanskrit work on tantricism.<sup>2</sup> 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, Dharaṇīdhar and Gaurīdatta. The latest of the Nepalese chronologies seems to be Goraḷṣādhiśacampū,<sup>3</sup> also written in Sanskrit, partly in verse and partly in prose, and hence the name campū 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 Munshī Shew Shunker Singh and Pandit Shri Gunānand, and edited and published by Daniel Wright<sup>4</sup> 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 Sisodiyā

---

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

2. Mahāmahopādhyāya Hara Prasād Śāstri: A catalogue of palm-leaf & selected paper mss. belonging to the Durbar Library, Nepal, vol.1, pp.242-44; vide also Preface, lxx-lxxii.

3. Hereafter abbreviated GC. It is published in IP, vol.II, pt.iii, pp. 598-611.

4. History of Nepal, Cambridge, 1877. He was for some time Residency Surgeon at Kāṭhmāṇḍu. Shew Shunker Singh was the Mīr Munshī of the Residency and Shri Gunānand a native Pandit of Pāṭan, the southern sister town of Kāṭhmāṇḍu.

house of Chitor. The statements made in these chronologies have generally been accepted by native historians. Sylvain Lévi, the great Oriental scholar who went to Kāthmānḍu to write an authoritative history of Nepal, did not find tenable the claim of the Gorkhā Śāhs to Rajput ancestry.

Goraksādhīśacampu and the chronology published by Wright ascribe the origin of the Śāh family of Gorkhā to Bhaṭṭāarak Ṛṣirāj 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 Yavanas called Māunās, who however defeated the fourteenth king, Ayutavamba, and reduced his state. He dropped the title Bhaṭṭāarak since he thought that the defeat at the hands of the Yavanas 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 Bhaṭṭāarak. The fourth king Āudumbara was given the title of Rāva by the Emperor (i.e. the Muslim emperor of Delhi) and from him onwards

1. Jñavāli: 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.

2. Le Népal, vol.I, pp.18, 254, 256.

3. For the first time we see the claim to this origin. Perhaps the chronology of the Kalyāls (q.v.p. 88) meant by Ṛṣirāj, their ancestor, the same Bhaṭṭāarak Ṛṣirāj 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 Ṛṣirāj makes us to suppose so.

<sup>1</sup> fifteen kings known as Rāva ruled over Chitor. Bhūpati Rāṇājī Rāva, the  
<sup>2</sup>  
<sup>3</sup> fifteenth Rāva king, had three sons, Udayabam, Phattesiṃha and Manmath,  
<sup>4</sup> and one daughter named Sandal. The Muslim emperor of Delhi demanded the  
<sup>5</sup> 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, Phattesiṃha and a host of  
other Rajputs were killed in the course of fighting. The princess burnt  
<sup>6</sup> 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  
<sup>7</sup> went towards the Hills in the north. He came to Riṛī. 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 Karṇasiṃha, ruler of Chitor (1193-1201). These titles originated from his eldest son and a younger son, Kṣemsiṃha 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 Ṛṣirāj 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 Phattesiṃha's daughter and that her name was Sadal. Other names Padminī (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 Rāmnārāyansiṃha Rāṇā 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 Jāuhar 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.

1 moved to Lasarghā and finally in 1495 to Khilung in Bhīrkoṭ. Here his  
 2 two sons, Khāncā Khān and Micā Khān were born. For them brides of  
 3 Raghuvaṁśī Rajput origin (i.e. Rajputs of the Solar race) were obtained  
 from Madhyadeśa (the Indo-Gangetic plains). Khāncā Khān 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, Bhīrkoṭ and Dhor. The younger Micā Khān went further  
 to the north-east and became the ruler of Nuwākot.<sup>4</sup>

According to the chronologies Jayan Khān, Sūrya Khān, Micā Khān  
 5 II, Vicitra Khān, Jagdeva Khān and Kulamaṇḍan ruled after Micā Khān I.  
 6 7 8

1. About the place vide p.94, n.2.

2. For the first time a date (1495) is mentioned in the Nepalese chronologies, a fact which helps us to probe the veracity of the hypothesis of the migration of the ancestor of the Śāhs from Chitor into the Hills (vide pp.116-17).

3. Khāncā and Micā are Magar words derivable from karhāncā >\*khāncā > khāncā, 'elder or the eldest of the brothers', and from mharca > micā, 'younger or the youngest of the brothers'. The etymology of Khān is dubious. These two brothers are also known by their Sanskrit names Harihar-siṁha and Ajayasiṁha (Hamilton, op.cit., p.240; Jñavālī: Dravya Śāhko jīvancaritra, p.6, Prthvinārāyaṇ Śāh, p.20). In Nepalese society brothers are nicknamed jeṭho (elder or the eldest, <Sk. jyeṣṭha-), mahilo (middle, <Sk. madhyama-), kancho (younger or the youngest, <Sk. kaṇiṣṭha-), etc. Considering the region of the Magars where Bhūpāl ruled, it is not unlikely to find the nicknames of his sons prevalent amongst the local people.

4. All these places where Bhūpāl and his sons settled are situated to the north-east of Rirī and in the region watered by the Modī and Ādhī rivers. The region then, as now, comprised settlements of the Magars.

5. Two Micās/<sup>Khāns</sup> are found and hence we shall call the latter Micā Khān II.

6. He is said to have annexed Kāskī (Jñavālī: Dravya Śāhko jīvancaritra, p.7).

7. Jayan 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 -ya is indistinct, Jayadeva may be read Jagadeva. Jayanta, Jayata and Jayadeva are heard as Jāinta, Jāita and Jāideva in speech, and hence these forms are also written.

8. This name is not found in some chronologies. In some two variants, Kuladaman and Kulamadan are met with (Jñavālī, ibid.), the latter being an unnasalised form of Kulamaṇḍan.

Kulamaṇḍan got the principality of Kāskī. 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.

Kulamaṇḍan had seven sons. The eldest succeeded him on the throne of Kāskī. The second, Kālu, was asked for by the people of Durādā<sup>1</sup>rā 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 Kulamaṇḍan 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<sup>west</sup> 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 Kirs', though now Kirātī is the name of the people themselves; cf. kirāt, 'the land of the Kirātīs'. Sekhānta is derivable from śeṣāntaka (śeṣa + 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 Kāskī, 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.

1  
their king.

Yaśobrahma had three sons, Narhari, Narpati (otherwise Narindra)  
2  
and Dravya. The eldest succeeded his father on the throne of Lamjung  
while the youngest carved out for himself the principality of Gorkhā.  
Chronologies say that high caste Hindus, Brahmans and Kṣatriyas, of  
Gorkha were not happy at being ruled by their king who was a Khārḱā,  
belonging to a Khas clan which then used to take alcohol without invol-  
ving 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 Gorkhā to their side and became  
successful to make Dravya Śāh the ruler of Gorkhā in 1559. 3  
Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ  
was the ninth king after him to rule over this state.

Gōrakṣādhiśacampū 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 Jñavālī: Dravya Śāhko jīvan-caritra, p.8, Yaśobrahma 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. GVI, pp.3,5; IP, vol.1, pp.98-99, and p.121, col.2; HP, vol.51, fo.5, vol.52, fo.59; Jñavālī, *ibid.*, pp.8-9, 12. But the order of their names varies. It is also said that Yaśobrahma 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. GVI, pp.5-7; Jñavālī, *ibid.*, pp.17-24.

1

Āṭhṭīkā Thakurī royal houses, which differs in the names of the rulers of Lasarghā, Garahū, Dhor, Bhīrkoṭ, Nuwākoṭ, Satahū, Kāskī, 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 Lasarghā. His two sons, Jāita Khān and Micā Khān, became rulers of Bhīrkoṭ and Nuwākoṭ respectively. Jāita 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 Dhor. Thus three independent lines, those of Bhīrkoṭ, Garahū and Dhor, originating from Sūrya Khān, Daśarath Khān I and Daśarath Khān II, came into existence as branches of the original house of Lasarghā. 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 Kāskī. But this genealogy does not say how the house of Lamjung evolved. It begins with Jasobam Sāhī [Yaśobrahma Śāh] 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 Dhor continued to be known as Khāns; those of Nuwākoṭ, Satahū and Kāskī, 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<sup>1</sup> as their title. The house of Gorkhā until Narbhūpāl's times were called Sāhī. Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ and his successors are called Sāh.<sup>2</sup>

There is another chronology<sup>3</sup> ~~the contents of which~~ has no historical validity at all. It traces the origin of the Śāhs of Gorkhā to the ancestors who had Sim i.e. Simha as their title. The ancestral seat is said to have been in Rāura, a mountain country in the west of Nepal, where the first ancestor was born of a pure Kṣatriya bride. Their youngest son, Harinārāyaṇsimha came to Gir Fort. His youngest son, Rāmnārāyaṇsimha (otherwise Rāmsimha) came to Chitor Fort and took the title of Rānā. He had two sons, Jāimalsimha 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, Jāimalsimha Rānā sent his wife and son, Viṣṇusimha 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. Jāimalsimha fought but was defeated. Padmakumārī was sacrificed. Jāimalsimha and a host of other Rānās were killed. Their fort was destroyed. Viṣṇusimha Rānā came to Vāighā Lasarghā.

---

1. The kings of Nuwākot, 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).

3. HP, vol.51, fos.111-13, vol.52, fo.52; IP, vol.I, p.98.

His son was Aṭalsim̄ha Rānā. He had two sons. The elder, Harisim̄ha, became king of Garahū and took the title of Khān. The younger, Ajapsim̄ha, became king of Nuwākot̄ (the central) and took the title of Sāhī<sup>1</sup>. 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 Śāh 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 Śāh 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 Śāh 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 Gorakṣādhiśa-campu and the chronology published by Wright are generally accepted by historians, they contain such discrepancies as render very doubtful the claim of the Śāhs to the Sisodiyā Rajput lineage. Even the name of the ancestor given in these two sources, Bhaṭṭāarak Ṛṣirāj Rānājī, 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.

---

1. Sāh in HP, vol.52, fo.52.

The earlier history of the various houses of rulers in the region from the Triśūlī to the Karnālī 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 Doṭī and Jumlā, the most prominent in the Karnālī region, is not altogether impossible. A list of kings of Doṭī and their accounts, especially with reference to their relations with kings of Kumāū and Garhwāl, is given by Atkinson. He states that the kings of Doṭī were for many generations styled Deva, but that after Nāgamalla Deva (who flourished towards the end of the fifteenth century) they became known as Sāhīs. Their capital was at Doṭī, now the westernmost district of Nepal, and during the first half of the fifteenth century the dominion of the state extended beyond the Kālī river, now

---

1. E.T. Atkinson: The Himalayan districts of the North-Western Provinces of India, vol.II (forming vol.XI of the Gazetteer, N.-W.P), pp.513 ff; Bhagavanlal Indraji, 'An inscription of King Aśokavalla', JBBAS, vol. XVI, Bombay, 1885, pp.357-60; Vinod Vihari Vidyavinod, 'Two inscriptions from Bodh Gaya', EI, vol.XII (1913-14), pp.27-30; Badarīdatta Pānde : Kumāū kā itihās, pp.237 ff ; Bāburām Ācārya, 'Doṭīko aitiḥāsik jhalak' Hāmro Nepāl, year 1, no.6 (Jhāpā, Nepal, 2012 V.S. = 1955 A.D.), pp.10-15; IP, vol.I, pp.68-72, 87,95, 106-9, 111-17; vol.II, pt.i, pp.45 ff ; vol.II, pt.ii, pp.1 ff ; vol.II, pt.iii, pp.321-416, 468-502, 545-65, 586-97; Rāhul Sāmkṛtyāyan: Himālaya Paricaya, Garhwāl, pp.110 ff; L. Petech: Mediaeval History of Nepal, pp.80-81, 108; Himavatsamskṛti, year 1, no.1, pp.34-35, no.2, pp.5-6 (Nepal, 2016 V.S. = 1957 A.D.); G. Tucci: Nepal, pp.51-80.

2. Atkinson, *ibid.* pp. 11-12.

the boundary between Kumāū and Nepāl, 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 Kumāū 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<sup>1</sup> Rājā and ruled over Doṭī with its capital at Dāreldhurā. The junior branch was known as Bam or Malla Sāhī and ruled over Sirā and Sor. Doṭī was annexed to Nepal in 1790 during the reign of Raṇa Bahādur Śāh.

The state of Jumlā was far more prosperous. Its kings<sup>2</sup> Nāgrāj, Krācalla, Aśokacalla,<sup>3</sup> Ripu<sup>4</sup> Malla, Prthvī Malla,<sup>5</sup> etc., are well known. The kingdom reached the zenith of its power during the times of Prthvī 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.

2. He established his capital at Sijā, near Jumlā (IP, vol.II,pt.i,p.59).

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 Kāntipur [Kāthmānḍu]" and victor of Kārtikeyapur i.e. Kumāū.

4. Mentioned as the king of Sapādalaksa (the central Himalayan region of Kāngra, Tehrī Garhwāl, Garhwāl and Kumāū) 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; IP, vol.II,pt.i, pp.79-81); op.cit.

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 Tibrikōṭ. Prthvī Malla's summer capital was Sijā (also called Señja or Sījā) and the winter capital Dullu (also Surkhet sometimes for a month or two). After him the regular line of the Mallas ended. We see his successors Samsārvarmā 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 Jumlā in 1404 and established his capital at Sunārgāū. His successors known as Sāis during the fifteenth century and afterwards Sāhis, Śāhis, Sāhās or Śāhs could not prevent subdivision of Jumlā. 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; Himavatsamskṛti, year 1, no. 1, p. 31; Tucci, op. cit., pp. 62, 64, 68.

2. Yogī 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).

4. IP, vol. I, pp. 108, 112-13, wherein it is mentioned that Balirāj got the kingship of Jumlā from its ruler Jaktisimha of Jaktipur.

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 Jumlās, 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, Dāilekh and Vilāspur are mentioned in 1568 (ibid., pp. 123-24, 169). Another state Rāskōṭ 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 Jumlā with their headquarters at different places: Chināsim, Tibrikōṭ, Liku, Kākakoṭ, Motipur (near Tibrikōṭ), Dunāi, etc. (ibid., pp. 123, 125, 128 ff).

be regarded as the seniormost amongst the states in the Nepal Himalaya<sup>1</sup>  
until it was annexed to Nepal in 1789.<sup>2</sup>

From the accounts and inscriptional and archival materials referred to above, although some of them are fragmentary, we learn that the rulers of Doṭī and Jumlā were originally Khasas whose forebears had come to settle in the eleventh century from the neighbouring region of Garhwāl and Kumāū. These invading Khasas 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 Kalyāls were Khasas and some were possibly Magars. Their surnames, which are mentioned in inscriptions, royal donations and grants, are even now used by various<sup>3</sup> clans of these two tribes. The Magars were the first tribal people to be converted to Hinduism. Some of their clans were subsequently up-graded to be Kṣatriyas.<sup>4</sup> Vanquished by the new intruders, some of the<sup>5</sup> Magars left their original homeland in the Karnālī region and went towards the east to dwell and establish their chieftainships in

1. Hamilton, op.cit., pp.237,283; Henry Ambrose Oldfield: Sketches from Nipal, vol.I, p.24.

2. Bāburām Ācārya (ed.): Purānā kavi ra kavītā, p.1; Hamilton, ibid., pp. 250, 287-88.

3. Adhikārī, Bhāḍārī (modern Bhārārī), Biṣṭa, Buḍhāthokī or Buḍho or Buḍhā (modern Būḥāthokī), Ḍāgī, Kaṭhait (modern Kaṭhāit), Kārki, Khaḍgā or Khaḍgāhā (modern Khārka), 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 Chetrīs.

5. They have still now their compact settlement in Dullu (as mentioned by Yogī 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 Magarāt<sup>1</sup> in the Sapta Gaṇḍakī region, which is now regarded their ancestral home. After some<sup>time</sup> here 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 Candas of Pyūṭhānā; the Sens of Pālpā, Tanahū, Rising and Pāiyū; and the two Khān brothers of Dhor, Garahū, Bhīrkoṭ, Satahū, Nuwākoṭ and Kāskī.<sup>3</sup> 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 Thakurīs and in later times as superior Kṣatriyas.<sup>4</sup> All these are known to have claimed Rajput ancestry. The descendants of some of the rulers of these principalities later took the name Sāhī (Śāhī and Śah in recent times), perhaps in imitation of the rulers of Jumlā, Achām, Dullu, Dāilekh and Rāskoṭ.

---

1. I.e. the region comprising Satahū, Pāiyū, Bhīrkoṭ, Dhor, Garahū, Rising, Ghiring, Gulmī, Arghā, Khācī, Musīkoṭ and Ismā. The region is watered by the Riṛī, Barī Gaḍ, Ādhī, Kālī (Kṛṣṇā) Gaṇḍakī, Jagdī, 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, Darāūdī, Jagdī, Tādī, etc. The names of other rivers seem to have been modified, e.g. Bherī < \*Bhedī, Ādhī < \*Adī, Riṛī < \*Ridī, Setī < \*Sedī, etc. The names of all these rivers suggest the Magar settlement in their catchment areas.

2. As is apparent from the conquests made by Pālpā, Gorkhā, etc. Vide HP, vol. 51, fos. 15, 38-40; G.V.Y., pp. 61-62; Hamilton, op. cit., pp. 170, 264.

- 3. Ācārya, 'Tanahūko Senyamāśa', p. 63.

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, Ghandrung and Siklis, i.e. the southern flank of the Annapūrṇā mountain where even now their settlement is compact<sup>1</sup>. Their country is bounded on the west by the Kālī (Kṛṣṇā) Gaṇḍakī and on the east by the Marsyāngdī<sup>2</sup>. But like the Magars the Gurungs are scattered throughout Nepal as is seen from their straggling settlements. They seem to have come into less contacts 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 *if* 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

---

1. Eden Vansittart, 'Tribes, clans and castes of Nepal', JASB, vol. XXIII, pt. i, 1895, p. 217.

2. Hagen, op. cit., p. 67.

marriage which is prevalent amongst these two tribes may have been adopted by the Ṭhakurīs, 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 Chetrīs.<sup>1</sup> Perhaps the Khases did not establish for themselves a status equal to that of the Ṭhakurīs, 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 Jaṅga Bahādur Kāvar, a Khas of the Khārka clan,<sup>2</sup> after becoming Prime Minister of Nepal in 1846, took the title of Rāṇā and managed to marry his sons and daughters into the royal Śāh family of Nepal regarded by that time as superior Ṭhakurī, 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 Śāh families. The Rāṇās also claimed descent from the Sisodiyā clan of Chitor,<sup>3</sup> 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 (GVY, 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 Śāh and the Rāṇā families, for the Hindu society does not sanction this. Perhaps their dissimilar gotras made this possible. The gotras of the Śāhs and Rāṇās are Kāśyapa and Vatsa respectively

amongst the Khas Chetrīs as well as social equality with the Śāhs on the ground of their homogeneity. After coming to power the Rāṇās endeavoured to be matched with the Śāhs in all respects: politically they did so by being de facto rulers of the country, and socially by intermarriages with the Śāhs and other Thakurī families. The reason of the intermarriages with the royal family was political in another respect also. The Rāṇās by such intermarriages aimed to raise 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 Rāṇā<sup>1</sup> 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 Rāṇās although there are many relating to the various tribes of the Nepal Himalaya. We cannot agree that Hodgson left Kāṭhmāṇḍu before Jaṅga Bahādur became Prime Minister and for that reason did not know about the Rāṇās. He was in touch with Kāṭhmāṇḍu during his stay in Darjeeling (1843-58) and had direct contact<sup>2</sup> with Jaṅga Bahadur himself. It would seem therefore that the Rāṇā genealogy was not available while Hodgson was in Kāṭhmāṇḍu or in Darjeeling. The first genealogy containing the claim of the Rāṇās to descent from the Sisodiyā clan is that contained in History of Nepal edited by Daniel Wright which was published in 1877. It may be therefore

---

1. Perceval Landon: Nepal, vol. I, p. 250.

2. Hunter, op. cit., pp. 110, 256, who also says that Jaṅga Bahādur 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 Jaṅga Bahādur. This assumption would seem to be confirmed by the fact that volumes of Itihāsprakāś 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.<sup>1</sup> During Rām Śāh's times the houses <sup>of</sup> Makwānpur, Tanahū, Pālṗā and Parvat<sup>2</sup> 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 Galkoṭ whose ruling house was a collateral branch of Parvat. Narbhūpāl Śāh, Prthvīnārāyaṇ's father, had four wives: they were princesses of Khācī, Pālṗā, 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 Ahimānsimha, a Bāis Rajput of Banaras, into whose family his brothers were also married afterwards. Prthvī-

---

1. The Samāl rulers of Salyānā 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 Thakurī mother (IP, vol.II, pt.iii, pp.376, 388, 391, 393, etc.). The house of Parvat (Malebam) evolved from the progeny of Jarīyā (i.e. of Jār, a Tibetan tribe) mother and a Gotāme Brahman father (Hamilton, ibid.). Bāburām Ācārya, however, believed that the Jārṣ are the descendants of the Indian Jāṭṣ (regarded on par with the Rajputs) who migrated into the Himalayan Hills in the distant antiquity.

2. G.V.Y., pp.12-13.

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 Gulmī, and the rest were Khases. Of the concubines, two were Māithil Brahmans, one a widow and the other her own younger sister<sup>1</sup>. From the Brahman widow concubine Gīrbāṇayuddhāvīkram 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 Gīrbāṇayuddhāvīkram 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, Surendravīkram, son and successor of Rājendra-vīkram 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, Rājendravīkram, that the latter belonged to his family<sup>3</sup>. 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.

2. Foreign Consultations, Government of India, 13 June 1838, no. 5; Surendranath Sen and Umesha Mishra (ed.): Sanskrit documents, Intro. pp. 14-24; Hunter, op. cit., pp. 179, 180.

3. Sen and Mishra, ibid., Document no. 21, pp. 48-49, 149-51.

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 Sisodiyā Rajput lineage. The chronology prepared by Bhīmsen Thāpā 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 Pradesh, had entered the lower range of the southern slope of the Himalaya and intermarried with the local peoples<sup>1</sup>. 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<sup>2</sup>. But the claim of the Nepalese Kṣatriyas 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<sup>3</sup>.

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 Thakurī royal houses of the Nepal Himalaya. As the later portions of the chronologies and

---

1. Tucci, op.cit.,p.66.

2. George Grierson: Linguistic Survey of India, vol.IX,pt.iv,pp.8,17.

3. Lévi: Le Népal, vol.I, pp.227, 257 ff.

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 Rirī<sup>1</sup> 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

---

1. Vide p.99.

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 Samarsimha fled to the mountains of Nepal and founded the state of Gorkhā and spread the Guhilot (Sisodiyā) line there. Samrsimha was the father of Ratnasimha and was alive up to 1299, i.e. four years before Alauddin captured Chitor. It is also said that Gorkhās (Śāhs of Gorkhā) reached Nepal through Kumāñ after the fall of Chitor. Hamilton mentions that Caturbhuj, a prince of the Sisodiyā clan, having left Chitor conquered Kumāñ and Jumlā 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, Makwānpur, Cāudaṇḍī and Morang. Nowhere in Nepalese accounts mention has been made of the migration of the ancestors of the Śāhs from Kumāñ and Jumlā. In all the accounts so far known the migration of the ancestors of the Śāhs is claimed to have been into the Sapta Gandakī 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 Bahādursimhajī and published under the title of Kṣatriya Rājput jāti kī sūcī it is mentioned on p.6 that a branch of the Sisodiyā Rajputs became king of Gorkhā.

2. Hamilton, op.cit., p.15.

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 Bhāradvāja with the threefold ṛṣi pravara, Āṅgīrasa, Bārhaspatya and Bhāradvāja. It is said that Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ<sup>1</sup> changed his gotra, Bhāradvāja, to Kāśyapa. There is however some reason to believe that it was his father, Narbhūpāl, who made this change. Gokul-  
Vilas<sup>2</sup> 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<sup>2</sup> 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<sup>3</sup> and hence it does not matter whether Narbhūpāl or Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ changed the original gotra. The Sisodiyās on the contrary belong to the Solar race, and belonged to a different gotra, Baijavāpa, though they have the same pravara, Āṅgīrasa, 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. Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ 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.

3. According to Vijñāneśvara's commentary called Mitākṣarā on Yājñavalkya-smṛti (q.v. J.R. Gharpure, Tr.; Yājñavalkya-smṛti, vol. II, pt. i, Bombay, 1936, p. 151; also Yājñavalkya-smṛti, Venkateśvar Press edition, Bombay, 1900, pp. 13-14).

It is quite possible that either the Nepalese kings were unheard of by the amplifiers of the epic Prthvīrāj rāso, traditionally believed to have been written by a bard, Canda Bardāī, 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 Bāīsī, Cāubīsī, Gorkhā, the Nepal Valley and Makwānpur, who claimed to be Kṣatriyas 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 Kṣatriyas of the Nepal Himalaya had not been accepted into the social order of the Indian Rajputs.

How strong is the desire of the Nepalese Kṣatriyas 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 Ṭhakurīs of Pyūṭhānā claim to be Candels; the Śrīnet Ṭhakurīs of Pāiyū state that they came from a mountain south-west from the Yamunā; the Sen Ṭhakurīs of Pālpā,

---

1. Daśaratha Sharma: Early Chauhan dynasty, pp.271,340-41; Vaidya, op.cit.,p.18.

2. Hamilton, op.cit.,p.269.

3. Hamilton, ibid. There are Śrīnet Rajputs also in Gorakhpur who are said to be descendants of the Sākya-Mauryas (Rājabalī Pāṇḍeya: Gorakhpur janpad aur uskī kṣatriya jātiyāūkā itihās, p.244). Quite possibly the Srinets of Pāiyū may have migrated originally from Gorakhpur, the neighbouring reason, although there is no historical evidence behind this claim.

and later of Tanahū and Makwānpur claim their origin from the Sisodiyā<sup>1</sup> clan of Chitor; the rulers of Buṭāul<sup>2</sup> claimed to be Cāuhāns; the Rānās, originally Kāvar Khārkā, a clan of the Khases, also claim their descent from the Sisodiyā<sup>3</sup> clan. Of the other Khases of Nepal, the Biṣṭas of Achām state that they were Pamārs,<sup>4</sup> the Bogaṭīs of Ḍoṭī claim to be Raghuvamśī<sup>5</sup> (the dynasty of Raghu in which Rām was born), the Khulāls<sup>6</sup> state that they are Candels, the Dulāls claim to have come from Ujjain,<sup>7</sup> the Khas Thāpās claim their origin from Udāi Bhattācārya, a Brahman of Dhārānagarī.<sup>8</sup> Even some of the tribal people claim an origin in different parts of India. The Kirātīs 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 Simrāungarh,<sup>9</sup> near Makwānpur, to the land where they are now settled. The Gurungs have a

---

1. IP, vol.I, p.72; Hamilton, op.cit., pp.15, 129. But Hodgson says them to be Cāuhāns (HP, vol.11, fo.97).

2. Rājabalī 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 Butaul where he and his descendants began to rule. In later times the principality was amalgamated with Pālpā and Tanahū. Perhaps by Ratna Sen is meant Ratnasimha (q.v. p.116, 117).

3. Vide p.111.

4. IP, vol.II, pt.iii, p.336.

5. Ibid., p.338.

6. Ibid., p.340.

7. IP, vol.I, p.98, col.2.

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

9. HP, vol.60, fo.248 (reverse).

genealogy which states that they are descendants of Candrasimha, a king of Kanauj in Bandelkhaṇḍa, belonging to the Solar race and having the Bhāradvāja <sup>1</sup>gotra. The Rānā Magars claim to have come from Chitor Fort.<sup>2</sup> 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.

2. HP, vol.58, fos.37-38.

## CHAPTER V

## EARLY CAREER OF PṚTHVĪNĀRĀYAṆ ŚĀH (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<sup>1</sup> 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 Cāubīsī<sup>2</sup> kingdoms in Nepalese accounts. The kingdom of Jumlā was the oldest of them. In earlier times its domains

---

1. Vide p. 82, n. 4.

2. Vide p. 39, n. 37.

extended into eastern Kumāū and Tibet, but it was confined in later times to the region from the eastern bank of the Karnālī to Tibrikot in the east. The kings of Jumlā 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.<sup>1</sup> Although in later times Jumlā was reduced in size, its old glory had not altogether vanished and it continued to exercise some sort of spiritual hegemony<sup>2</sup> over the Bāīsī 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 Śāh on 26 July 1559 and enlarged further by his grandson Rām Śāh. 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.<sup>3</sup>

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 Jumlā in the west.

2. PP. 107-8.

3. P. 109.

and Tanahū, the boundary with the former being the confluence of the Cepe with the Marsyāngdī,<sup>1</sup> and that with the latter the confluence of the Triśūlī with the Marsyāngdī.<sup>2</sup> To the south lay the Tarai sector of Tanahū and Pāṭan,<sup>3</sup> the boundary here being the Triśūlī river. To the east lay Nuwākot, the north-western frontier province of the kingdom of Kāṭhmānḍu from which Gorkhā was separated also by the Triśūlī river. To the north lay the Himalayan range, a region usually known as Bhoṭ.<sup>4</sup> beyond which was the territory of Tibet which was also known as Bhoṭ.<sup>4</sup> In 1742, when Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ became king of Gorkhā, it was a tiny principality both in dimension and population and had not yet begun to emerge<sup>5</sup> as the powerful and prosperous kingdom which was to compete so powerfully 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 Pālpā, Tanahū, Parvat, Kāskī and Lamjung on the one side and Makwānpur<sup>6</sup> 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 Cepeghāṭ. (vide DU, Tr., p.20).

2. Quite probably Jyāmīrghaṭ as mentioned in HP, vol.51, fo.103. It could be modern Jyāmire.

3. The southern kingdom in the Nepal Valley ruled by Mallas, the other two kingdoms were Kāṭhmānḍu, the central, and Bhātḡāū, the eastern.

4. For the difference in uses of the term Bhoṭ meaning the Himalayan regions and Bhoṭ meaning Tibet vide p. 50, n.116.

5. Vide p. 47, n.96.

6. For the state of Makwānpur 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 Nuwākot<sup>1</sup> only a few miles east of Gorkhā. Lamjung also to some extent enjoyed commerce with Tibet, the goods being carried through Tārku, Tanahū, Deughāṭ<sup>2</sup> and Bakrā<sup>3</sup> into the provinces of Bihar and Bengal. Valuable goods were also carried from Mirzapur and Patna into Tibet via Mustang<sup>4</sup>. The mart of Pokhrā (in Kāskī) was frequented by merchants from the Nepal Valley, Pālpā and Parvat<sup>5</sup>. Although relatively a petty principality in the Cāubīsī, Gulmī had a famous mart at Riṭī<sup>6</sup>. 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<sup>7</sup> by in other principalities. 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.
  4. J. Long: Selections from unpublished records of the Government for the years 1748 to 1767 inclusive relating mainly to the social condition of Bengal, vol.I (hereafter abbreviated Selections), no.913, pp.480-81; Letter from Surgeon James Logan to the Governor (25 August 1769) as published by Nandalal Chatterji, 'A forgotten English expedition against Prithvi Narayan', The journal of the United Provinces Historical Society, vol.XI, pt.i, July 1938, p.64, n.98; Memorandum by George Bogle (5 December 1774) on the trade with Tibet, as published by D.B. Disalkar, 'Bogle's embassy to Tibet', Indian Historical Quarterly, vol.IX, no.2, June 1933, p.428; C.R. Markham: Narratives of the mission of George Bogle to Tibet, 2nd.ed., 1879 (hereafter abbreviated Narratives), p.128; S.C. Sarkar, 'Some notes on the intercourse of Bengal with the northern countries in the second half of the eighteenth century', Bengal past and present, vol.,XLI, January-June 1931, pp.121-22.
  5. Hamilton, op.cit., pp.242-43.
  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 Kāskī; Bhīrkoṭ 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 Musīkoṭ, Ismā, Khingrī and Bhingrī<sup>1</sup>. Thus Gorkhā was isolated. It was not a member of the Čaubīsī 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 Čaubīsī 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 Pṛthvīpati 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 Nuwākot (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 Kāmrajdatta 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

---

1. Bāburām Ācārya, 'Śrī Śrī Jayaprakāś Malla', Pragati, year 3, no.1, pp.37-38.

2. Ācārya gives his regnal period as 1694-1741 ('Tanahūko Sen-vaṃśa', Bhānubhakta-smāraḥ grantha, ed. Sūryavikram Jhāvālī, p.72). Once he had attacked some territory of Narbhūpāl. But both came to terms. After the conclusion of a treaty Kāmrajdatta 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 Lāmīḍārā district in favour of Kāmrajḍatta. Out of spite he planned in 1737 an invasion of Nuwākoṭ, but this miscarried. The Gorkhalese troops led by Jayanta Rānā were repulsed by Kāsīrām Thāpā, officer in charge of Nuwākoṭ<sup>1</sup>. 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.<sup>2</sup> 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 Prthvīnārāyaṇ 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 Cāutārā (modern Cāutariyā)<sup>3</sup>, a title given exclusively to senior male members of the royal family not in the direct line of succession.<sup>4</sup> 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 Prthvīnārāyaṇ, his successor, was a mere lad of fifteen. She managed affairs very creditably and made

---

1. Ācārya, 'Śrī Śrī Jayaprakāś Malla', p.39.

2. G.V.Y., pp.125-27.

3. Ibid., p.137.

4. She was the first female member of the Śāh house of Gorkhā to become a Cāutārā. Prthvīnārāyaṇ's first wife, Indrakumārī, was the second lady who was made a Cāutārā (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, Candraprabhāvātī, Princess of Khācī, was issueless; from the second, Princess Kauśalyāvātī of Pālpā, were born three sons: Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ, Dalmardan and Pṛthvīpāl, and two daughters, Padmakumārī and Viśālavadanā; from the third, Princess Buddhimatī of Parvat, were born two sons: <sup>V</sup>ṇḍakesar and <sup>S</sup>ūrapratāp, and four daughters: Padmavadanā, Induvadana, Sarpāvātī (Sarvāvātī) and Hemantakumārī; and from the fourth, Princess Subhadrāvātī of Tanahū, were born two sons: Kīrtimahoddām (also known as Mahoddām-kīrti) or Mahoddām-kīrti and Daljit, and three daughters: Mahālakṣmī, Padmanetrā and Sūratkumārī. 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), Bhīmdatta, Keśimadan, Ranaśūr and Jagajjit, and two daughters: Prakāśanā and Bindavāsanā. Raṇarudra was the eldest of all the sons of Narbhūpāl, legitimate and illegitimate.

*also see, vol. 55, nos. 97-98.*

1. G.V.Y., p.113, But Lalitāvallabh in his Bhaktavijayakāvyaṃ (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, Mahoddām-kīrti, Dalmardan, Daljit and Sūrapratāp. It is because by this time only these were alive. Vṇḍakesar 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).
2. Ācārya, 'Śrī Śrī Jayaprakāś Malla', p.42.

Pr̥thvīnārāyaṇ was born on Thursday, 27 Pauṣa 1779 V.S.<sup>1</sup> (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 Pr̥thvīnārāyaṇ was born after seven months and was regarded by them as a usurper. Meanwhile Vṛndakesar died and the succession passed to Pr̥thvīnārāyaṇ without contention.<sup>2</sup>

Pr̥thvīnārāyaṇ 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.<sup>3</sup> He was still more fortunate to have a step-mother like Candraprabhāvati 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.<sup>4</sup> She looked after him as her own son, and from her he got much of his training in statecraft.<sup>5</sup> She coopted him into her Regency and did much to shape his ambition.

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

---

1. Saṃskṛtasandēśa, year 1, no. 6, Kāṭhmāṇḍu, 2010 V.S. (1953 A.D.), pp. 11-12.

2. IP, vol. I, p. 123, col. 1. But in JP, vol. 55, fols. 87-88, the name of Mahoddām Kīrti is mentioned instead of Vṛndakesar.

3. DU, Tr., p. 17.

4. Vide p. 128.

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 Cāudaṇḍī 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 inherited. 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 Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ was given his<sup>1</sup> 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<sup>2</sup> Mīśra family of Banaras. But since Narbhūpāl had been born and brought

---

1. Jñavālī: Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ Śāh, p.46.

2. HP, vol.1, fo.80, vol.51, fo,92; <sup>vol.55, fo.88,</sup> G.V.Y., p.127; IP, vol.I, p.123, col.1.

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 Pṛthvī-nārāyaṇ's holy thread-giving ceremony. Gaureśvar had hoped that he would be Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ's priest also. So Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ 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<sup>2</sup> pacified him.

After some years of the holy thread-giving ceremony Pṛthvī-nārāyaṇ was sent to Bhātgāū to effect a ritual friendship<sup>3</sup> between King Raṇajitsimha Malla of Bhātgāū and Narbhūpāl. 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 Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ was sent to Bhātgāū.<sup>4</sup> Gorkhā's relations with Pāṭan and Kāṭhmāṇḍu had deteriorated

1. GY, pp.92,94-95,127-28.

2. HP, vol.51, fo.92; GY, 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 Leñhard 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.; GY, pp.137-38.

because of Narbhūpāl's attempts to occupy some parts of Lāmīdārā and his invasion on Nuwākot<sup>1</sup>. But it seems its relations with Bhāt-gāū 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<sup>2</sup>. 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 Bhāt-gāū, where he first gave proof of that political shrewdness which was to be his most prominent characteristic. Since 1725 Malla kings of Kāṭhmāṇḍu, Pāṭan and Bhāt-gāū 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<sup>3</sup>. 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 Kāṭhmāṇḍu and Pāṭan 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. Ācārya, 'Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ Śāhkā jīvanīko pūrvārdha', Pragati, year 1, no.4, p.71.

regard of Raṇajitsimha of Bhāt-gāū, and became successful in forming the ritual friendship between him and his father. He also formed the ritual friendship with Raṇajitsimha's son Vīrnarsimha 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 Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ expressed to Candraprabhāvati 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, Hemkarṇa Sen, which next to Jumlā 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, Kāskī and Pālpā. With this aim in view Candraprabhāvati got Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ married to the Princess of Makwānpur, Indrakumārī.

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

to take her home. Digbandhan Sen, Prince of Makwānpur, and Kanaksimha 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, Candraprabhāvati, 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, Pr̥thvīnārāyaṇ 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 Kanaksimha 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 Kanaksimha became violent. He remarked that being the king of the land of the Magars Pr̥thvīnārāyaṇ was prone to kill human beings. Hence Kanaksimha was determined to take him to task. He sought the support of Digbandhan in a plan to have Pr̥thvīnārāyaṇ killed. Hemkarṇa Sen, father of Digbandhan Sen, however managed to pacify his son and the minister, and avoid an awkward situation. Hearing of the

*also HP, vol. 55, fo. 88, according to which Pr̥thvīnārāyaṇ came after one or two years*  
 1. HP, vol. 51, fo. 92; IP, op. cit., Perhaps according to the social custom, dvirāgamana ('second coming'), still prevalent in the Tarai. DU also says that the bride was not taken to Gorkhā after the marriage and hence Pr̥thvīnārāyaṇ 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. G.V.Y., p. 129, HP, ibid., fo. 81.

5. HP, ibid.

6. Ibid., fo. 92.

7. Indrakumārī being his only daughter, Hemkarṇa did not want any harm to be done to his son-in-law, Seeing that Digbandhan and Kanaksimha were determined to kill Pr̥thvīnārāyaṇ, 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 Kanakśiṃha to kill him, Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ 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.<sup>1</sup> Timely intervention thus helped to bring the fiery temper of both sides under control.

Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ cannot be wholly blamed for being out of temper. He was probably weary of this enforced stay at Makwānpur.<sup>2</sup> 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 Candraprabhāvatī, who was responsible for the marriage arrangement, was also being criticised. Furthermore the defeat at Nuwākot<sup>3</sup> was still fresh in Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ'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 Hemkarṇa Sen in his court that he would not take her home unless a one-tusked elephant and a Navalākhī diamond necklace were

---

1. IP, op.cit.

2. After remaining for one year at Makwānpur Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ 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.<sup>1</sup> Hemkarṇa 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 Jośī Arjyāl, the persons in attendance on Pṛthvī-nārāyaṇ, said to Hemkarṇa that since he had offered the hand of his daughter to Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ 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. Hemkarṇa nevertheless regarded the demands as unreasonable and refused to grant. The upshot was an unpleasantness which was never resolved. Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ told Digbandhan Sen that if his demands were not met he would take them by force.<sup>2</sup> They were not met and the refusal provided Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ 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 G.V.Y., p. 130, mention two demands: a one-tusked elephant and a Navalākhī diamond necklace. According to HP, vol. 51, fos. 81-82, 92, it appears that even after one year's stay at Makwānpur when the bride was not allowed to be taken by him home, and he was asked to stay further, Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ, though exasperated, agreed to do so provided Kanaksimha was given to him. This was refused by Hemkarṇa. Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ then asked for the one-tusked elephant and the Navalākhī necklace; both of which were also refused. It is also said that Hemkarṇa did send a one-tusked elephant but it appears that it was not that Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ demanded. Seeing his demands thus repudiated, Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ left for Gorkhā without even taking formal leave of his father-in-law. IP, vol. I, p. 24, col. 2, however, puts all the three demands together: Kanaksimha, one-tusked elephant and diamond necklace, and says that the refusal to hand over Kanaksimha provided Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ with the excuse he sought for.

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

2. DU, Tr., p. 18.

had not yet married, to take Indrakumārī to his home. This threat was an insult and destroyed any possibility of bringing about closer relations with Makwānpur. Both sides stuck to their contentions for reasons of prestige and relations consequently became very strained. So Candraprabhāvati's plans remained unrealized. As retaliation for what had happened

---

HP, vol. 55, fo. 88; IP, op. cit.

1. Prthvīnārāyaṇ did actually send his son, Pratāpsimha, born of the second queen whom he married shortly after he returned frustrated from Makwānpur, to bring Indrakumārī. Perhaps Pratāpsimha was sent sometime during or after the rains of 1755 when Indrakumārī wrote to Prthvīnārāyaṇ bemoaning that the fault was not hers but that of her brother. By this time Prthvīnārāyaṇ 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 Prthvīnārāyaṇ, Hemkarṇa 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 Prthvīnārāyaṇ's court. Still a rough highlander, lacking such etiquette, he was so pleased with her that he made her Gātārā and laid down a jāgir 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, Narendralakṣmī, associated with Prthvīnārāyaṇ in his inscriptions (IP, op. cit., pp. 38, col. 1, 88, col. 2; Saṁskṛtasandēśa, year 1, no. 5, p. 1). Her name in gold coinage of 1771 (Walsh, op. cit., p. 742) also proves that Narendralakṣmī 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 Prthvīnārāyaṇ heard that his parents-in-law deferred the sending off of their daughter until she came of age. This angered Prthvīnārāyaṇ. 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.).

nos. 10-12  
4P. 50-51)

she had Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ married in the same year<sup>1</sup> with a daughter of Ahimānsimha, a Bais Rajput of Banaras.<sup>2</sup> Afterwards his brothers, Mahoddāmkiṛti and Dalmardan, were also married into the same family.<sup>3</sup>

While returning from Makwānpur, Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ came by way of Candrāgiri, 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, Mānsimha 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 Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ's second marriage his mother died and Dalmardan performed her obsequies. Soon after this Candraprahvatī also died and Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ himself performed her obsequies. most lavishly (HP, vol.17, fo.162). According to Hindu custom kings are immune to obsequial performances. The fact that Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ did not perform his mother's obsequies whereas he did his step-mother's shows his deep regard for Candraprahvatī. She was alive until 1744 (vide p.157).

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

3. Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ 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 Gosāīkuṇḍa and Kāṭhmāṇḍu, and on his way back home was to pass through Gorkhā to visit the temple of Gorakhnāth. Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ<sup>1</sup> waited for him in order to seek his advice regarding the invasion.

In the meantime Narbhūpāl died and Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ<sup>2</sup> 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 Rāmanavamī of that year, which corresponds with this Christian date.

## CHAPTER VI

## FIRST PHASE OF PṚTHVĪNĀRĀYAṆ'S CAMPAIGNS (1742-46)

When PṚthvīnārāyaṇ succeeded to the throne of Gorkhā there was no collaboration between the Ṭhakurī rulers of the Baīsī and Cāubīsī kingdoms, or the Malla rulers of the Nepal Valley, or the Sen rulers of Makwānpur, Cāudaṇḍī 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, PṚthvīnārāyaṇ'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 PṚthvīnārāyaṇ'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 Yakṣa 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 Kāntipur (Kāṣṭhamanḍap or Kāṭhmāḍā<sup>1</sup>), Lalitpur (Lalitpaṭṭan or Pāṭan<sup>2</sup>) and Bhaktapur (Bhātḡā<sup>3</sup>). From that time on the history of the Valley was one of intrigue, counter-intrigue and domestic quarrels.

When Prthvīnārāyaṇ became king of Gorkhā, the kingdom of Kāṭh-<sup>3</sup>māḍu had under its jurisdiction almost all the famous ṭols in the Valley, e.g. Thimī (which formed the frontier with Bhātḡā<sup>3</sup> and Pāṭan), Luṭikoṭ (Bālāju), Thamel, Hārīḡā<sup>3</sup>, Nandīgrām, Mālīgrām, Gābhel, Devapāṭan, etc., as well as the settlements or outposts of Kāhule, Kakanī, Ṭokhā, Gokarna, Cāḡu, Sākhu (Śamkhapur), Sāḡācok, Nagarkoṭ, Mahādeva Pokharī and Nāldum. Outside the Valley its domains included in the west the Nuwākot province which extended to the north as far as Kerung, the latter forming its frontier with Tibet; in the due north Sindhu Pālcok and Pāṭibhanjyāḡ; in the north-east Cā<sup>3</sup>utarā, Dolakhā, and the tract of the territory between the Indrāvati and Bhoṭe Kosī rivers tapering off to Kutī, another frontier with Tibet. The kingdom of

---

1. The form Kāṭhmāḍu 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 ṭol is a distinct social and religious entity.

Bhātḡāũ, the eastern kingdom, had inside the Valley a small tract of the land bounded from north to the south by the Bhadrmatī, Hanūmatī and Kaṁśāvatī rivers; beyond the Valley its territories included the Banepā Valley, Dāpcā and the land up to Cisaṅkhu where it was bounded by the Dudh Kosī, the latter separating it from Kirāt, the land of the Kirātīs (Kirātas in learned speech). Pāṭan, the southern kingdom, possessed in the Valley the whole tract south of the Bāḡmatī 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, Jhiltung, Pālung, Tistung, Citlāng and Godāvarī, which apart from being noted as granaries of agricultural produce had rich mines of copper, iron and other mineral ores. The people of Kāṭhmāṅḡu 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 Bhātḡāũ 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 Jayaprakāś Malla to the throne of Kāṭhmāṅḡu. 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 Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ. 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, Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ had built up his strength and was too firmly entrenched to be repulsed.

Soon after the succession to the throne of Gorkhā, Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ planned to invade Nuwākot<sup>1</sup> 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 Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ 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 Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ'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 Pṛthvīpati Śāh (1669-1716), and sent him in 1742 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, Virāj Thāpā encamped at Khincet on the western bank of the Trisūlī, one mile to the west of Nuwākoṭ, 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, Nuwākoṭ had a seemingly unassailable position. Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ was annoyed by the delay. Virāj Thāpā was accused of incompetence and dismissed. He was replaced by two Brahman officers, Bali <sup>1</sup> 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 Nuwākoṭ, <sup>2</sup> and Jayaprakāś Malla came himself to assist in the defence. <sup>3</sup> The Gorkhalese troops were completely routed. Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ's attempt to capture Nuwākoṭ ended in <sup>4</sup> failure. The two Brahman officers were banished from the country.

The miscarriage of the invasion was a serious blow to Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ'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 Nuwākoṭ 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. Jñavālī, 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 Narbhūpāl 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. Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ Śāhko jīvanī, p.24, wherein it is further mentioned that they were forgiven and recalled by Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ 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 Bhāt-gāū, Harihar Panta to Kāṭhmāṇḍu and Gaṅgādhar Panta to Kāskī. Kālu Pāre's relatives were sent to other kingdoms. Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ<sup>1</sup> entrusted him with the administration of the country.

It is alleged that when Hemkarṇa Sen came to know that Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ was passing through the plains for Banaras in order to fulfil his mission, he sent some men and money to assist him. But Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ refused the assistance, telling the men to return with the message that he would take what he wanted when he <sup>would</sup> come to take Indrakumārī home.<sup>2</sup>

Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ's entourage included Kālu Pāre,<sup>3</sup> Virāj Bakhetī, Jayā Bāniyā, Bhānu Arjyāl, Kulānanda Dhakāl, Śivarāmsimha Basnet, Devarṣi Upādhyāya, Vīrbhadra Upādhyāya, Maheśvar Josī, Aṅgad Dvāre and several others.<sup>4</sup> There were also Sardār Balibhañjan Malla of Parvat and other hillmen of Parvat, Pālpā and Pyūṭhānā who joined Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ 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. Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ Śāhko 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 Khatrī Kālu Pāre (q.v. p.41, n.51).

4. Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ Śāhko jīvanī, p.3.

1

accepted this proposal and all lived together in Banaras. The total party  
 is said to have numbered <sup>2</sup>600.

At Banaras Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ was introduced to a Siddha, a mendicant  
<sup>2a</sup>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 Lolārkakuṇḍa 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. <sup>3</sup>

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 jīvanī, p.4.

2. Ibid., p.6

3. Ibid., pp.6-8; HP, vol.51, fo.93.

2a. I.e. Aghorpathin, a particular sect of  
 Śaivas 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 Rāmkr̥ṣṇa Thāpā. They were once held up by some toll collectors on the bank of the Gomatī 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 Balibhañjan 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 Balibhañjan 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.

2. HP, op. cit., fos.94, 221; IP, vol. I, p.36, col.1; Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ Śāhko jīvanī, pp.12-14; Jñavālī, op. cit., pp.60-62.

disrespect by them. Skirmishes took place between the Gorkhalese and the Pālpā soldiers. Gandharva Sen controlled the situation by appeasing Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ, and further made overtures to him to strengthen friendly relations between Pālpā and Gorkhā. In order to win the favour of the people of Buṭāul Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ 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, Balibhañjan and other hill-men who were in his party. At the time of parting Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ 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 Balibhañjan 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 Balibhañjan replied that if he ate another's salt he would then prefer to serve him. After a few days' halt at Tanahū Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ proceeded towards Gorkhā. At the frontier he was received by his brothers and ministers, Māhōddāmkīrti, Dalmardan, Śūrapratāp, Daljit, Pṛthvīpāl, Rudrī Śāhī, Kālu Pāre, Caturbhuj Panta and Govinda Jośī Arjyāl. This was early in the spring of 1744. Shortly afterwards he commenced the

- 
1. Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ Śāhko jīvanī, p.10, mentions that Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ 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 Śāh.
  2. He did join the service of Raṇa Bahādur Śāh and was killed in action in the course of Nepal's conquest of the Čaubīsī (IP, vol.II, pt.iii, p.434).
  3. Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ Śāhko jīvanī, pp.15-21.
  4. Ibid..p.16.

reorganization of his old-fashioned army on the British model.<sup>1</sup>

Some time after Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ's arrival home, Kulānanda Dhakāl, the royal astrologer, suggested to him that he should once more invade Nuwākot 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<sup>2</sup> 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.<sup>3</sup> 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<sup>4</sup> rely solely on Khas soldiers.

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

1. C.R. Markham: Narratives, p.144; Thomas Smith: Narrative of a five years' residence at Nepal, vol.I, p.156.

2. HP, vol.51, fo.94. Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ, however, called him back when he was ready to invade Nuwākot for the second time the same year (vide p. 153).

3. HP, vol.17, fo.85; vol.51, fo.94.

4. DU, Tr., pp.19-20.

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 Cāubīsī states it could easily swing the rest to go against, and perpetually threaten, Gorkhā. Although intermarriages took place between the houses of the Cāubīsī families and the Śāh family of Gorkhā they did not bring about a cessation of the traditional hostilities.

In accordance with the advice given by Udyot Sen, Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ sent an embassy to Lamjung consisting of Raṇarudra Śāh (Rudrī Sāhī), Lakṣmīnārāyaṇ Pāre and Guṇanidhi Panta, with the proposal of friendship between the two states. He saw the necessity of developing friendship also with other Cāubīsī states, and accordingly sent Harihar Pandit, Śrī Upādhyāya Kaṛariyā and Sadāśiva Upādhyāya Kaḍyāl to Tanahū, Maṇi-kaṇṭha Rānā to Pālpā, and Gaṅgādhar Panta to Kāskī. They told the kings to whose courts they were sent that Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ 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. Kāskī too was an outlet for Tibetan trade. Pālpā and Tanahū, though far from Tibet, commanded gates to the trade routes to the plains and consequently shared the Tibetan trade. But

---

1. Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ Śāhko jīvanī, p.26.

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 Čaubīsī 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 lākh 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 Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ's<sup>1</sup> guarantee. Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ was happy that Lamjung accepted his proposals.

Soon afterwards Kālu Pāre arranged a meeting between Ripumardan and Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ at Cepeghāt, the confluence of the Cepe and Marsyāngdī, where the frontiers of Lamjung and Gorkhā met. The result was satisfactory to Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ. A treaty of friendship was drawn up. In order to bring lasting amity between the two states, Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ effected a particular ritual friendship<sup>2</sup> between Vaṃśarāj Pāre, son of Kālu Pāre, and Vīrmardan Sāhī, Crown Prince of Lamjung. He also wrote a letter<sup>3</sup> to Kulānanda<sup>1</sup> 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.<sup>3</sup>

This diplomatic success was due to the ingenuity of Kālu Pāre<sup>4</sup> 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. Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ Śāhko jīvanī, pp. 26-29.

2. I.ē. mit lāunu (q.v. p. 132, n. 3).

3. HP, vol. 51, fo. 94.

4. Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ Śāhko jīvanī, 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 Arghā<sup>1</sup>. 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 Čaubīsī states. To push on towards the east without making Lamjung neutral, if not an ally, would have been inviting disaster. That is why Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ 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 Čaubīsī 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 Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ's favourite and his first choice for the post, Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ 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 Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ 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 Pāṭībhanjyāṅg, the northern territory of Kāṭhmāṇḍu. Arghā, about 70 miles to the west of Gorkhā and 4 miles to the east of Pokhrā, was then the frontier between Lamjung and Kāskī (Jñavālī, op. cit., p. 72).

2. DU, Tr., p. 21.

3. Ācārya, DU, p. 26.

had become popular in and outside Gorkhā due to his ability. Pṛthvī-nārāyaṇ 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. Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ 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 Nuwākot, Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ was preoccupied with the problem of appointing a suitable person as minister. He sought advice from Candraprabhāvatī. He told her that since the Magars and Pantas had already showed their incompetence in the earlier invasions of Nuwākot, and since Kālu Pāre had

---

1. G.V.Y., p.105. It also seems likely that Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ 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 Bisya Nagarcī, a drummer, was mentioned by name. All assured him of their cooperation. Meanwhile Pr̥thvīnārāyaṇ 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 Pr̥thvīnārāyaṇ 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 Pr̥thvīnārāyaṇ 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. Pr̥thvīnārāyaṇ made a pledge to that effect and Kālu Pāre accepted the ministership offered to him.<sup>2</sup>

---

1. HP, vol. 51, fo. 94.

2. Pr̥thvīnārāyaṇ Śāhko jīvanī, p. 23.

Now that the potentially dangerous enemy, Lamjung, had become an ally, Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ sent his troops under two commanders, Bhadru Sāhī and Nandubisu Panta, to assist Ripumardan, King of Lamjung, in the conquest of Arghāū. The combined troops, however, met with serious reverses. Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ 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 Mahiman Khavās. Candraprabhāvati 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 Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ 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 Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ 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. Prthvīnārāyaṇ and Kālu Pāre followed 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, Prthvīnārāyaṇ 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 Jośī Arjyāl, Lakṣmīpati Panta, Gaṅgārām Pāre and Kālu Rānā Gyāngmī 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 Simalcaur near Khincet where his soldiers disguised themselves as farmers

---

1. HP, vol.51, fos.94-95.

2. Prthvīnārāyaṇ Sāhko jīvanī, p.38.

working the fallow land there. Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ<sup>1</sup> also won over an influential and experienced person in the locality, one Kalyāṇ Upādhyāya Rimāl.<sup>2</sup> Kulānanda had in the meantime found an auspicious day for the fixing of a pole on the Mahāmaṇḍal, the highest ridge of Nuwākoṭ, where the defenders had entrenched themselves. The fixing of a pole was an old tantric custom,<sup>3</sup> 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 Jāisī Adhikārī offered himself. He proposed that his face be smeared black and that he should feign to have been ignominiously ejected from Gorkhā. 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 Triśūlī, 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.

3. Jñavālī, op. cit., p. 83, n. 1.

1  
 feat and gave him some freehold land in Dhārkharka.

This time circumstances were favourable to Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ. 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 Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ for help against Jayaprakāś and had promised in return to be neutral when he attacked Nuwākot. The latest cause of estrangement between Pāṭan and Kāṭhmāṇḍu was on the question of the Lāmīdārā 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. Jayaprakāś 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. Jayaprakāś sent his minister, Sikhvāl Kājī, to Tanahū to negotiate; and a minister from Pāṭan, Kālīdās, solicited Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ for his help in its recovery, whereupon the latter obliged the King of Pāṭan by returning the tract held by Gorkhā.<sup>3</sup>

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

---

1. HP, op.cit., fo.95: ...

2. Son-in-law of Jagajjaya Malla, father of Jayaprakāś (Ācārya, 'Lalitpurkī māiyā Yogmatī', Śāradā, Kāṭhmāṇḍu 2007 (1950), Nārīviśeṣāṅka, p.23.

3. Regmi, op.cit., p.53.

precluded any possibility of collaboration between Pāṭan and Kāṭhmāṇḍu and the formation of a common front to check Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ'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 Kāṭhmāṇḍu only a prince born in Mohancok <sup>1</sup> during the reign of his father was eligible to be king. Rājendraprakāś, the eldest of the brothers, and Jayaprakāś, the next eldest, were not born in Mohancok; and they were both born before their father Jagajjaya <sup>2</sup> 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, <sup>3</sup> Rājendraprakāś died in 1731, <sup>4</sup> 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 Kāṭhmāṇḍu (d.1715), or Mahīndrasīmha, King of Dolakhā, a principality which it seems he had founded. He later became king of Kāṭhmāṇḍu and Pāṭan (1717-22). Dolakhā appears to have been then absorbed in Kāṭhmāṇḍu. After Mahīndrasīmha's death his daughter's son, Sukul Ṭhākur, was made his successor and placed on the throne of Kāṭhmāṇḍu under the name of Jagajjaya Malla by Jhagal Ṭhākul, since 1705 minister of Kāṭhmāṇḍu (HP, vol.50, fo.23, vol.52, fo.103; Ācārya, 'Lalitpurkī Māiyā Yogmatī', p. 21, 'Śrī Śrī Jayaprakāś Malla', pp.38-39).

3. HP, vol.55, fo.67; Ācārya, 'Śrī Śrī Jayaprakāś Malla', ibid.

4. HP, vol.50, fo.23, vol.52, fo.41; Jñavālī: Nepāl upatyakāko madhyakālīn itihās, pp.168-69.

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-<sup>1</sup>thokī, Raṅguvālī Bista and Basnet clans. They promised to make Rājyaprakāś king on the ground that he had been born in Mohancok<sup>2</sup> during the regnancy of his father.

On the death of Jagajjaya Malla in 1735<sup>3</sup> there arose two factions in the court, one faction led by a minister named Jhagal

---

1. HP, vol.50, fo.25. Khases had been in the military service of Kāṭhmāṇḍu 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). Jñāvālī has mentioned two dates of his death : 1735 (Prthvinārāyaṇ Śāh, p.76) and 1736 (Nepāl upatyakāko madhyakālīn itihās, pp.120 and 169).

Thakul supported the cause of Jayaprakāś, and curiously enough in doing so he had the approval of Rājendraprakāś 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 Kāśīrām Thāpā who had been appointed officer in charge of Nuwākot by Jagajjaya Malla.<sup>2</sup> Rājendraprakāś himself was afraid of incurring the wrath of Jayaprakāś Malla and fled to Pāṭan before the traditional mourning period for his father was over.<sup>3</sup> At Pāṭan he was received by the King Viṣṇu Malla who adopted him as his heir.<sup>4</sup> The main candidate having thus fled the Khas officers then advanced the claim of Narendraprakāś. Kāśīrām Thāpā took him to Devapāṭan where he declared him king of the north-eastern portion of Kāṭhmāṇḍu consisting of Nandīgrām, Devapāṭan, Gokarṇa, Cāgu and Sākhu. Jayaprakāś became furious and four months later sent troops to deal with the rebels. Kāśīrām Thāpā fled to Bhāt-gāū and entrusted Narendraprakāś to the protection of Raṇajitsimha, the King of Bhāt-gāū, while he himself retired to his home at Cāgu.<sup>5</sup> Shortly afterwards however Narendraprakāś died.

---

1. Ācārya, op.cit., pp.39-40.

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 itihās, 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 Raṇajitsimha as mentioned by Ācārya, ibid.

It was during these uneasy times that Narbhūpāl 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 Narbhūpāl for the failure of the attack on Nuwākoṭ, for which he was directly held responsible. Thereupon he joined Jayaprakāś, presumably to take revenge upon Narbhūpāl. Jayaprakāś appointed him officer in charge of Nuwākoṭ in place of Kāśīrām Thāpā<sup>1</sup>. In 1739 he also dismissed his minister Jhagal Ṭhakul<sup>2</sup> whose capacity for intrigue he suspected. Nevertheless the defection of Kāśīrām 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 Bhātḡāū 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, Bhājuvāsim Bhāju, and marched out to recover the lost territory. His attack failed whereupon he dismissed his new minister for incompetence and appointed Tāudhik<sup>3</sup> in his place. This constant change of ministers failed to strengthen Jayaprakāś's

---

1. Ācārya, op.cit., p.39; Jñavālī: Pḡthvinārāyan Śāh, p.36

2. Ācārya, ibid., p.40.

3. Jñavālī, ibid., pp.77-78.

position. His relations with Bhātgaū were bad, neither was there any love 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 Pr̥thvīnārāyaṇ's plans, and there is no doubt that it influenced his decision to attack at once. The objective was Nuwākoṭ.

Pr̥thvīnārāyaṇ 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-<sup>1</sup>prakāś whom he was now bound in honour to serve to the last. Nevertheless Pr̥thvīnārāyaṇ 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, Pr̥thvīnārāyaṇ led his army to attack. The troops were secretly ferried across the swollen waters of the Trisūlī by a boatman named Jalevā Mājhī<sup>2</sup>. His fortune

---

1. DU, Tr., p. 23.

2. Pr̥thvīnārāyaṇ Śāhko jīvanī, p. 39.

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 Mahāmaṇḍal. Thus Pr̥thvīnārāyaṇ<sup>1</sup> was able to reach the Nuwākōṭ Valley without opposition. He sent his troops to invade Nuwākōṭ in four columns via Gerku, Dharampānī, Asāubārī and Tīndhāryā<sup>2</sup>. The first three points were situated on the northern perimeter of Nuwākōṭ and at higher altitudes. Each column was led by a competent commanders. Jayanta Rānā had perhaps thought that the Gorkhalese troops would make the usual assault from the west after crossing the Triśuli river and that if they did he would be in a position to rout them. He was taken by surprise. Dalmardan Sāh, Pr̥thvīnārāyaṇ's 12-year-old brother also accompanied the troops. He is said to have fought heroically and killed Śankhamāṇi Rānā, the son of Jayanta Rānā, at Mahāmaṇḍal<sup>3</sup>. Jayanta Rānā, when effective resistance ceased to be possible, escaped to Belkōṭ, four miles south of Nuwākōṭ. The fort of Nuwākōṭ was beleaguered; and, there being no relief, it fell to the Gorkhalese troops during the early autumn. Pr̥thvīnārāyaṇ<sup>4</sup> marched via Tīndhāryā to take formal occupation of it at the head of a triumphal procession.

The presence of Jayanta Rānā only four miles away from Nuwākōṭ remained however a matter of anxiety to Pr̥thvīnārāyaṇ. In one

---

1. Jñawālī, op.cit., p.83.

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; Pr̥thvīnārāyaṇ Śāhko jīvanī, pp.40-41;43; Jñawālī, ibid., p.84). It appears that Pr̥thvīnārāyaṇ himself followed the troops marching through Tīndhāryā.

3. DU, Tr., p.24.

4. HP, vol.51, fo.95; IP, vol.I, p.125, col.1.

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<sup>1</sup> and advised him not to be so impulsive. Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ 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. Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ 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 Rānā was captured and taken to Nuwākōṭ<sup>2</sup>. There he was flayed alive. The occupation of Belkōṭ rendered Nuwākōṭ secure. Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ fortified it and shifted his headquarters there from Gorkhā<sup>3</sup>. Now he was just outside the Nepal Valley and poised to fall upon it.

---

1. A place quite close to Belkōṭ Fort and situated at the confluence of the Sindhure and Tādī rivers.

2. HP, op.cit., fos.95-97.

3. Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ Śahko jīvanī, 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 Kāśīrām 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 Kāśīrām Thāpā in his place and sent him at the

~~head of the allied force to recover Nuwākoṭ. This was his first success.~~

1. HP, op.cit., fo.97; Ācārya, 'Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ Śāhkā jīvanīko pūrvārdha', p.73.

2. Ācārya, 'Śrī Śrī Jayaprakāś Malla', p.43.

head of the allied force to recover Nuwākoṭ<sup>1</sup>. This was in 1746. Hearing that his enemies were coming with a big force to attack him, Pṛthvī-nārāyaṇ made ready to face the onslaught. He sent his family across the Triśūlī, and posted Māhādōlā<sup>2</sup> Śāh, Kālu Pāre and Tulārām Pāre to defend Gorkhā, ordering them to ensure that the King of Lamjung stayed neutral according to the existing agreement<sup>3</sup>. The Crown Prince was encamped at Sallyān Tār, midway between Gorkhā and Nuwākoṭ<sup>4</sup>, but the Queen remained with Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ, affirming that she would not leave her husband at the critical hour and would share any consequences, however dire, which might befall him. Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ 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 Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ'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.

2. Jñawālī: Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ Śāh, p.90.

3. I.e. Pratāpsimha (also known Simhapratāp) 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. Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ 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.<sup>1</sup> Thus assured and confident, the men marched out to fight in an orderly manner. Battle was joined at Gāirītheum 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 Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ was master of the whole of the Nuwākōṭ Province. Ashamed of the humiliating defeat, Kāśīrām preferred to go to his home in Palāncok,<sup>2</sup> in the territory of Bhātgāū, 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 Kāṭhmāṇḍu with the other seven officers, on Tuesday, 22 July 1746 to perform a religious rite Śrāvaṇī,<sup>3</sup> at Gaurīghāṭ on the bank of the Bāgmatī river.

---

1. HP, vol. 55, p. 90.

2. For Kāśīrām Thāpā's home vide p. 163, n. 5.

3. HP, vol. 55, p. 68, n. 24. 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 Kuṭubahil, a neighbouring ṭol. Jayaprakāś himself went to the place where Kāśīrām was staying. He charged him with desertion and had him murdered along with the other seven.<sup>1</sup> The same day also he had two of his ministers, Dāṭī and Bhiṅkhvā, decapitated in his palace garden.<sup>2</sup> These murders increased Jayaprakāś's unpopularity with his ministers and undermined the loyalty of his soldiers, many of whom were hillmen and Khases to whose tribe Kāśīrām Thāpā belonged. Kāśīrām Thāpā's murder was particularly unwise in view of his high standing as a military chief and his popularity especially among the Khases and hillmen. Kāṭhmāṇḍu was in turmoil and the fortunes of Jayaprakāś were at a low ebb.<sup>3</sup> Raṇabhīm Thāpā was released from prison; but it was too late. The situation got steadily worse. The brother of Bhiṅkhvā, Tāḍhik, himself a minister, fled to Pāṭan to seek the protection of Rājya-prakāś, Jayaprakāś's younger brother, who had recently become king there. Once there Tāḍhik strove to strain still further relations between the Malla kings.<sup>4</sup> Paraśurām Thāpā, Kāśīrām Thāpā's younger brother, was then at Palāncok. When he heard the news of his brother's death he fled to Kābhre out of fear and hid himself there. From there he went to Bisānkhu and afterwards to Pāṭan. There he aligned himself with its ministers,<sup>5</sup> Dhanākṣaya, Kṛṣṇadās, Sāikhvāl and Dhanavanta.

1. HP, op.cit., fos.97-98.

2. Ācārya, op.cit., p.43.

3. HP, ibid., fo.98.

4. Ācārya, ibid.

5. Prthvīnārāyaṇ Śāhko jīvanī, p.33

1

They entrusted him to the protection of Rañajitsimha, 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.<sup>2</sup> At this point Jayaprakāś was completely isolated.

Pr̥thvīnārāyaṇ 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 Triśūlī. Apart from the strategical and commercial importance it possessed, the whole fertile region comprising the valleys of Nuwākoṭ and these rivers<sup>3</sup> was to be of a source of supply to Pr̥thvīnārāyaṇ for the maintenance of his troops who then had been considerably increased. The acquisition of the Nuwākoṭ Province was a turning point in Pr̥thvīnārāyaṇ'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. Pr̥thvīnārāyaṇ Śāhko jīvanī, p.33

2. Ācārya, 'Pr̥thvīnārāyaṇ Śāhkā jīvanīko pūrvārdha', p.73.

3. As is apparent from Landon: Nepal, vol.II, pp.27-28.

## CHAPTER VII

## SECOND PHASE OF PRTHVINĀRĀYAṆ'S CAMPAIGNS (1746-56)

After the conquest of Nuwākot and now that the whole of the Nuwākot Province was in his possession Prthvinārāyaṇ 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 Nuwākot 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. Prthvinārāyaṇ 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 Čaubīsī states envied Prthvinārāyaṇ his conquest of the Nuwākot 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 Ranajitsimha began to invite him against Prthvinārāyaṇ, who therefore was moved to strengthen relations

with Raṇajitsimha 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 Raṇajitsimha. These two places formed the north-eastern extremity of the Nepal Valley, and were in the territory of the kingdom of Kāthmāṇḍu. Being situated in the immediate neighbourhood of Bhātgāū they were strategically important to Raṇajitsimha. As relations between Raṇajitsimha and Jayaprakāś were not cordial, the handing over of these places to Raṇajitsimha would have the advantage for Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ 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 Raṇajitsimha, 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 Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ 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 Jahāgīr Śāh and Sardār Mannu Sāhī of Khācī at Nāldum, and Devarṣi Upādhyāya Adhikārī and Umrāva Āśājī Bhāṛārī at Mahādeva Pokharī. After making this disposition he returned to Nuwākot.

---

1. HP, vol.51, fo.98.

2. Jñavālī, op.cit., p.101.

3. HP, ibid.

This action of Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ again flanned the flame of rivalry between Raṇajitsimha and Jayaprakāś, as indeed he had intended that it should. Raṇajitsimha 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 Jayaprakāś blinded him to the best interests of Bhātgaū<sup>1</sup>.

Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ was able to seize Nāldum and Mahādeva Pokhari so easily because Jayaprakāś 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 Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ 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 Bhātgaū<sup>2</sup> as well as from their kings. They even went to the extent of asking Paraśurām Thāpā, minister of Bhātgaū, to go to Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ in order to invite him to attack Kāṭhmāṇḍu, knowing that since the murder of his brother, Kāsīrām Thāpā, Paraśurām Thāpā had become hostile to Jayaprakāś. They hoped that, as relations between

---

1. HP, op.cit., fo.98.

2. In Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ Śāhko 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.

Rañajitsimha and Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ were cordial, the latter would accede<sup>1</sup> to Paraśurām's request.

A major portion of the land which is now Sindhu Pālcok and Dolakhā 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 Paraśurām 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 Paraśurām to propose to him a campaign to be jointly undertaken against Cāgu and Sākhu, the two places in the possession of Kāṭhmāṇḍu. He also said that if conquered these places were to be occupied by Bhātḡāū. Paraśurām was<sup>2</sup> determined to take revenge upon Jayaprakāś for the murder of his brother and so he obtained the concurrence of Rañajitsimha in this campaign.

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

---

1. Jñavālī, op.cit., pp.95-96; In DU, Tr., p. 24, Paraśurām is mentioned as having invited Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ to attack Nepal, while simultaneously sending his brother to incite the Caubīsī 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 jīvanīko pūrvārdha', 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 Rājyaprakāś of Pāṭan for help and getting it quickly marched with troops under his leadership<sup>1</sup>. They routed the Gorkhalese from the place where they had encamped. The people of Kāṭhmāṇḍu, who were already angry with Jayaprakāś because of the loss of Nāldum and Mahādeva Pokharī, were still further enraged by the loss of Cāgu. Taudhik, his former minister, besieged the royal palace with the help of troops sent by Rājyaprakāś; and Jayaprakāś was de-throned during the autumn festivals (Dasāī) of 1746 and sent as a captive to Pāṭan where Rājyaprakāś provided for his comfort.<sup>2</sup> The intriguers put Jayaprakāś's infant son, Jyotiprakāś,<sup>3</sup> on the throne. Even his mother Kumudini, his wife Dayāvati, and a concubine Māiju had collaborated with the intriguers to precipitate his downfall. Dayāvati was influenced by a Brahman called Dhanu Jujū,<sup>4</sup> and Māiju by a minister called Mihma Pradhān, to side with them.<sup>5</sup> The mother of the infant king

1. Jñavālī: Nepāl upatyakāko madhyakālīn itihās, pp.170-71, Prthvinārāyaṇ Śāh, p.96.

2. Ācārya, 'Śrī Śrī Jayaprakāś Malla', p.45.

3. HP, vol.55, fo.67, and Wright, op.cit., p.224, say he was of eighteen months. According to Ācārya, ibid., p.40, and Jñavālī, Nepāl upatyakāko madhya-  
Kālīn itihās, p.170, he was five. Walsh, op.cit., p.696, mentions him to have been 2½ years old.

4. Probably the son of the royal priest who was also against Jayaprakāś (Prthvinārāyaṇ Śāhko jīvanī, p.32).

5. HP, vol.50, fos.24-25; Jñavālī, op.cit., p.200.

became Regent,<sup>1</sup> and Tāudhik was made Chief Minister.<sup>2</sup> The latter was quick to realize the threat posed by the advances of Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ into the Nepal Valley.<sup>3</sup> He therefore prevailed upon Kālidās, minister of Pāṭan,<sup>4</sup> 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,<sup>5</sup> now 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 Tāudhik, assisted by troops of Pāṭan, made a surprise attack upon the Gorkhalese troops lately encamped near Sākhu and put them to flight.<sup>6</sup> Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ, who was then in Bhātgāū, returned to Nuwākōṭ.<sup>6</sup> The defeat was a serious blow to him. He realized that the advance into

the

---

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.

2. Jñavālī: Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ Śāh, p.97.

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

4. He <sup>was</sup> also one of the intriguers responsible for the dethronement of Jayaprakāś (Jñavālī: Nepāl upatyakāko madhyakālīn itihās, p.170).

5. Ācārya, ibid., where he says that Śivarāmsimha 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 Nuwākot 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 Kāṭhmāṇḍu; 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 Dayāvati<sup>1</sup>. She had by this time become powerful enough to slight her minister Taudhik. She went as far as to enter into an adulterous relationship with Garuḍsimha, 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 Guhyeśvari<sup>2</sup>. 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 Khastchiefs, knew that he was staying in Guhyeśvari 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 (Prthvinārāyaṇ Sāhko jivani, p. pp.31-32).

2. HP, vol.55, fo.67; Ācārya, op.cit., p.45.

attack him; but they were repulsed.<sup>1</sup> After some time he marched with his improvised band of soldiers towards the royal palace. Troops sent by Dayāvati came over to his side. He reached the royal palace without further resistance. His antagonists scattered, and Garuḍsimha fled to seek the protection of Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ. Tāuḍhik hid in the house of a noble, Manorathsimha Māske. Dayāvati was arrested and confined to the Lakṣmīpur courtyard of the royal palace. Jayaprakāś regained his throne on 30 April 1750.<sup>2</sup> The intriguers were treated with great cruelty. All the attendants of Dayāvati were slaughtered. Tāuḍhik was forced to commit suicide. The property of Manorathsimha was confiscated on the ground of his having given shelter to Tāuḍhik. Unable to survive her cruel punishment, Dayāvati died in confinement. Mihmadhan Pradhān, accused of adultery with Māiju, was killed. Dhan Juju, the Brahman also accused of adultery with Dayāvati, died as a result of wounds inflicted upon him while undergoing punishment. Only the infant son was spared.<sup>3</sup> 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 Paraśurām took Sindhu Pālcok 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.

2. L. Petech: I missionari italiani nel Tibet e nel Nepal, Pt.I, Intro. xxxi.

3. HP, ibid., vol.50, fo.25; Ācārya, op.cit.; Jñavālī; Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ Śāh pp.97-98.

Bhātgaū. Jayaprakāś, 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 Pāṭībhanjyāng by Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ and his control of the route to Kerung, and furthermore, of the ~~the~~ occupation of Sindhu Pālcok and Dolakhā by Raṇajitsimha and his consequent control of the route to Kutī, the people of Kāṭhmāṇḍu, 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, Jayaprakāś thought it better to attempt to establish friendship with Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ as well as with Raṇajitsimha 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 Citlāṅg and Pharping which were situated on the outskirts of Pāṭan, and a few other places which stretched from the Mahābhārat range<sup>2</sup> down to the plains. Prthvīnārāyaṇ put an end to the competition from Tanahū by a ruse. He persuaded Rājyaprakāś and his Chief Minister, Dhanavanta, to pay an indemnity to Trivikram for the restoration of the conquered boundary to the jurisdiction of Pāṭan; whereupon the commander of Trivikram's troops withdrew taking with him the money paid as indemnity.<sup>3</sup> Prthvīnārāyaṇ then took measures to prevent Trivikram from making like advances in the future. He sent Kālu Pāre to occupy Jhiltung, which formed a part of the Lāmīdārā district then in the possession of Pāṭan, even at the risk of hostility from the side of Tanahū. After occupying it Gorkhalese troops captured Pālunḡ, Tistung and Citlāṅg, all these places in the same district, and annexed the whole of the district without any opposition.<sup>4</sup> The loss of the Lāmīdārā district, which had fertile valleys and a few mines, further

1. Regnal period 1749-64 as given by Ambīkāprasād Upādhyāya: Nepālko itihās, 2nd ed., p.79, and 1741-69 by Ācārya, 'Tanahūko Senvaṃśa', p.72.

2. The central range of <sup>the</sup> mountains running from east to west in Nepal.

3. Ācārya, 'Śrī Śrī Jayaprakāś Malla', pp.47-48, 'Prthvīnārāyaṇ Śāhkā jīvanīko pūrvārdha', p.74.

4. It is not certain when Jhiltung and other places in the Lāmīdārā district were occupied by Prthvīnārāyaṇ. According to a grant made by Rājyaprakāś to a Brahman, Gaṅgādās Panta, for a gift of Gajurī village this district seems to have been in the possession of Pāṭan until 1748 (IP, vol.I, pp.155-56). Ācārya, 'Śrī Śrī Jayaprakāś Malla', pp.48, 83, refers to two letters written by Rājyaprakāś and Jayaprakāś to Kālu Pāre after he captured Jhiltung. 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 Pālunḡ, Tistunḡ and Citlānḡ accepted Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ as their master.<sup>1</sup>

Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ next began to plan with considerable shrewdness of timing to capture other prominent outposts round the Nepal Valley and strengthen his blockade. Jayaprakāś, though shaken by the pressure exerted by Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ, 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 Caubīsī. This emboldened him to take steps to retrieve Nāldum and Mahādeva Pokharī, still occupied by Raṇajitsimha after Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ had handed them over to him in 1746, and their forts which were controlled by the Gorkhalese contingents stationed there. Jayaprakāś realized that by collaborating with Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ in their possession, Raṇajitsimha had endangered the security of Kāṭhmāṇḡ, but concealing his concern at their loss he made it clear to Raṇajitsimha that had Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ 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 Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ's retention of them betrayed his ulterior motive which was to establish bases inside the Nepal Valley from which to conquer Bhātḡāū and the country to the east of it. Raṇajitsimha was apparently convinced. Apparently the King of Pāṭan was also won over and the three monarchs

---

1. Letter no.2, p.59.

planned to dispossess Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ of the bases he held in the Valley. As a result of their joint action the Gorkhalese were driven out of Nāldum and Mahādeva Pokharī by Malla troops in command of Cingdi Māske, a minister of Jayaprakāś<sup>1</sup>. Cāutariyā Jahāgīr Śāh and Devarṣi Upādhyāya Adhikārī were killed while defending the forts and Sardār Mannu Sāhī and Āsājit Bhāṛārī fled with the remaining troops to Nuwākoṭ. The defeat foiled Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ's plan to maintain an eastern gateway into the Valley.<sup>2</sup>

Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ 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, Śaktivallabh Jośī, Bali Panta, Bāgyā Basnet, Motyā Khatri, Vīrbhadra Basnet and Harivaṃśa Upādhyāya Adhikārī<sup>3</sup>. Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ was now only eight miles away from Kāṭhmāṇḍu and close enough to make a direct attack. On one side Dahacok linked up Lāmīḍāṛā and Dhāding, and on the other the Triśūlī 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. Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ made arrangements to strengthen his hold on this strate-

---

1. Jñavālī: Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ Śāh, pp.101-2, wherein he also says that Jayaprakāś availed of the opportunity at this time when Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ was involved in hostilities from the side of the Cāubīsī.

2. HP, vol.51, fo.98. From an inscription of January 1754 (Sāṃskṛtaśandeśar year 1, nos.10-12, pp772-74) it seems that Nāldum remained in the possession of Raṇajitsimha until it was recaptured by Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ on 1 August 1754 (vide p. 183).

3. HP, ibid.

gically important bastion and stationed troops there under the command of Harivaṁśa Upādhyāya Adhikārī who was expressly charged to retain it at any cost. From Dahacok Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ<sup>1</sup> was able to subjugate Pharping and other villages to the south of it, all of which were in the possession of Pāṭan. 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 Thānkoṭ, Balkhu and other villages of strategical importance under his own control.<sup>2</sup>

As a result of the success Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ felt himself enough to push on to the east beyond the Sindhu Valley even without the support or concurrence of Lamjung.<sup>3</sup> Kālu Pāre was commissioned to do battle for the campaign. He, however, objected to Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ'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 Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ, 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 Nuwākoṭ

---

1. HP, op.cit.

2. Jñavālī: Nepāl upatyakāko madhyakālīn itihās, p.201.

3. Vide p. 154.

saying that since Pr̥thvīnārāyaṇ 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. Pr̥thvīnārāyaṇ 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 Bay <sup>1</sup>ṭār 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 Cāubīsī. Pr̥thvīnārāyaṇ sent his troops accompanied by Rudrī Sāhī, Daljit Śāh, Sardār Bali Panta, Jayā Bāniyā, Ranyā Bāniyā, Vīrbhadra Basnet, Bijyā Khatrī and Motyā Khatrī for the conquest of the east.

There is a story<sup>2</sup> that about this time Pr̥thvīnārāyaṇ 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, Rāmkr̥ṣṇa Jośī, to interpret it for him. But the priest told him that it was caused by flatulence. Not satisfied with this interpretation, he called Śaktivallabh Jośī, one of his astrologers then stationed as the frontier officer of Lāmīdārā. He said that the dream augured well for the conquest of the Nepal Valley. Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ was very pleased with this interpretation as it fell in with the ambition which he so greatly cherished. Śaktivallabh was a Brahman but being in the military service he had given up his priestly functions. He was made to undergo expiation after which Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ again made him a priest. Rāmkr̥ṣṇa on the other hand having<sup>1</sup> enraged his master by his interpretation was retired on a year's pay.

Meanwhile Jayamaṅgal Miśra came from Banaras to see Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ at Nuwākoṭ. He was the Pandit of Banaras who had performed Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ's second marriage, and belonged to the Miśra family the members of which had been priests to the Śāh kings of Gorkhā since the times of Rām Śāh.<sup>2</sup> Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ 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<sup>3</sup> 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. Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ was very pleased with

---

1. HP, op.cit.

2. Vide p. 131.

3. About Jayamaṅgal Miśra and the mendicant vide p. 147.

the priest and he made him the priest of his Queen Narendralakṣmī. 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 Milāñce 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 Pālcok and Dolakhā. These places had recently been captured by Raṇajitsimha 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 Raṇajitsimha. He was now master of the region stretching from Sindhu and Pāṭībhanjyāṅg 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. Hp, op.cit.

2. Jñavālī: 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 Gaubīsī invasion of Sirhāncok 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).

3. Vide pp.180-81.

4. Letters nos. 1 and 4, pp.56, 61. Vide also Ācārya, ibid. : p.

blow to the Malla kings. The capture of Dahacok, Milāñce, Sindhu Pālcok and Dolakhā was clear proof of their inability to defend their territories.

Shortly after, Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ planned to attack Nāldum 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 Nuwākoṭ on Wednesday, 7 August, to the headmen and principal inhabitants of Dolakhā 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 Pālung, Tiṣṭung and Citlāng had completely surrendered and thereafter had been enjoying security of life and property.

The spectacular advances made by Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ alarmed the King of Parvat who feared that the Čaubīsī and Bāīsī would be overrun by the Gorkhalese 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 Čaubīsī kings made a combined attack on Sirhāncok, a frontier outpost near the boundary of Lamjung and 10 miles north-west of Gorkhā. Their main purpose was to distract Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ from the

---

1. HP, vol.51, fos.98-99, vol.52, fo.117.

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, Sardār Bhadrū Sāhī and Bhadāl Dvāre,<sup>1</sup> informed Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ of the concerted attack.<sup>2</sup> Sirhāncok was captured by the Cāubīsī troops on Monday, 26 May 1755.<sup>3</sup> Shortly after Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ sent his troops to defend Ajīrḡarḡh, one mile north of Gorkhā. He further sent his troops from Nuwākoṭ accompanied by Mahoddām̄kīrti Śāh, Kālu Pāre,<sup>4</sup> Kalāi Dvāre and Ambar Pāre, the Dvāre of Sallyān Ṭār 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.<sup>5</sup> 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, Kalāi Dvāre and others, died. Ultimately however the Gorkhalese were victorious and Sirhāncok was recovered. Many of the enemy chiefs, including Sardār Mahīdhar 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 Balibhañjan 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'.

2. HP, vol.51,fo.99.

3. HP, vol.52,fo.117.

4. It seems he had by this time returned from Lamjung (vide p.186).

5. HP, *ibid.*

1  
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 Malla 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 Kāṭhmāṇḍu. They included Kājī Tulārām Pāre, Bali Panta, Jayakṛṣṇa Thāpā, Devarāj 2 Kaṭuvāl 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 3 permitted by Jayaprakāś to remain in Kāṭhmāṇḍu for a couple of weeks.

---

1. HP, vol.51,fo.99. Balibhañjan 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 Mūlcok, the main courtyard of the royal palace Hanūmāṇḍhokā. 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 Dhokā Ṭol and escaped through a drain to the other side of the Viṣṇumatī 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 Lakṣmīpur, 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 tutelary deity of the Mallas, Taleju (Tulajā 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. He

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 Nāldum with the help of Kājī Dhanavanta of Pāṭan with whom he had formed a ritual friendship. From Nāldum he reached Nuwākoṭ safely and reported to Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ. Bali Panta's health was fast deteriorating. He was asked if he wanted to go to the temple of Paśupati 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 Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ. 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 Pāṭan, and with his help managed to reach Nuwākoṭ. Jñavālī: Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ Śāh, p.109, says that he escaped through the help of Kālidās, and angered at this Jayaprakāś had the Pāṭan minister murdered later.

2. HP, vol.51, fo.101.

The object of sending his men on espionage having proved futile Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ 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 Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ 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 Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ. 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, Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ 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<sup>1</sup> 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 Brahmins of Belkoṭ, Tānsing and Nuwākot, once his subjects but now Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ's. He suggested that they should

---

1. HP, op.cit.

invite Pratāpsimha Śāh, the Gorkhalese Crown Prince, to hunt wild boars in the forest of Citlāng, where he could be arrested by his (Jayāprakāś's) <sup>Bhotiyā</sup> 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 Jageśvar 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 Pāvā. 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 <sup>1</sup> than the Upādhyāya Brahmans.

What Jayāprakāś 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,<sup>2</sup> 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 Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ. 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 Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ, in spite of the fact that the latter had already overrun much of Pāṭan's territory.

---

1. Vide p. 178.

2. Vide p. 163.

Raṇajitsimha was more anxious to regain Nāldum rather than stand united with Jayaprakāś. Accordingly he sent a request to Pṛthvī-nārāyaṇ asking him to hand over the place once again as he did when he conquered it the first time. Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ replied that since he (Raṇajit-<sup>1</sup>simha) was incapable of retaining it, he would instead capture Cāgu and hand that over to him. Cāgu was in the territory of Kāṭhmāṇḍu and it also commanded the route to Bhāt-gāū, and if captured would be a great strategical asset to Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ. His greed quickened, Raṇajitsimha wrote a letter to Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ on Sunday, 31 August 1755, agreeing to his proposal,<sup>2</sup> and assuring him of his cooperation in the action. Seeing that Dhanavanta was friendly towards him and that Jayaprakāś stood alone, Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ 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 Bhāt-gāū would join them<sup>3</sup> at Telkoṭ Bhanjyāṅg. But the minister of Raṇajitsimha, Paraśurām Thāpā, told his king that Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ 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. Paraśurām objected to this alliance on the ground that it was only a means to aggrandize Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ and was sure to estrange Jayaprakāś. Raṇajitsimha was however confident that Pṛthvī-nārāyaṇ 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).

2. IP, vol.II,pt.iii,p.467, Letter no.10.

3. A pass in the Telkoṭ ridge which is nearly 4 miles south-east of Sākhu and 2½ miles due east of Cāgu. From Bhāt-gāū it is 4 miles in the north-east.

Paraśurām 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 Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ. From the place where he encamped Paraśurām sent a message to the kings of Pāṭan and Kāṭhmāṇḍu about the intended attack and warned them of the serious consequences which would befall all the Malla kings if it were successful. Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ himself marched with his troops hoping to be joined by those of Bhātḡāū later, but to his surprise he saw a body of men from Pāṭan and Kāṭhmāṇḍu assembled to resist him. The Gorkhalese troops were not strong enough to face the combined forces of their adversaries and were badly defeated. Śivarām-simha Basnet, a prominent Gorkhalese army chief, was killed at Sāḡācok in the course of the fighting. Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ too had a narrow escape when his palanquin-bearers were shot dead in the battle-field. He hurried on foot to Bhātḡāū but being unable to walk employed a Newār farmer to carry him on his back for the rest of the journey. He met Paraśurām on the way at the foot of the Telkoṭ ridge, and exhorted him not to be forgetful of the moral duty he owed him. Paraśurām replied that he would do what his duty demanded. So saying he deputed his son to accompany Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ and went himself to Telkoṭ for its defence. Nāldum also came near to being recaptured by the Malla troops, but the Gorkhalese managed to hold out. When Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ reached Bhātḡāū, he charged

---

1. ? Prabhurām. The name is not clear in the account given in HP, vol. 51, fo. 103.

2. Erroneously written Belkoṭ Pass in the account (ibid.).

Rañajitsimha with having betrayed him. The latter denied the charge telling Pr̥thvīnārāyaṇ that perhaps he (Pr̥thvīnārāyaṇ) knew who had betrayed him but if he did not he would tell him himself.<sup>1</sup>

Pr̥thvīnārāyaṇ remained for one year at Bhātḡāū. During his stay he asked Rañajitsimha for Paraśurām Thāpā, the man whom he held responsible for creating unpleasantness between himself and Rañajitsimha, and for the loss of the action against Cāḡu. Rañajitsimha refused to surrender him to Pr̥thvīnārāyaṇ. Meanwhile much disconcerted at the presence of Pr̥thvīnārāyaṇ inside the Nepal Valley, Jayaprakāś sent his men with messages to Rañajitsimha, asking him to arrest Pr̥thvīnārāyaṇ and send him to Kāṭhmāṇḡu, adding that if he did not do so, he would endanger the security of both Bhātḡāū and Kāṭhmāṇḡu. Rañajitsimha 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 Jayaprakāś were fast deteriorating, he ultimately requested Pr̥thvīnārāyaṇ to go back to his country. Accordingly the Gorkhalese king left Bhātḡāū for Nāldum, whence he returned to Nuwākot<sup>2</sup> at the end of 1756.

---

1. HP, op.cit., fos.102-3.

2. Ibid. fo.103.

## CHAPTER VIII

## THIRD PHASE OF PRTHVINĀRĀYAṆ'S CAMPAIGNS (1756-67)

Next to Lamjung the most powerful kingdom in the Caubīsī were Tanahū, Pālpā, Kāskī and Parvat. Since in the course of Prthvī-  
*Campaigns*  
 nārāyaṇ's, 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.<sup>1</sup> 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.<sup>2</sup> Later he supported the kings of Lamjung and Parvat in their joint invasion of Sirhāncok in 1755.<sup>3</sup> 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.<sup>4</sup>

Some time after his return from Bhāt-gāū 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 Bhāt-gāū during the year

1. Jñavālī: Prthvīnārāyaṇ Śāh, p.114.

2. Vide p.182.

3. Jñavālī, *ibid.*

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 Raṇajitsimha, 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 Kāśī (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 Kāśī and died there. Whatever may have been the reason for Trivikram's action Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ took it as a great insult to his concubine and determined to take revenge. He sent for Gaureśvar,<sup>2</sup> who was a priest both of his father and Trivikram,<sup>3</sup> 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.<sup>4</sup> Gaureśvar went to Trivikram with this proposal. Trivikram told him that Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ 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 G.V.Y., p.132; also Jñavālī, op.cit., p.115).

3. G.V.Y., p.102.

4. There is a variant story regarding the person whom Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ requested to arrange the meeting he contemplated. It is said that when he heard the death of his concubine called Svabhābati [? Śobhāvati] after she had been detained at Deughāṭ by the King of Tanahū on her way to Kāśī, Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ 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 Jyāmīrghāṭ. Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ was pleased with this Bārā, and appointed him priest of Mankāmnā 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 Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ. 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 Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ's heart and his real intention. The priest therefore came to Nuwākoṭ to find if there was any such intention on Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ's part. He told the king about the fears harboured by Trivikram. Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ replied that he had to meet Trivikram at any <sup>1</sup> 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 Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ's pure motive. A letter was written to Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ, proposing the meeting to take place at Jyāmīrghāṭ, on the banks of the Triśūlī, and that both parties should meet unarmed. Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ accepted the proposal. He encamped at Phujelṭār. Trivikram also encamped on the bank of the Triśūlī. Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ had ordered his men the previous night to hide their swords and

---

1. G.V.Y., p.89; H.P., 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 Gaureśvar, Trivikram came unarmed. Once the formal exchanges were over, the two kings retired to discuss business. At the outset Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ 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 Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ of insulting his concubine. He was taken by him to Nuwākoṭ as a captive by way of Gorkhā. On the way Trivikram saw Gaureśvar whom he reprimanded for having led him into a trap. Gaureśvar was greatly distressed and at Gorkhā he remonstrated with Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ about his behaviour. In consequence he was ordered to leave Gorkhā. Gaureśvar was constrained to leave for Tanahū with his family. Trivikram was taken to Nuwākoṭ and subsequently released. This episode abundantly shows how Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ could without compunction resort to any act of betrayal to further his interests.

---

1. The sons of Gaureśvar 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., fos.103-4.

3. It is not known when Trivikram was arrested and released. He was one of the Caubīsī kings who had invaded Sirhāncok in 1755 (vide p. 201). It is quite probable that Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ determined to take revenge upon him from that time. From an inscription of Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ (IP, vol.I, 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, Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ was also simultaneously planning to apprehend Raṇajitsimha of Bhātgaū. 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. Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ sent Kālu Pāre with some troops to arrest Raṇajitsimha, ordering him first to invite Raṇajitsimha to meet him at Pālcok and then to arrest him on his arrival there. On the way to Pālcok however Raṇajitsimha 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. Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ 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 Raṇajitsimha and arrest him there, he had no alternative but to return. Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ was not satisfied with this explanation. The apparent outcome of the episode was that henceforth Raṇajitsimha no longer remained friendly towards Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ, a fact which is also confirmed by the campaigns which the latter undertook shortly afterwards against the dominions of Bhātgaū.

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.

2. Vide p. 218.

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 Jayaprakāś's brother Rājyaprakāś, who had been ruling in Pāṭan since 1745, was murdered by his ministers.<sup>1</sup> Jayaprakāś once more acted violently. He determined to retaliate. At this Bhiṅkhvādhan, one of the ministers in Pāṭan, made it known that he would not be subservient to Jayaprakāś, but he later went to Jayaprakāś when assured by the latter's agent of the word of honour given to him. Jayaprakāś got hold of the minister by this artifice and imprisoned him. Bhiṅkhvādhan committed suicide. Jayaprakāś also got hold of the other ministers of Pāṭan 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 Jayaprakāś of his throne.<sup>2</sup>

In the meantime Jayaprakāś had constructed an inn in the temple of Guhyeśvarī. 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 Rājyaprakāś'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 Gaṅgādhar Jhā, a Māithil Brahman minister of Jayaprakāś, and the jewelry was restored to its place.<sup>1</sup> This incident strained relations between Jayaprakāś and Raṇajitsiṃha even further.

Prthvīnārāyaṇ was quick to see his opportunity in the disorder prevailing in the Nepal Valley. He decided to attack Kīrtipur, 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 Nāldum, 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 Śūrapratāp and a few others, opposed the plan Prthvīnārāyaṇ was contemplating. The veteran Kālu Pāre, the infallible astrologer Kulānanda, and the seasoned strategist Harivaṃśa 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. Prthvīnārāyaṇ became very angry. He rebuked and abused Harivaṃśa and Kulānanda for having sided with Kālu Pāre. He

सुन्दर गणेश

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 Bālkr̥ṣṇa<sup>1</sup> to do so and would 'suré achieve success by invading at the auspicious moment declared by him. Kulānanda on his part berated Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ, telling him that Bālkr̥ṣṇa 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 Śūrāpratāp 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. Bālkr̥ṣṇa 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. Bālkr̥ṣṇa Arjyāl, another astrologer.

up their differences. They realized that Kīrtipur was the heart of the Valley and hence its loss to Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ would consequently mean loss of their kingdoms. They also realized that Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ 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 Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ 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, Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ 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 Vamśarāj to the care of Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ 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 Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ 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 Ṭamkeśvar with his whole army, and King Viśvajit of Pāṭan<sup>1</sup> marched via Gaṇeśthān to join him. Although the King of Bhātgaū 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 Bhātgaū 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,<sup>2</sup> Lāṭā Khatrī, Sahasrām Rānā, Sobyā Banuvā<sup>3</sup> and Sheikh Zorābar. All the mercenaries brought from the plains by Śaktivallabh, a Gorkhalese officer, were killed.<sup>4</sup> A great number of Gorkhalese Umrāvas (Commandants) and members of the traditional families died, and almost an equal number were wounded. Kālu Pāre was struck down by Jayaprakāś himself. Pṛthvī-nārāyaṇ, 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.<sup>5</sup> He was carried

---

1. A Ṭhakurī of 18 who had been made king in early 1757 (Ācārya, 'Śrī Śrī 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 Banuvā. He was perhaps the same Sobyā Banuvā Thāpā mentioned in Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ Śāhko jīvanī, p.2.

3. A Muslim who had trained Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ's artillerymen (DU, Tr., p.54, n.143)

4. Wright, op.cit., p.227.

5. Ibid.

away by a Duān (palanquin-bearer) and a Kasāī (butcher), and lastly by Jayakṛṣṇa 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-bhairava in Kīrtipur. Next day he permitted the Gorkhalese to bury the dead and carry away the wounded. He thought that the Gorkhalese were now destroyed, and made great rejoicings. Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ realized his folly for having repudiated the advice given by Kālu Pāre. He was very sad at the huge casualties<sup>and</sup> 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<sup>at</sup> the costly defeat of Kīrtipur that he suspended his campaign for 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 "Syābās 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 Jayakṛṣṇa 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, Kāṭhmānḍu and Gorkhā, were to exchange representatives who would be stationed at Kāṭhmānḍu and Gorkhā respectively.
- 2) The dominions of Fāṭan were to be handed over to Gorkhā and Nāldum must be restored to Kāṭhmānḍu, 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 Sāmvat 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 śudi 8 Tuesday, the week-day 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 India 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 Nuwākot and goods were liable to be checked and opened provided both the 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 Kāṭhmāṇḍu<sup>1</sup>ko 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 Kāṭhmāṇḍu are honoured. May five great sins<sup>2</sup> 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 Raṇajitsimha with whom first discord quickly arose. Raṇajitsimha detained some of Jayaprakāś's subjects who had come to Bhātgaū 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 Raṇajitsimha, who had come to the temple of Paśupatināth to perform some religious rite, and released<sup>1</sup> 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 Kāśīrām Thāpā the Khas and Magar 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 Nagarkoṭīs from

---

1. Wright, op.cit., pp.227-28.

Kānḡrā. This however seems unlikely in view of its distance from  
 Kāṭhmāṇḡu.<sup>1</sup> It is more likely that they were Bhoṭiyās, some of whom he  
 had employed on an earlier occasion;<sup>2</sup> or the reference might be to the  
 sect of the Sannyāsīs known as Nāḡās who operated as raiders in northern  
 India where they were employed as mercenaries.<sup>3</sup>

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 Paśupatiṇāth  
 and Jayavāgeśvarī.<sup>4</sup> This was an act of necessity not of impiety. Jaya-  
 prakāś 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.<sup>5</sup> On this occasion he promised to pay back twice the value of the  
 jewelry he had taken.<sup>6</sup> 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 in-  
 excusable profanation in their eyes, but also because the jewelry was

1. Modern Nagarkoṭ is west of Simla and south-east of Kashmir. In the seventeenth century the name Nagarkoṭ 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.

5. Wright, ibid., pp.225-26, 228; HP, vol.52, fo.44; IP, vol.I, p.88, col.2, vol.II, pt.iii, pp.454-56.

vol.55, fo.68;

6. Wright, ibid.; HP, vol.55, fo.69.

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 Bhātḡāū as some of the jewelry held at Paśupatinhād from time to time been offered to the temple by them.<sup>1</sup>

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.<sup>2</sup> 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 Nuwākot.<sup>3</sup> His love for them however made the Khases violent. They plundered and appropriated the property of the Māithil Brahmans.<sup>4</sup> Jayaprakāś's love for them further made the Khases of Kāṭhmāṇḍu resentful. They went to Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ and transferred to his name the revenue and possession of the lands they enjoyed within the jurisdiction of Kāṭhmāṇḍu.<sup>5</sup>

---

1. Wright, op.cit.; HP, op.cit.

2. HP, ibid.,fo.68.

3. HP, vol.52,fo.41.

4. HP, vol.55,fo.67.

5. Ibid.,fo.70.

Jayaprakāś's embarrassment was soon utilized by Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ 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 Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ 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 Kāthmāṇḍu Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ 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 Śivapurī<sup>1</sup>. 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 Nuwākot being apparently satisfied by Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ's reassuring letter. He was asked to find an auspicious moment for fixing a pole<sup>2</sup> in Śivapurī. Kulānanda declared midnight of Sunday, 2 July 1759 to be auspicious for that purpose. Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ took the first step. He sent his troops to fix a pole at the auspicious moment and capture Śivapurī. It was captured shortly afterwards. The victory none the less cost a great

- 
1. For Śivapurī 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, Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ decided to capture other outposts as well. He sent a force which included Daljit Śah, Śrīharṣa Panta, Bhadru Sāhī, Rāmkrṣṇa Kāvar, Vīrbhadra Basnet, Pratiman Adhikārī, Śyām Adhikārī, Bhīmsen Thāpā<sup>1</sup> and several prominent chiefs to capture Palāncok<sup>2</sup>. They captured it on Friday, 11 January 1760 after defeating a force of Jayaprakāś'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 Bhāt-gāū<sup>3</sup> via the valley of Banepā. Thus they were a great acquisition for Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ. Next the Gorkhalese troops further marched west and captured Kābhre<sup>4</sup>, an important fort nearly 10 miles to the south-west of Palāncok, where they defeated some troops of Raṇajitsimha, who were stationed there in defence. It appears that Jayaprakāś and Raṇajitsimha had been since their joint action for the defence of Kīrtipur become united to resist Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ's advances. But one notices their inability to compete with Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ 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 <sup>the</sup> Banepā Valley. It is nearly 35 miles to the east of Kāthmāṇḍu and was in the possession of Bhāt-gāū.

3. For the land of the Kirātas vide p.49, n.105.

4. A village nearly 10 miles to the south-west of Palāncok. It was also in the possession of Bhāt-gāū. 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 Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ illustrates their incapacity to cope with him in a campaign. The inhabitants of Kābhre were hostile to Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ for a considerable time and so he had to come there personally to persuade one of its headmen (Pradhān), Abhudsi [?Abhyudayasimha] Pradhān, to create a division there<sup>1</sup> for which he was promised some high rank. In 1761 Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ captured two more outposts, Cāukoṭ<sup>2</sup> on Monday, 8 June, and Kāhule sometime later.<sup>3</sup> 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 Cāukoṭ, the inhabitants of which defended it with a great heroism for a fortnight.<sup>4</sup> 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. Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ 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<sup>5</sup>

---

1. Letter no.5, p.63.

2. HP, vol.51, fo.105. According to IP, vol.I, p.126, col.1, Bāgyā Basnet was in command of the Gorkhalese troops who attacked Cāukoṭ. The place is roughly one mile to the south of Banepā.

3. IP, ibid. For Kāhule vide p.46, n.91

4. Wright, op.cit., pp.253-55. But the invasion of Bhātḡāũ mentioned on p.255, ibid., did not follow the invasion of Cāukoṭ.

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 Śaka 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 Cāukoṭ are mentioned as Śaka 1683 Jyeṣṭha 30 Monday, which also correspond with Monday, 8 June 1761.

Mahendrasimha) Rāī, its gallant defender, had been killed, and his companion, Nāmsimha Rāī<sup>1</sup>, 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 Mahīndrasimha was dead, he fled away to safety. The villagers seeing their leaders fallen fled also. The Gorkhalese set fire to the village. Next morning Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ himself went to inspect the battlefield. He saw Mahīndrasimha dead, and, moved by his gallantry, undertook to protect and support his family.<sup>2</sup>

Some little time after June 1761, Jasrām Thāpā, a minister of Jayaprakāś, who had left Kāṭhmāṇḍu for Banaras owing to some difference with his master, was arrested while passing through Dahacok.<sup>3</sup> Harivaṁśa Upādhyāya reported the arrest to Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ and asked for further orders. Jasrām for his part wrote to Vīrbhadra Upādhyāya, an officer in the service of Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ. The letter is lost; but one may assume from the later course of events that he indicated a willingness to enter Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ's service. Happy at the arrest of Jasrām,

---

1. Narsimha Rai in Jñavālī, op.cit., p.140. Possibly, Mahīndrasimha (otherwise Mahendrasimha) and Nāmsimha (otherwise Narsimha) were Kirātīs of the Rāī sept. But<sup>it</sup> is curious that the names of Mahīndrasimha Rāya and Karmasimha Rāya, both of Caukoṭ, are mentioned to have been killed and their property confiscated after Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ's conquest of Bhātḡāū in 1769 (HP, vol.50, fo.26 reverse). The discrepancy is hard to be accounted for. The title Rāya is a pedantic variant of Rāi or Rāī used by the Kirātīs.

2. Wright, op.cit., pp.254-55.

3. HP, vol.2, fo.104; also vol.51, fo.105.

Pr̥thvīnārāyaṇ ordered Harivaṁśa to send him to Nuwākot̥ where he received him hospitably. In the course of consultations regarding the conquest of the Nepal Valley, Jasrām told Pr̥thvīnārāyaṇ that there was no possibility of conquering it until Makwānpur had been taken. Pr̥thvīnārāyaṇ 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 Ḍambar Thāpā<sup>1</sup> and the daughter of Tulārām Pāre. This stroke of policy was apparently successful because the members of the Thāpā clan were now assured of Pr̥thvīnārāyaṇ's<sup>2</sup> favour towards them, and were content to remain at Nuwākot̥. This was a shrewd act on the part of Pr̥thvīnārāyaṇ as certain members of the large Thāpā clan were residents in Kāṭhmāṇḍu and the treatment that the Thāpās had received in Nuwākot̥ was not likely to have passed notice by them.

Mention has been made of one Thāpā minister of Jayaprakāś, who was sent to attack the Gorkhalese troops stationed at Kāhule. In the course of the action he was arrested by them.<sup>3</sup> 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 Ḍambar 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 Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ at Nuwākot<sup>1</sup> 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 Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ<sup>1</sup> to conquer Makwānpur first as a necessary preliminary. This Thāpā minister might well have been Jasrām 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 Jasrām Thāpā's advice Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ<sup>2</sup> 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.

2. He succeeded his father Hemkarṇa Sen early in 1762 (Ācārya, 'Śrī Śrī Jayaprakāś Malla', p.54).

time on friendly terms with one of the ministers in Pāṭan. Furthermore, the possession of Makwānpur was an important element in the blockade of the Nepal Valley which was now being planned. Outposts which Prṭhvī-nārāyaṇ already held <sup>a</sup>g<sub>k</sub>aranteed 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 Makwānpur and was consequently open to them. Prṭhvīnārāyaṇ determined therefore to isolate the Valley from that quarter also. He began by repeating his earlier demand for the Navalākḥī<sup>2</sup> 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 Kanaksimha, who was still a minister in Makwānpur, turned the demand down without even informing his king about it. Thus provided with the pretext he needed, Prṭhvīnārāyaṇ quickly drafted a sizeable body of troops, including Mahoddāmkīrti Śāh, Dalmardan Śāh, Daljit Śāh, Śūrapratāp Śāh, Vamśarāj Pāre, Kulānanda Dhakāl, Nāharsimha Basnet, Keharsimha Basnet, Abhimānsimha Basnet and Nandubisu Panta, and sent them to Makwānpur, the capital of the kingdom, to <sup>3</sup>attack it. As the later course of events shows it appears that Prṭhvī-nārāyaṇ had also followed to supervise the operation. They laid siege

---

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

2. For the Navalākḥī 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, Rāmkr̥ṣṇa 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 Kanaksimha and the remaining troops. Stationing Nandubisu Panta at Makwānpur in charge of the fort, Pr̥thvīnārāyaṇ ordered his troops to march to capture Hariharpur, Sīdhulī (twenty-two miles to the east of Hariharpur) and Timāl<sup>1</sup>. The column led by Daljit Śāh, Vamśarāj Pāre, Jīva Śāh and Rudrī Sāhī 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 Pr̥thvīnārāyaṇ. But King Digbandhan and his minister Kanaksimha escaped. Hearing this Pr̥thvīnārāyaṇ 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 Timāldārā, 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 Pr̥thvīnārāyaṇ 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. Pr̥thvīnārāyaṇ was very pleased with Bāgyā Basnet. Digbandhan was taken to Nuwākoṭ with his family. Pr̥thvīnārāyaṇ had not forgotten the treatment<sup>1</sup> he had received previously from him, and so he imprisoned him at Nuwākoṭ. Kanaksimha, however, could not be arrested. He managed to escape to Bettia where he requested Mir Kasim, Nawab of Bengal and Bihar, for<sup>2</sup> succour to renew the fight with the Gorkhalese; but before help could be sent the conquest of Makwānpur was completed by Pr̥thvīnārāyaṇ. 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, Vajravāṇī,<sup>3</sup> Sabuj, Gorakh and Kālībaksa. 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<sup>4</sup> Jasrām Thāpā and Campasimha Godār Thāpā<sup>5</sup> to send for their families from Kāṭhmāṇḍu and to them he gave the revenues of Sīdhulī 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).

2. S.C. Sarkar, 'Some interesting documents', Bengal past and present, vol.XLIV, July-December 1932, p.50.

3. Jñavālī, op.cit., p.135, n.1. For the variant accounts regarding the raising of the companies by Pr̥thvīnārāyaṇ vide p.307, n.1.

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 Barharvā near Makwānpur 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,<sup>1</sup> and he went as far as Jaleśvar (now the headquarters of the Mahottarī district in the eastern Nepal Tarai) to supervise administration and make settlements there.<sup>2</sup> With the conquest of the Makwānpur state Prthvī-nārāyaṇ's territory was now contiguous with the southern boundaries of Pāṭan and Bhātgaū, 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.<sup>3</sup> Early next year the Gorkhalese captured two more outposts, Parevākoṭ on Sunday, 2 January 1763 and Kavilāspur the following Saturday (8 January).<sup>4</sup>

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

1. HP, vol.2, fo.105, vol.51, fo.106.

2. HP, vol.51, fo.221. Probably the southern part of what is now the Saptarī 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 Śāh (January 1775-September 1777). The northern part of what is now the Saptarī district was then in the possession of the Caudaṇḍī 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 Népal', 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 Heṭāūrā 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 (koṭ) stationed there. Through the ridge perhaps passed the usual route linking Makwānpur and the Nepal Valley on the one hand and on the other Pālunḡ and Dhāding, both these in the possession of Gorkhā. Kavilāspur (also Kavilās) is a small village situated near the Trisūlī. 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, Jugalkiśorsimha, had fled to Tanahū. So it was apprehended that Mir Kasim would attack Tanahū. But Kanaksimha's invitation turned his attention in the direction of Makwānpur.

Mir Kasim's Commander-in-chief, Gurgin Khan<sup>3</sup>, informed by Kashmiri and Armenian traders about the fabulous wealth of Nepal, persuaded the Nawab to send an expedition to that country,<sup>4</sup> 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

1. L.S. O'Malley: Champanan, Bihar and Orissa District Gazetteers, p.135.

2. Ācārya, 'Tanahūko Sen-vaśā', 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, 'Gurgin Khan', Bengal past and present, vol.XXXIV, January-June 1928, pp.74-80, 'Armenians at Chandernagore', ibid., vol.XLII, 1931, p.18, n.1).

4. Maharaja Kalyan Singh's Khulasat-ut-Tawarikh, (Tr.) Khan Bahadur Sarfaraz Hussain Khan, Journal of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society, vol.V, pt.iv, 1919, p.608. For the details of this expedition vide also Nandalal Chatterji: Mir Qasim, pp.163-76.

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.<sup>2</sup> Accordingly at the end of 1762 Mir Kasim despatched Gurgin Khan to attack Makwānpur with a huge army of nearly 30,000 men. Meeting no opposition in the plains they reached the foothills below the fort of Makwānpur 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 Harnā and made dispositions for a siege. Hearing that troops of the Nawab had laid siege to Makwānpur on Wednesday, 12 January, and also to the garrison at Duḍuvā, Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ sent instructions to his men on Saturday, 15 January regarding the action they were to take.<sup>3</sup> He also despatched reinforcements accompanied by Vamśarāj Pāre, Śrīharṣa Panta, Jīva Śāh, Nāharsimha Basnet, Keharsimha Basnet, Rāmkr̥ṣṇa Kāvār, Bāgyā Basnet and Durlabh Khatri.<sup>4</sup> They were also

---

1. HP, vol.51,fo.106; also vol.52,fol.62.

2. Riaz-us-salatin, p.296; Seir-ul-Mutaqherin, vol.II,p.447; O'Malley, op.cit.,p.28; Nandalal Chatterji: Mir Qasim, op.cit.

3. IP, vol.II,pt.iii,p.463 (Letter no.3).

4. HP, vol.51,fo.106.

joined by Āśājīṭ Bhāṛārī. He had earlier been accused of deserting his colleague Devarṣi Upādhyāya who was killed in the course of fighting at Nāldum<sup>1</sup>. He joined them without orders from Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ. The Gorkhalese troops went to Makwānpur via Pharping and Nandarām Mahādevā, covering a distance of nearly 30 miles<sup>2</sup>. They fell upon the enemy in three columns: Vaṃśarāj attacked them on Tuesday, 20 January from the side of Tāplākhar, one mile north of the Makwānpur Fort; Nāharsimha Basnet and Keharsimha 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<sup>3</sup>. The casualties on the part of the Gorkhalese were by contrast very small. Two of their notable fighters, Nandubisu Panta and Āśājīṭ Bhāṛārī, 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<sup>4</sup> and considerable quantities of other arms and ammunition<sup>5</sup>. These enabled Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ to form two companies of his army on European lines<sup>6</sup>. The victory was a rich gain and a great achievement for him. It was the first occasion that the Gorkhalese troops had

---

1. Vide p. 184.

2. Papers respecting the Nepal War, p.225; also HP, vol.2, fo.27.

3. Riaz-us-salatin, op.cit.; Séir-ul-Mutagherin, op.cit. ; O'Malley, op.cit. K.C. Chaudhury: Anglo-Nepalese relations, p.10.

4. HP, vol.51, fo.106.

5. Séir-ul-Mutagherin, vol.II, p.448; O'Malley, op.cit.

6. Ācārya, 'Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ Śāhkā jīvanīko pūrvārdha', 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.<sup>1</sup>

Hearing that Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ was engaged in fighting in the east, in the Tarai as well as in the Nepal Valley, the Cāubīsī 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 Marsyāngdī river and laid siege to Harmī, Dhuvākot, Cyānglī, Bhīrkoṭ, Dyāurālī, Lakāng, all of which places belonged to Gorkhā and lay on its western perimeter.<sup>2</sup> 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 Mahoddāmīkīrti and Śūrapratāp. They reached Lakāng on the morning of

---

1. HP, op.cit.

2. In all such sporadic attacks it was Lamjung which generally took the lead.

1

Sunday, 18 March 1763. In the engagement that followed the Cāubīsī troops were defeated and forced to retreat. The Gorkhalese pursued them, and there being no boat the Cāubīsī 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 Cāubīsī troops were also ultimately forced to raise the siege they had laid.

As though these campaigns were not enough Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ 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 Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ 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 Panāutī, and to enlist the brothers and sons of a

---

1. In all accounts the date given is Śāka 1685 Caitra 9 Sunday, the Śāka year being erroneously written for 1684. Since Śāka year, a lunar year, begins on Caitra śukla 1 and Vikram year, a solar year, on 1 Vaiśākh, the corresponding Christian dates for the New Year's days of Śāka 1685 and its equivalent Vikram 1820 were Sunday, 1 April 1764 and Monday, 9 April 1764 respectively. But Caitra 9 Sunday of Śāka 1685 or Vikram 1820 was not Sunday but Tuesday (19 March 1764). Being Caitra the Vikram New Year 1821 had not yet begun and hence Śāka 1685 was written to be equivalent to Vikram 1820 (Vikram year - 135 = Śāka year). Hence the correct Śāka 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 Panāutī in the Banepā Valley.

1  
 certain craftsman resident in that area. In return the agent was  
 promised nearly 300 sikkās,<sup>2</sup> some gold bangles, a horse, a robe of  
 honour and a post carrying remuneration, in return for the accomplish-  
 ment 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<sup>3</sup>  
 expeditiously.<sup>4</sup>

After repulsing the Cāubīsī invaders,<sup>5</sup> Śūrapratāp came back  
 to Nuwākoṭ bringing with him Yogī Bhagavantānāth whom he wished to  
 introduce to Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ. The Yogī, who was said to be a Siddha,<sup>6</sup> was  
 treated by Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ 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, Rāmkr̥ṣṇa Kāvar, Harivaṃśa  
 Upādhyāya Adhikārī and other prominent officers. They were instructed  
 to capture Cāukoṭ,<sup>7</sup> Panāutī and Dhulkhel, all strategically important  
 places within the dominions of Bhātgaū, 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. Damāī (tailor and musician), Kāmī (goldsmith and blacksmith), Sārki (who flays dead cattle, prepares leather, makes shoes and other leather articles), etc. Among other things Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ 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 Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ 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 Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ undertook campaigns against the Banepā Valley from October 1763 (vide pp.233-34).

4. One notices here Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ'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 Pr̥thvīnārāyaṇ sent reinforcements under the command of Jaskarṇa Khatri, ordering him to capture first Dhulkhel and then Cāukoṭ and Panāuti. But he too could not reduce Dhulkhel. Pr̥thvīnārāyaṇ 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, Rāmkr̥ṣṇa Kāvar and Harivaṃśa 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 Panāuti and Kharpu the same day. Shortly afterwards they captured Banepā and Sāgā on Thursday, 27 October, and Nālā and Rānīkoṭ the following day

---

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

2. Wright, op.cit., p.253.

3. The revenue of Dhulkhel was given to Rāmkr̥ṣṇa Kāvar (HP, vol.51, fo.221).

(Friday, 28 October)<sup>1</sup>, thus conquering almost the entire Banepā Valley.<sup>2</sup> In the attack on Sāgā the Gorkhalese troops came into conflict with some 500 Nāgās who had been <sup>probably</sup> procured by Raṇajitsimha to help Jayaprakāś.<sup>3</sup> They were led by an ascetic Gulābrām of Banaras, whom Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ 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.<sup>4</sup> Believing that the success achieved by Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ 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 Kāṭhmāṇḍu 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 Banepā Valley, which had just been occupied by Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ. 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, Cāutariyā Jahāgīr<sup>5</sup> Sāh, who was

1. HP, vol. 51, fo. 106, vol. 52, fo. 119, vol. 56, fo. 41; IP, vol. II, pt. iii, p. 431.

2. All these places conquered by the Gorkhalese are closely situated in the Banepā Valley as will be seen from their relative situation: Bhātgaū to Sāgā 4 miles SE, Sāgā to Banepā 2 miles E, Banepā to Nālā 4 miles S and Dhulkhel 6 miles E, Dhulkhel to Kharpu 3 miles SW, Kharpu to Cāukoṭ ½ mile E, Cāukoṭ to Panautī 6 miles S. Rānikoṭ is in between the Banepā Valley and Bhātgaū. The Banepā Valley being in the dominions of Bhātgaū, its conquest had now completely strained relations between Raṇajitsimha and Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ.

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 Nāgās of this batch went on to Bhātḡāũ. But the remaining batches which were following the first were defeated by the Gorkhalese. All the Nāgās were slaughtered to a man in the seven villages they had gone to. The leader Gulābrām could not be traced.<sup>1</sup>

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 Bhātḡāũ 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.<sup>2</sup>

---

1. Ācārya, 'Śrī Śrī Jayaprakāś 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 Nāgās 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, Kharpu, Nālā, Čaukoṭ 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<sup>I</sup> 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<sup>2</sup> occupied Pharping and Bisankhu, 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 Jāulākhel, 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.

2. HP, vol.52, fo.118, vol.56, fo.42; IP, vol.I, p.126, col.1, vol.II, pt.iii, p.431.

very small as we are told that they withdrew before a mob who pelted them with stones and brickbats.<sup>1</sup> Nevertheless Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ maintained his pressure on Pāṭan, and the following year, on Tuesday, 7 August, he captured Cobhār and Pāgā,<sup>2</sup> the former being an important ridge a few miles to the south<sup>west</sup> of Pāṭan. It appears that at this point Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ 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, Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ 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 Rāmkr̥ṣṇa, 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 Bhagavāntanāth. Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ therefore decided to press on with the attack and instructed Bālkr̥ṣṇa to search out an auspicious day. Śūrāpratāp, the King's brother, was appointed to command the troops. He was supported by Daljit Śāh, Jīva Śāh, Tulārām Pāre, Śrīharṣa Panta, Prabhu Malla, Vīrbhadra Basnet and several others. Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ kept Vaṃśarāj Pāre 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.

2. HP, vol.52,op.cit.; vol.56,op.cit; IP,vol.I,op.cit. But IP,vol.II,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.<sup>1</sup> The Gorkhalese casualties at the walls were very heavy. Daljit Śāh was seriously wounded by a sword blow on his shoulder. Jīva Śāh, 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.<sup>2</sup> Thus the second attempted assault on Kīrtipur failed. But Pṛthvinārāyaṇ 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.<sup>3</sup>

---

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 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 Bāghāsīmha, chief of the Nagarkoṭis.<sup>1</sup> 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 Vaṃśarāj Pāre, and in accordance with his advice despatched troops from Dahacok under the command of Tulārām Pāre, Prabhu Malla and Harivaṃśa Upādhyāya Adhikārī. They encountered no resistance in the way and were able quickly to reach Nāldum by way of Simbhu, Ṭhamel<sup>2</sup> and Sākhu. They managed to kill Bāghāsīmha 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.<sup>3</sup> He did not however allow his pleasure to keep him from pressing forward while the enemies were on their retreat, and shortly afterwards Marikhu<sup>4</sup> was also entered.

---

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

2. Simbhu, the western and Ṭhamel, the northern residential areas of Kāṭhmāṇḍu. 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 Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ found his position threatened by internal discord, the settlement of which called for the exercise of considerable ingenuity. After the campaign against Maṛikhu had succeeded he observed that his brothers were showing signs of disaffection and had ceased to work on his behalf with their previous enthusiasm. Śūrapratāp in fact soon broke away and went to join Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ's traditional enemies, the kings of the Cāubīsī, who on their part were very happy to welcome him. So deeply had disaffection established itself among Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ's brothers that he was forced to the conclusion that he could rely only on the Khas and Magar tribesmen.

The defection of Śūrapratāp was a serious blow to Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ who was given to understand that the person who had succeeded in winning his brother over was Siddhinārāyaṇ Sāhī, King of Kāskī.<sup>1</sup> Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ was forced to take measures to bring his brother back. He sent Śaktivallabh to pacify him and induce him to return. But he found that Śūrapratāp was willing to come back only on his own terms which included the handing over to him of three of Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ's men. Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ had no option but to agree. Śūrapratāp returned and demanded

---

1. From HP, op.cit., fos.180-81, it appears that Śūrapratāp first went to Tanahū, and since its king had some time back committed suicide, the Prince then went to Lamjung and Kāskī. It is however difficult to say who was the king of Tanahū who had then committed suicide. *It could not be Trivikram Sen who is seen alive in 1768 (vide p.275)*, although historians do not agree over the date of his death. Jñavālī, op.cit., pp.117-18, mentions 1764 as the year when he died, whereas Ācārya, 'Tanahūko Sen-vamśa', p.74, says that he died in or after 1769. Ācārya also says, *ibid.*, that Śūrapratāp defected after 1769, which however is mentioned in HP, *ibid.*, to have taken place after the occupation of Maṛikhu and before the capture of Luṭikoṭ some time in 1765.

at once that these three men, Śrīharṣa Panta, Vīrbhadra 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 Śūrāpratāp and Śrīharṣa Panta in the course of the second attack on Kīrtipur in 1764. Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ agreed to comply with the demand but immediately took steps to nullify it. He despatched Harivaṁśa on a pilgrimage to Purī. Vīrbhadra was actually handed over to Śūrāpratāp but Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ had already planned to secure his release. The plan was typical of Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ's cunning. He sent his priest Śrīharṣa Miśra to call on Śūrāpratāp about the time when he was ending his hour of worship. Śūrāpratāp 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 Vīrbhadra Upādhyāya, and as the vow had been made at the end of his worship hour, Śūrāpratāp 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 Śūrāpratāp. Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ therefore had to take him by force. Once he was handed over to Śūrāpratāp, Śrīharṣa Panta was forced to undergo the public disgrace being carried<sup>1</sup> round the town of Nuwākoṭ in a cage.

---

1. HP, op.cit.

It appears that this act of vengeance satisfied Śūrapratāp who then accepted the post of officer in command of one of Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ's armies. He was sent to capture Luṭikoṭ (Bālāju), an important stronghold two miles north of Kāṭhmāṇḍu. The post was defended by troops of Jayaprakāś but one of his ministers, Śrīkṛṣṇa Pāṭhak, defected to Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ who sent him to Śūrapratāp who used him to open the way through<sup>1</sup> 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 Rājyaprakāś, probably in the summer of 1757 and<sup>2</sup> enthroned Viśvajit, an 18-year-old<sup>3</sup> 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.<sup>4</sup> 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 Raṇajitsimha. Raṇajitsimha 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 Āśvin 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).

3. Ācārya, 'Śrī Śrī Jayaprakāś Malla', p.51.

4. HP, vol.50, fo.4, vol.55, fo.38; also Wright, op.cit., p.251; Jñavālī: Nepāl upatyakāko madhyakālīn itihās, p.178, Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ Sāh, p.124.

became unpopular, and the ministers expelled him during the monsoon period of 1763. Jayaprakāś<sup>1</sup> was angry with the ministers firstly because<sup>2</sup> of the murder of his brother, although one 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 Raṇajitsimha.<sup>3</sup> 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.<sup>4</sup> 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 Pāṭan at this time was grievous on account of the blockade imposed by Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ. 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 Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ's hands. Realizing his opportunity he increased the tightness of the blockade on Pāṭan. 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 Pāṭan 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; Jñavālī: Nepāl upatyakāko madhyakālīn itihās, pp.171-177-78, 191-92, Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ Sāh, pp.123-26. The probable dates when such offers were made have been fixed with reference to the date of enthronement of Tejnarsimha Malla which took place on 2 May 1765 (vide

who had been earlier disgraced by Jayaprakāś<sup>1</sup>, invited Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ to accept the throne. In this offer he had the support of his colleagues.<sup>2</sup> They hoped to make Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ a nominal king and by offering the kingship to him ease the prevailing scarcity of essential commodities. Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ 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. Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ 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. Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ 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.<sup>3</sup>

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

1. Vide p. 206.

2. Some Nepalese accounts mention that Jayaprakāś, for the apparent reason that he did not accept the deposition peacefully, caused one of the ministers of Pāṭan, Bhīṅkhvādhan, 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 Jayaprakāś was not on peaceful terms with the ministers in Pāṭan particularly owing to their support of Rājya-prakāś. As the Mallā kings were only fitfully friendly towards each other, Jayaprakāś 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).

3. Ācārya, op.cit., pp. 57-58.

the ministers and appear to identify himself with the interests of the populace he made a show of hostility towards Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ<sup>1</sup>. This plan<sup>2</sup> succeeded to the extent that the ministers declared him king. This seemed to have awakened suspicion in Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ 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 Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ. It appears that Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ'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 Tejnarsimha, a distant connection of the royal house of Pāṭan, to the throne. The date of his enthronement is 2 May 1765<sup>3</sup>. 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<sup>4</sup>. Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ 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 Thānkoṭ and Citlāng 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.

3. Jñavālī, op.cit., pp.126-27.

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, <sup>1</sup> presumably to deter other smugglers from making further attempts. Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ was so strict that even the children and women who supplied the inhabitants of the Valley with cotton were not spared.<sup>2</sup>

Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ further tightened the siege over Kīrtipur and ordered his troops to attack the Malla garrison at Bharīgu 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 Nuwākot. Among them was Vīrnarsimha, the son of Pāṭan's Chief Minister, Dhanavanta. Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ forced him to write a letter to his father asking him to come to Nuwākot to surrender. Out of affection for his son Dhanavanta came to Nuwākot and surrendered to Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ.<sup>3</sup> Later he helped the Gorkhalese troops

---

1. IP, vol.II,pt.iii,pp.463,467 (Letters nos. 5,9).

2. Father Giuseppe, op.cit.,p.317.

3. Jñavālī, op.cit.,pp.142-43. But the place Bharīgu mentioned here is perhaps Muṛikhu (otherwise Maṛikhu) where according to Ācārya, op.cit., p.64, Vīrnarsimha was arrested while fighting for Jayaprakāś and from where he was taken as a hostage to Nuwākot. If Muṛikhu is the place, then the story of his arrest and his release on the surrender of his father to Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ seems to have taken place some time during April 1767. Moreover, Ācārya, ibid., says that Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ 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 Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ's possession. Since Dhanavanta is seen later in the service of Pāṭan, it is quite likely that Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ, when assured of loyalty in future, released him shortly afterwards. Even in the past Dhanavanta had helped the Gorkhalese (vide p. 93). After the conquest of the Nepal Valley by Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ perhaps both Dhanavanta and Vīrnarsimha were in his service. We see Tribhuvan, son of Vīrnarsimha, serving Rana Bahādur Śāh, Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ's grandson, in 1799 (vide HP, vol.60,fo.169).

1  
to enter Kīrtipur secretly. Utterly exhausted by the siege laid by the  
Gorkhalese for nearly seven years and unable to stand the strain of the  
2  
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 Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ guaranteeing them <sup>security</sup> of their lives and  
3  
property if they surrendered, but when the Gorkhalese troops had entered  
the heart of their stronghold, they were left with no option but to  
4  
surrender. They surrendered on Wednesday, 12 March 1766. Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ  
was then at Nuwākot. In order to make a show of liberality he even

- 
1. Father Giuseppe, op.cit., p.318. But according to Ācārya, op.cit., p.61, the persons who opened the main gates of Kīrtipur for the Gorkhalese to enter and occupy it were Tāuḍhī Dhan and Sāikhvā. They were the officers in charge of the defence of the town sent there from Pāṭan. But instead of saving it they prevailed on its headmen to surrender.
  2. Saṁskṛtasandēśa, year 1, no.8, p.13; HP, vol.50, fo.27, vol.52, fo.47.
  3. Ācārya, *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 Kīrtipur, namely <sup>Saṁskṛtasandēśa, *ibid.*, no.9, p.7;</sup>
    - i) Śaka 1687 Caitra 3 Wednesday (HP, vol.52, fo.110; IP, vol.I, pt.iii, p.431), corresponding with Wednesday, 12 March 1766;
    - ii) Śaka 1687 Caitra 3 Friday (HP, *ibid.*, fo.119) which works for Śaka 1687 Adhika Caitra śukla 3 Friday, corresponding with Friday, 14 March 1766;
    - iii) Nepāl Saṁvat 886 Adhika Caitra sudi 3 (HP, vol.50, fo.27), corresponding with the Christian date in ii);
    - iv) Śaka 1687 naṣṭa Caitra śukla 9 (Ācārya, *ibid.*, p.84), corresponding with Wednesday, 19 March 1766;
    - v) Pauṣa kṛṣṇa 10 of Nepāl Saṁvat 887 (Regmi: Modern Nepal, p.79), corresponding with Thursday, 25 December 1766, which apparently is incorrect. Since the Śaka New Year begins on Caitra śukla (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 (Śaka year + 135 = Vikram year). Being Caitra the Vikram year then had not ended and hence the Śaka year 1687 was written to correspond with the Vikram year. What seems most likely is that Kīrtipur 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 Kīrtipur.<sup>1</sup> Two days after the surrender (Friday, 14 March) he sent Śūrapratāp 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 Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ was not there in person. When the people had assembled Śūrapratāp 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 Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ was angry with the people of Kīrtipur for the wound that made Śūrapratāp one-eyed, and in retaliation he ordered him to cut off their noses and lips,<sup>2</sup> a fact which is clear on Father Giuseppe's evidence, who further says that Father Michael Angelo, a Capucin missionary then at Pāṭan, went to Śūrapratāp to intercede on behalf of the people.<sup>3</sup> The story of cutting of the noses has also been narrated by a contemporary poet Lalitāvallabh who was also one of the principal priests of Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ.<sup>4</sup> Kirkpatrick, who went to Nepal in 1793, had also seen such men whose noses had been cut off on that occasion.<sup>5</sup> It is also said that the Bhoṭiyās, who were ordered to cut off the noses, cut off the ears and heads besides. Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ had them murdered on

---

1. Ācārya, op.cit.; IP, vol.I, p.76, col.2.

2. HP, vol.50, fo.27, vol.52, fo.47.

3. Father Giuseppe, op.cit., p.319.

4. Jñavālī, op.cit., p.143.

5. Kirkpatrick: An account of the kingdom of Nepaul, p. 164.

charge of the excess committed by them.

After the fall of Kīrtipur Gorkhalese troops began to capture one after another of the remaining places in the territory of Jayaprakāś. They encamped at Maṛikhu (also called Muṛikhu) 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 Kīrtipur. Hari Khārkā, a non-Brahman, who could be either a Khas or a Magar, was decapitated. The Gorkhalese plundered Maṛikhu and occupied the fort there. Soon afterwards they captured Ṭokhā and established a post at Gajḍol. The revenue of Ṭokhā was given to Śrīkṣṇa Pāṭhak, the minister of Jayaprakāś, who had defected to Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ.<sup>2</sup> The Gorkhalese also captured Gokarṇa, Cāgu and Sākhu.<sup>3</sup>

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

1. HP, vol.52, fo.47.

2. Vide p.242.

3. HP, vol.51, fo.221, where Maṛikhu, Jitpur, Ṭokhā, Gajḍol, Gokarṇa, Deupāṭan, Battīspatalī, Cāgu, Sākhu and Dolakhā are mentioned to have been captured by the Gorkhalese after their seizure of Kīrtipur. Gokarṇa, Cāgu and Sākhu could have been possibly captured then. According to a letter written by Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ (Letter no.8, pp.67-68), Cāgu seems to have been captured some time early in 1767. Dolakhā was already captured (vide p. 188). But the capture of Deupāṭan and Battīspatalī, the residential areas quite close to Kāṭhmāṇḍu and not of easy access for the Gorkhalese, seems doubtful. According to Ācārya, Muṛikhu (i.e. Maṛikhu) was captured by the Gorkhalese after Jayaprakāś applied to the British authorities of the East India Company in Bengal for help with arms to repulse Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ (Ācārya, op.cit., pp.63-64).

of the Nepal Valley, the Cāubīsī chose again to attack Gorkhā in the rear. They made assaults on a number of places on the western perimeter of Gorkhā. Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ could ill afford to raise the siege of Kīrtipur, so he had to recall troops from the Banepā 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 Vaṃśarāj Pāṇe and Śrīharṣa Panta to check the Cāubīsī invasion. They threw back the invaders in complete disarray. They took possession of Sālimpā on Wednesday, 14 May 1766 without any engagement, established a garrison at Cihāṇḍāṛā on Monday, 25 August and captured Lākhājung on Friday, 18 September. Vaṃśarāj Pāṇe brought as captives some prominent enemy chiefs whom the Gorkhalese had arrested in the course of fighting. Notable among them were Pārath<sup>1</sup> Bhāṛārī and Kuñjar Bhāṛārī. Suffering defeat at many points the Cāubīsī<sup>2</sup> troops eventually had to retreat.

There is a letter written by Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ to one Pandit<sup>3</sup> Rājīvalocan of Kāskī, assuring him of Gorkhalese help to Kāskī in return for Kāskī's help in the action to be undertaken against Cāgu and Sākhū. The letter mentions a Kājī (i.e. minister) who appeared to have been displeased with Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ. Rājīvalocan was requested to exercise his good offices to pacify the Kājī and win him back. The evidence on

---

1. He subsequently joined the service of Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ and took an active part in the extension of his kingdom (vide Letter no.15, p.78; IP, vol.I, p.11).

2. HP, vol.51, fos.106-7, vol.52, fo.118; IP, ibid., p.125, col.1.

3. Letter no.6, pp.65-66.

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,<sup>1</sup> 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 Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ. 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 Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ 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 Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ who then sent him to occupy Kīrtipur on 14<sup>2</sup> 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 Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ from Cāgu in Vikram year 1823 Phālgun sudi 1 Sunday<sup>3</sup> which corresponds with Sunday, 1 March 1767 A.D. The reference to Cāgu from where the letter was written suggests that Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ had encamped<sup>there</sup> after its capture.

It is not clear who the Kājī in question was. But it may be conjectured that he was Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ's brother Śūrapratāp. Pṛthvī-

---

1. Vide pp.240-42.

2. Vide p.248.

3. Letter no.8, p.68.

narayan had four brothers, Mahoddāmkīrti, Dalmardan, who were Cāutariyās,<sup>1</sup> Daljit, who was at this time commander of the army, and Śūrapratāp, who was a minister, i.e., a Kājī.<sup>2</sup> Śūrapratāp 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 Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ and all his brothers were strained,<sup>3</sup> and the way they could express their dissatisfaction best was to join the Cāubīsī kings who were always ready to welcome them. Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ, 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 Bhātgaū was Śūrapratāp.<sup>4</sup>

---

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 Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ's time they were like Cabinet ministers senior in rank to their colleagues who were commoners.

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

3. Vide Letters nos. 11, 12, pp.70-71.

4. Vide p. 287.

## CHAPTER IX

## LAST PHASE OF PṚTHVĪNĀRĀYAṆ'S CAMPAIGNS (1767-75)

Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ 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 Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ 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. Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ'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 Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ 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 Guhyeśvarī 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 Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ. 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

1  
 sent two emissaries, Mukṭānanda, 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 Prṭhvīnārāyaṇ. In Golding's opinion such an expedition had a prospect of much advantage to the Company. He believed that if Prṭhvīnārāyaṇ 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 Prṭhvīnārāyaṇ. 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 Kāṭhmāṇḍu, Bhātḡāū and Pāṭan in the Valley was also used in a narrower sense to denote only the territory in the Valley under the jurisdiction of Kāṭhmāṇḍu. 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 Raṇajit-siṃha, King of Bhātḡāū, 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 Muktan Unda and Ramdoss, which are apparently anglicised spellings of Mukṭānanda 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 Gosāī traders in the Nepal Valley, was sent to the Company which was itself a trading company.

pendence alleged to have passed between Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ and the Phāujdārs (native subordinate officers of the Company) of those domains also aggravated Golding's fears. The letters are lost but one can presume that they represented Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ's demand for some villages which were occupied by the Company and which he claimed by virtue of his possession of Makwānpur 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 Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ, and he was alarmed that the advance likely to be made by Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ 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 Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ. 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 Jayaprakāś 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. 515, p. 545; Political Consultations, 4 March 1814, no. 61*).
  2. J. Long: *Selections*, pp. 480-81, no. 913, p. 489, no. 934, also p. 281, no. 589.
  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 Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ, 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 Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ 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 Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ 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

---

1. Sel.Com.Pro., 30 April 1767.

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 tranquillity 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 [Jayaprakāś]". 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 Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ, and was expecting a reply shortly, but he said he doubted whether an offer of mediation would be accepted by Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ as he had already nearly completed the conquest of Nepal. Actually, Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ 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.

2. Sel.Com.Pro., op.cit.

3. Long, op.cit., p.538.

the remonstrance. He did not reply to Rumbold's letter, and instead intensified his campaign against the Nepal Valley. Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ'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 Jayaprakāś had been engaged in fighting with Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ for about five years during which period the latter had occupied ten principal cities and taken possession of all Jayaprakāś's country, except the towns of Kāṭhmāṇḍu, Bhāt-gāū, Pāṭan and Zeemy [Thimī], 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 Jayaprakāś "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 Jayaprakāś. 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. Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ had begun his campaigns against the Valley from 1742, occupying first Nuwākot 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 Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ 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 Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ. 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 Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ had occupied two subdivisions of Lamboo [? Balambu] 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".<sup>1</sup>

---

1. "Narrative taken from the Rajah's Vakeels by Capt. Kinloch" in the month of June 1767 at Patna (Sel.Com.Pro., 21 July 1767).

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 Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ 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 Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ'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 Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ'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 Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ from  
<sup>1</sup>  
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.<sup>2</sup> 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:

From Patna to Hajipur	3 kos	Water and provisions to be obtained at these stages.
Darbhangā	22 "	
Bawah ( ? )	7 "	
Janakpur	12 "	
Jelandbass ( ? )	6 "	Water but no provisions.
Rānībās	9 "	ditto
Sīdhulī	9 "	Water and provisions.
Kharkoṭ	6 "	ditto
Jhāgājholī near Dumjā	6 "	Water but no provisions.
Dāpcā	10 "	The Raja will supply the troops with provisions at Dāpcā.
Panautī	6	

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

Sīdhulī 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 Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ 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 <sup>1</sup> 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"<sup>2</sup>. In his reply of 6 August Rumbold assured the President that every precaution would be taken to ensure <sup>3</sup> 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

---

1. Sel.Com.Pro.,op.cit.

2. Ibid.

3. Sel.Com.Pro.,18 August 1767.

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"<sup>1</sup>. Their high hopes miscarried. The expedition failed.

Meanwhile Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ had encamped at Kīrtipur<sup>2</sup> and was strengthening his siege operations against Pāṭan. He had occupied twelve outposts under the jurisdiction of Pāṭan<sup>3</sup> 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<sup>4</sup>. 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.

2. Ācārya, op.cit., p.63.

3. Petech: I missionari italiani nel Tibet e nel Nepal, Pt. II, p.237.

4. Lévi, op.cit., vol.II, p.271; Father Giuseppe, op.cit., p.251.

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"<sup>1</sup>. Rumbold reacted sharply. The expedition could 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.<sup>2</sup> From Nepalese accounts however it seems that the expedition occupied Sīdhulī on Monday, 21 September 1767 from where it was repulsed by Kājī Vamśarāj Pāre and Śrīharṣa Panta on Sunday, 27 September.<sup>3</sup> The English troops were forced to retreat leaving 100 sets of arms behind.<sup>4</sup>

The exact strength of the English expedition is also not known. It appears that it consisted of 2,400 sepoy<sup>5</sup>s. It is also mentioned that Kinloch had ten battalions under his<sup>6</sup> command, of which four companies were from the Patna Detachment.<sup>7</sup> 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.

2. India Office Records, Home Miscellaneous Series, vol.515, p.243.

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.

5. Richard Barwell's letter to his father dated Calcutta 28 February 1768, Bengal past and present, vol.X,pt.i, January-March 1915, p.29, Letter no.cxi.

6. Letter from the Select Committee to Rumbold, 11 December 1767, Sel.Com.Pro., 11 December 1767, p.625.

7. Letter from Rumbold to the President, 19 December 1767, Sel.Com.Pro., 12 January 1768, pp.33-34.

1

expedition had 1,500 sets of new arms. In Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ's memoirs the English force which attacked Sīdhulī is alleged to have consisted of three to four platoons.

2

The English expedition had an initial success in taking Sīdhulī, 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 Vamśa Gurung, Chief of hunters, with a force under the command of his treasurer, Vīrbhadra Upādhyāya. They were ordered to save the fortress at Pāvāgarhī, 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 Vamśarāj Pāre, Śrīharṣa Panta and several other chiefs. Vīrbhadra Upādhyāya took up a position at Pāvāgarhī to check the advancing column of the adversaries. Vamśa Gurung was sent to Dhungrēbās to attack them in the rear. Meanwhile the reinforcements led by Vamśarāj Pāre had also joined the Gorkhalese troops. Finding himself intercepted at Sīdhulī, Kinloch had to retire to Janakpur. After one month he

---

1. Sel.Com.Pro., 3 October 1767, p.492.

2. DU, Tr., p.32.

3. HP, vol.51, fo.107. In Sel.Com.Pro., 12 January 1768, pp.33-34, Hariharpur and not Sīdhulī 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 Sīdhulī is still there.

4. Letter from Rumbold to the President, 28 January 1768, Sel.Com.Pro., 10 February 1768, p.98.

attempted however to march to Kāṭhmāṇḍu by way of Makwānpur. 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 Bāgmatī 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.

1

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 Pṛthvinārāyaṇ. 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, Vajravāṇī and Purāno Gorakh.

2

3

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 Hādī or Hādī who is alleged to have been repulsed from Sīdhulī. 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 Pṛthvinārāyaṇ (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<sup>1</sup> 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<sup>2</sup> 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<sup>3</sup> December written to the President he explained the circumstances that had brought about the failure. In his view they were extremely bad

---

1. Sel.Com.Pro., 11 December 1767, pp.625-26.

2. Long, op.cit., p.540.

3. Sel.Com.Pro., 12 January 1768, pp.31-34.

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

---

1. Sel.Com.Pro., 12 January 1768, p.36.

that the Tarai possessed by Kinloch was a valuable acquisition. Its loss had considerably affected Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ'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.<sup>1</sup>

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<sup>2</sup> in order to defray the expenses incurred during the expedition.

---

1. Sel.Com.Pro., 12 January 1768, pp.34-35.

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 Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ 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 Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ 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 Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ 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 Sīdhulī. 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. Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ 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 Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ's resources. Kinloch hoped that after he had repulsed Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ 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 Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ subdued 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.<sup>1</sup>

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.<sup>2</sup> From the contents of the letter it appears Keer Sing had proposed cessation of hostilities between the English and his king.<sup>3</sup> 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 Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ 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 Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ 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.<sup>4</sup>

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

---

1. Sel.Com.Pro., 10 February 1768, pp.99-101.

2. Probably Keharsimha Basnet, one of the prominent Gorkhalese officers.

3. Sel.Com.Pro., *ibid.*, p.102.

4. *Ibid.*

country, which bordered on Bettia, in an expedition against Pr̥thvīnārāyaṇ, and suggested that they should also march by way of Parsā. Golding was confident that several other rulers of the Hills would follow Trivikram<sup>1</sup> 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 Pr̥thvīnārāyaṇ 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 Pr̥thvīnārāyaṇ 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 Pr̥thvīnārāyaṇ "relinquish his design on Napaul". 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

---

1. Sel.Com.Pro.,op.cit.

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 Prthvinārāyaṇ<sup>1</sup> 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<sup>2</sup> 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<sup>3</sup> 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<sup>would</sup> 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 Weakn'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

---

1. Sel.Com.Pro., 10 February 1768, pp.97-99.

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".<sup>1</sup>

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.<sup>2</sup>

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

---

1. Sel.Com.Pro., 16 February 1768, p.143.

2. Ibid., pp.143-44, and pp. between pp.144-45.

restored to Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ<sup>1</sup>. The conduct of the Company strengthened Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ'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 Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ'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 Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ'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 Paśupati-nāth had had to be suspended. Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ 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<sup>2</sup>. The opportunity was clearly ripe.

He first moved against Thamel, one of the residential areas in Kāthmānḍu, which was not more than a mile to the north of the royal palace Hanūmānḍhokā. This was on Sunday, 4 September 1768<sup>3</sup>. Shortly

---

1. In 1770 (India Office Records, Home Miscellaneous Series, vol. 515, p. 545).

2. Wright, op. cit., p. 231; HP, vol. 55, fo. 70.

3. HP, vol. 52, fo. 119.

afterwards he captured Luṭikoṭ (Bālāju)<sup>1</sup>. Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ vacated Ṭhamel. The regaining of Ṭhamel was a great relief to Jayaprakāś and seemed to have filled him with false confidence; perhaps this was what Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ intended. The annual festivals of Indrayātrā and Kumārīyātrā were to take place about that time and because Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ had vacated Ṭhamel Jayaprakāś did not suspend the festival celebrations.<sup>2</sup> This act of carelessness gave Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ the opportunity he needed.

On Sunday, 25 September Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ 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 Tūḍīkhel<sup>3</sup> and from the north via Nardevī. Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ followed the northern wing of his troops.<sup>4</sup> It was the midnight of the third day of the annual Indrayātrā and Kumārīyātrā 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,<sup>5</sup> a minor girl worshipped as the representative of the goddess Tulajābhavānī or Tulajā, the tutelary 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 Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ 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 Tūḍīkhel area until recently a parade ground made by Bhīmsen Thāpā, Prime Minister of Nepal (1804-37), but now a jumble of parks, memorials, etc., all closely partitioned and enclosed.

4. IP, vol.I, p.126,col.2

5. Ācārya, ibid., p.66.

completely unawares by the advent of Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ's troops. As the merry-makers were unarmed, and dazed at the unexpected presence of the enemy, they put up no resistance. Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ 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 Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ 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.<sup>1</sup> There he sought asylum of Tejnarsimha. 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 Pāre, 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 Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ; 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 deputed one of his brothers to preside over<sup>2</sup> them.

---

1. Father Giuseppe, 'An account of the kingdom of Népal', p.320. But elsewhere he mentions 200 (Petech, op.cit.,Pt. II, p.239).

2. Jñavālī: Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ Śāh, pp.154-55; Ācārya,op.cit.,p.66.

Jayaprakāś did not remain in Pāṭan long. Its ministers, instead of responding to his call to fight back, succumbed to the overtures made by Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ's delegation consisting of Keharsimha Basnet,<sup>1</sup> Dhanavanta and Bāhābal Rānā; 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 Bhātgaū<sup>2</sup> accompanied by Tejnarśimha on 5 October. Pāṭan fell into Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ's<sup>3</sup> hands without any encounter, on Friday, 7 October 1768. Shortly after the ministers went to him to invite him to be their king. But Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ 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 Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ. It is said that when they came to him with an invitation to be the king of Pāṭan, Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ<sup>4</sup> treated them with courtesy and asked them to meet him the next day at Teku, the confluence of the Bāgmatī and Viṣṇumatī rivers. The ministers returned to Pāṭan. One of them apprehended destruction at

---

1. Jñavālī: Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ Śāh, p.155; also Father Giuseppe, 'An account of the kingdom of Népal', p.321.

2. Ācārya, op.cit., p.66.

3. HP, vol.52, fo.119.

4. Father Giuseppe, *ibid.*, says that after Pāṭan came in his possession Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ 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 stratagems", and eliminated active disaffection.

the hands of Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ and distributed all his property as gifts,<sup>1</sup> presumably to prevent it being confiscated. Next day their fears were realized. When they reached the banks of the Bāgmatī river in response to Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ'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 Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ to be satis.<sup>2</sup> According to a Nepalese account the incident took place in April, for it is said that eight months after this incident Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ conquered Bhātgaū.<sup>3</sup> The date of the conquest of Bhātgaū 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.<sup>4</sup> It is probable that the persons murdered on this date were the descendants of the ministers, i.e. Pradhāns, who were earlier hanged by Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ. 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 Cāubīsī states and the descendants of the ministers of Pāṭan were probably intriguing to forestall his move.

---

1. Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ later confiscated the property of the ministers of Pāṭan but confirmed the gifts distributed (HP, vol.52,fo.46), also

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 Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ assumed the kingship of Pāṭan. There is a coin of 1768<sup>1</sup> in the name of his brother, Dalmardan Śāh. It is quite possible that Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ 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 Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ's brothers had been somewhat disaffected towards him and by this move he tactfully controlled their disaffection.<sup>2</sup> Dalmardan had once before been king of Pāṭan.<sup>3</sup> 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,<sup>4</sup> for it is mentioned that Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ assumed the kingship of Pāṭan some time during the winter of 1768/69 and shortly after went there in state for the royal investiture.<sup>5</sup> This fact is supported by a Nepalese account which assigns to Tejnarśimha 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,<sup>6</sup> comes to December/January 1768/69. It is further confirmed<sup>7</sup>

---

1. Walsh, 'The coinage of Nepal', p.759.

2. Vide pp.240-42, 250-52; also Letter no.6, pp.65-66, Letter nos.11, 12, pp.70-71.

3. Vide pp.244-45.

4. It is quite likely that Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ 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.

5. Jñavālī, op.cit., p.155.

6. HP, vol.55, fo.38.

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<sup>1</sup> 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<sup>2</sup> before the conquest of Bhātḡāũ, 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~~member~~<sup>3</sup> of each of the families of the nobility should be sent to reside in Nuwākot<sup>3</sup>. 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 Nuwākot<sup>4</sup>, leaving a governor to look after the Valley territories.

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

4. Petech, *ibid.*,Pt.II, pp.240-41.

at the price of neutrality, Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ 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.<sup>1</sup> Jayaprakāś for his part had not yet lost hope of regaining his kingdom. He influenced the seven illegitimate sons of Raṇajitsimha, who were called Sātbahālyās, to side with him. The King of Cāudaṇḍī, Karṇa 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.<sup>2</sup>

Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ therefore determined to take arms against Raṇajitsimha and laid his plans for the capture of Bhātḡāū. He first wooed the Sātbahālyās by promising them the throne and revenue of Bhātḡāū, retaining for himself only nominal sovereignty over the kingdom.<sup>3</sup> A few months after reaching this understanding Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ was alarmed by fresh troubles which had been created in the eastern

---

1. Ācārya, op.cit.,p.67; Jñavālī, op.cit., pp.156-57.

2. Ācārya, ibid. There is a letter written by Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ (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 Karṇa 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 Karṇa 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 Bhavansīmha who would have killed him had not Śrīharṣa Panta intervened to save his master. For this timely action Śrīharṣa Panta was nicknamed Bijulī<sup>1</sup> ('lightning') Panta. Now Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ could no longer put off action against Bhātgāū. He despatched his troops in November 1769 in two wings under the command of Śūrapratāp and Vamśarāj Pāre respectively. Jayaprakāś himself commanded his troops who were stationed on two fronts<sup>2</sup> to intercept the invaders. The Sātbahālyās 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

---

1. Jñavālī, op.cit., p.157.

2. Ācārya, op.cit., p.68.

3. Wright, op.cit.; Lévi: Le Népal, vol.II, p.274.

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 Bhoṭiyā 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: Bhaktavijayakāvya, verse 42.
  3. Wright, op.cit., HP, vol. 55, fo. 70.
  4. Ācārya, op.cit., pp. 68-69.
  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 Pṛthvī-nārāyaṇ, who was then in Kāṭhmāṇḍu. On receipt of the news Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ went to Bhātḡāū. After calling on Raṇajitsiṃha, he went to the room where Jayaprakāś was lying, still in pain from his wound. Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ 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 Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ's offer and asked for permission to live in the temple of Guhyeśvarī 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 Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ to spare their lives and property. Jayaprakāś's wishes were granted. Then seeing that his condition was worsening Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ sent him to Āryaghāṭ, one of the ghāṭs on the bank of the Bāgmatī river. Pṛthvī-nārāyaṇ went there to see him. The next day he sent messengers 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 Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ.

---

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 ghāṭ.

Tejnarsimha remained silent and refused to speak.<sup>1</sup> He was beaten severely and sent to Kāthmāṇḍu, and imprisoned in the Lakṣmīpur courtyard in the royal palace.<sup>2</sup> He passed his days in silence and in worship.<sup>3</sup> He died in chains some time during March/April 1771.<sup>4</sup>

Pr̥thvīnārāyaṇ was not vindictive with Raṇajitsimha. 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. Pr̥thvīnārāyaṇ 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. Raṇajitsimha 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 Pr̥thvīnārāyaṇ provided the expenses for the journey, made arrangements for his maintenance for the rest of his life<sup>5</sup> and sent him accompanied by his two queens, a son  
(

---

1. Lévi, op.cit.,p.275.

2. IP, vol.I,p.127,col.2.

3. Wright, op.cit.,p.258.

4. According to HP,vol.55,fo.38, which assigns to him regnal period of 3 years 11 months.

5. IP, ibid.; Jñavālī, op.cit.,p.159.

called Avadhūtsim̄ha<sup>1</sup> and a minister Jogrāj Khatowta<sup>2</sup> (sic). While passing through the Candrāgiri mountain from where he had the last glimpse of the Valley, Raṇajitsim̄ha sighed with grief and cursing the Sātbahālyās all the time cried that the misery that had befallen him<sup>3</sup> was due to them. He then bade farewell to the temples of the gods and goddesses of the Valley<sup>4</sup> and left the country, never to return again. Nevertheless once he was out of the Valley and free from the influence of Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ 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 Avadhūtsim̄ha and the minister<sup>5</sup> to make overtures. But all was in vain. He died afterwards without

1. As far as is known Raṇajitsim̄ha had only one legitimate son. His name was Vīrnarsim̄ha. It is not certain who this Avadhūtsim̄ha 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 Raṇajitsim̄ha not being one of the Sātbahālyās. We know of another son of Raṇajitsim̄ha, Sarvajitsim̄ha by name. He was with his father in the palace when the Gorkhalese troops were fighting their way in (Jñavālī, 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 Khativarā Brahman or a Khativarā Khatrī Chetrī.

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

4. Wright, ibid.

5. Askari, ibid.; Kirkpatrick, ibid.

realising his hopes. With his death the Malla dynasty came to an end,<sup>1</sup> though Avadhūtsimha made a vain attempt to regain his paternal throne by enlisting the support of some of the Caubīsī kings.<sup>2</sup>

Soon after the conquest of the Nepal Valley Prthvinārāyaṇ shifted his headquarters from Nuwakoṭ to Kāṭhmāṇḍu. 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 Bhātgaū though later he replaced him by Kālu Kapardār.<sup>4</sup> Prthvinārāyaṇ brought his family from Gorkhā to Kāṭhmāṇḍu. 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.<sup>5</sup> He permitted Jayaprakās'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 Mahīndrasimha Malla in 1709 the regular line of the royal house of Kāṭhmāṇḍu had already come to an end. His successor Jagajjaya Malla was a distant relation. The regular line of the royal house of Pāṭan had broken long ago. Jayaprakās was left issueless after the death of his son Jyotiprakās in or after 1757 (Wright, op.cit.,p.227). With the death of his only legitimate son Vīrnarsimha in 1750 (HP, vol.50,fo.15; also Wright, ibid.,p.199) Raṇajitsimha was also left without any rightful heir. After the death of Jayaprakās and Raṇajitsimha the Nepal Valley, it can be presumed, would have been in further grip of domestic squabbles and the Malla kingdoms would have probably disintegrated. Raṇajitsimha was 67; Jayaprakās was 53 (according to IP, vol.II,pt.iii,p.568, Raṇajitsimha was born in 1702, and according to Ācārya, op.cit.,p.38, Jayaprakās was born probably in 1716). They would not have survived long. Prthvinārāyaṇ only hastened the downfall of the Malla kingdoms.

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

3. Vide p.48, n.102.

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

5. Wright, ibid.,pp.256-57.

of her diamond necklace before her departure. The widow of her grandson accompanied her.<sup>1</sup> In this way Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ eliminated all possible contenders to the thrones of the Nepal Valley, though there were still some Nagarkoṭīs who refused to acknowledge him. Once it so happened that while he was coming back to Kāṭhmāṇḍu from Bhātgaū 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 Nagarkoṭīs<sup>2</sup> hunted down and murdered.

After the conquest of the Nepal Valley Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ 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.<sup>3</sup> 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 Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ because of the assistance which he had been promised by certain hill rulers including Karṇa Sen, the King of Cāudaṇḍī. 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.

3. IP, vol.I, p.128, col.1.

for Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ the East India Company finally decided against committing its arm aid to an attack on the Himalayan kingdom.<sup>1</sup>

In the past Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ had often endeavoured to incite the King of Kāskī 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 Kāskī to his side.<sup>2</sup> Lamjung and Kāskī had a common boundary and disputes between them were frequent. In consequence relations between them had long been strained. So Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ was hopeful that the King of Lamjung would not interfere if he sent his troops to reduce Kāskī.<sup>3</sup>

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, Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ 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) Gaṇḍakī

1. For the details of the territorial disputes between the Company and Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ 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.

A. Public Consultations, 9 July 1771; Fort William - India House Correspondence, vol.VI, pp.367-68,603; India Office Records, Home Miscellaneous Series, vol.648, pp.198-221.

B. Long: Narratives, pp.281,480-81,489; Sel.Com.Pro.,10 and 19 February 1766, 14 July 1767, 23 July 1768; Public Consultations, 11 May, 14 August, 14 September, 28 September 1767, 5 June, 8 June, 25 November 1772; Fort William - India House Correspondence, vol.V, pp.16,78,174, 332,508,541, vol.VI, pp.9,252.

C. Nandalal Chatterji, 'A forgotten English expedition against Prithivi Narayan', p.63, n.102; Calendar of Persian Correspondence, vol.II, pp. 430-31; Fort William - India House Correspondence, vol.VI, pp.179-80.

2. Vide Letter no.6, p.65.

3. Jhāvālī, op.cit.,p.171.

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 (Kṛṣṇā) Gaṇḍakī in the west.<sup>1</sup> They were led by Kājī Vaṁśarāj Pāre, Sardār Keharsimha Basnet and Sardār Prabhu Malla. It also appears that meanwhile the rulers of Tanahū and Lamjung had been appeased by Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ, 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 Gaṇḍakī region.<sup>2</sup>

In the course of their forward thrust from Bhaṇḍārīḍhik the Gorkhalese officer had to fight with Kāskī in the basin of the Setī. Here they achieved victory and were able to cross the Setī, whence they marched forward by way of Barsāmī to attack Nuwākoṭ (the central). They were however defeated in the fighting that took place at Tekan Ār in the territory of Nuwākoṭ. Vaṁśarāj and Prabhu Malla retreated and took up a position at a place close to Tekan Ār.<sup>3</sup>

---

1. Nepalese accounts only mention that Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ sent his troops to extend his kingdom up to the banks of the Kālī which presumably is implied by the Kālī (Kṛṣṇā) Gaṇḍakī and not the Kālī (otherwise Mahākālī) the western limit of the Bāīsī states.

2. I.e. the region of the seven (sapta) prominent tributaries of the Kālī (Kṛṣṇā) Gaṇḍakī

3. IP, vol.I, p. 128, col.1, vol.II, pt.iii, p.432.

At this point it appears that Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ sent other troops under the command of Keharsim̄ha Basnet to attack Tanahū. The reason for this attack is not clear, but it may be that it was because the King of Tanahū had granted asylum to Śūrapratāp Śāh, Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ's brother, who defected shortly after the conquest of Bhātḡāū. Initially Keharsim̄ha's expedition was successful. He captured in swift succession Mānpāṅ on Thursday, 19 February 1771, Chāṅg on the following day (20 February), Darucung on Saturday, 2 March, Mānmul and Pacbhāiyā on the following day, Rāngrung and Jyāmire on Wednesday, 1 May 1771. The Gorkhalese surrounded Sur, the capital of Tanahū. In desperation its king, Kāmāridatta Sen, committed suicide. Hearing this King Mukunda Sen II of Pālpā, King Vīrmardan Sāhī of Lamjung and King Kīrtibam Malla of Parvat became angry with Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ and united to repulse the advancing Gorkhalese troops. Kāmāridatta Sen who was issueless was succeeded by his brother, Harkumārdatta Sen. The latter compromised with Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ and allowed him to station his army in Tanahū. Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ with help from Harkumārdatta sent troops to conquer the lands in the Kālī (Kṛṣṇā) Gaṇḍakī region. Keharsim̄ha who was still in command conquered Rising and Ghiring and crossed the Kelādī river. Battle was joined with the forces of Bhīrkoṭ at Kihū (otherwise Kahū), and with its capture the Gorkhalese conquered Bhīrkoṭ. At Grihākoṭ (otherwise Grimhākoṭ) the Tanahū troops deserted and joined the defenders, but

---

1. HP, vol.52, fo.120.

2. Ācārya, 'Tanahūko Sen-vamśa', 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 Kyāngmī. In the course of the fighting the troops of Bhīrkoṭ suffered heavy casualties. Malhebār and Sekhāng 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 Dhūvākōṭ, a place close by.

A little later hostile contact was made with the forces of Lamjung. In the course of the resultant battle Keharsimha captured the Crown Prince and sent him as a hostage to Kāṭhmāṇḍu. At this point the Gorkhalese advance seems to have halted for some time.

Vaṁśarāj and Prabhu Malla now joined Keharsimha 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 Vaṁśarāj and Prabhu Malla marched from one front and Keharsimha from another to attack Satahū. But victory lay with the Cāubīsī troops. In the course of the fighting Keharsimha was killed and Vaṁśarāj severely wounded and taken prisoner. In all 500

---

1. HP, op.cit.

2. Jñavālī, op.cit., p.173.

3. He was released by Kīrtibam at the news that Pratāpsimha Śāh, successor of Pṛthvinārāyaṇ, had sent to the neighbouring states informing them of his decision of suspending his campaigns for the coming two years (1775-77). Vaṁśarāj was murdered later in Kāṭhmāṇḍu in June 1785 consequent upon palace intrigues (Ācārya, 'Śrī 5 Rājendralakṣmī Devī', pp.12, 15).

Gorkhalese were killed in these engagements. Prthvīnārāyaṇ<sup>1</sup> appointed Daljit Śāh, one of his brothers, as his minister in absence of Vamśarāj.<sup>2</sup>

The Cāubīsī troops pressed hard in pursuit, and the Gorkhalese, now greatly reduced in number, retreated first to Bhīrkoṭ and later to Dhor. The latter place was surrounded by the Cāubīsī troops.<sup>3</sup> Prabhu Malla, Raṇaśūr Pāre<sup>4</sup> 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.<sup>5</sup> Nevertheless the Gorkhalese troops could not retain Bhīrkoṭ, Garahū and Pāiyū, and were forced to evacuate them the next day. On 24 January Atibal Biṣṭa, another Gorkhalese officer with the expedition withdrew from Rising. Thus the entire territory was lost and the Gorkhalese retired towards Kāṭhmāṇḍu 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 Cāubīsī against the Gorkhalese (vide IP, vol.II,pt.iii,p.432; also Jñavālī, op.cit.,p.174).

4. Younger brother of Vamśarāj Pāre.

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 Cāubīsī troops laid siege to Dhor for 14 days, and on Māgh 13, as mentioned in HP, ibid., the Gorkhalese retreated from Bhīrkoṭ, Garahū and Pāiyū after holding out for a fortnight, and so the siege laid by the Cāubīsī was on Pauṣa 28, i.e. 8 January 1772, and not on Magh 12.

1  
 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.<sup>2</sup>

Troops were sent from Kāṭhmāṇḍu as reinforcements under the command of Kājī Śrīharṣa Panta and Dhāukalsimha Basnet. The retreating Gorkhalese troops crossed the Marsyāṅgī and joined the reinforcements at Setīghāṭ.<sup>3</sup> But they did not resume the operation. The first Gorkhalese expedition against the Čaubīsī 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 Čaudaṅḍī and Morang to open up their country for the production of timber. Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ realised that if the British were permitted to penetrate Čaudaṅḍī 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 Kosī, occupied Rāvā, Cisaṅkhu and Dinglā and marched as far

---

1. HP, vol.52, fo.120.

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

3. IP, vol.I, p.128, col.1, vol.II, pt.iii, pp.432-33.

as the Arun river. The commander of the Gorkhalese troops of this expedition was Rāmkr̥ṣṇa Kāv̥ar. 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 Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ's cause was served by Brahmans. Harinanda's elder brother Narottam, was a minister of Cāudaṇḍī and it seems both these brothers were persons of eminence in this state. For some reason relations between Karṇa Sen, the King of Cāudaṇḍī, and Harinanda became strained and the latter left the Court of Cāudaṇḍī and went over to the Gorkhalese taking with him what appears to have been a large sum of money which Rāmkr̥ṣṇa Kāv̥ar 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 Cāudaṇḍī and was promised whatever other freehold lands he cared to have.

At the end of 1773 Amarsimha Thāpā, an officer under the command of Rāmkr̥ṣṇa Kāv̥ar drove the defenders out of Majhuvā, Kalum and Mahadignā Pāvuvā and in February 1774 occupied Cāudaṇḍī, the capital of the state. This was the first successful campaign of a young officer who was to achieve extensive victories under Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ's successors.

---

1. HP, vol.52, fo.120.

2. IP, vol.II, pt.iii, pp.466-67 (Letter no.8).

3. Kṛṣṇacandra Upādhyāya Pokhrel: Pokhrelko vaṃśāvalī, pp. 142, 185-86.

4. IP, vol.I, pp. 12-13.

5. IP, vol.II, p.466 (Letter no.7).

In the meantime Harinanda was assisting the officers of Rāmkr̥ṣṇa Kāvar, Abhimānsim̥ha 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 Abhimānsim̥ha 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 Caudaṇḍī state was now wholly occupied by Pr̥thvīnārāyaṇ's troops, and it was annexed to Nepal on Saturday 16 July 1774. Its ruler Karṇa Sen escaped to Morang. Meanwhile the troops under the command of Abhimānsim̥ha and Pārath were reinforced by other contingents under Kīrtisim̥ha Khavās and Bali Bāniyā. Together they pushed forward to the east along three routes. They crossed the Tamar river, captured Cāinpur on Sunday, 17 July, and Vijayapur on 18 July. Thence they marched further ahead and captured Islimbā and Cānthāpu. 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 Pr̥thvīnārāyaṇ's domains in the east were contiguous with those of Sikkim.

---

1. IP, vol. I, pp. 12-13 (Letter from Rāmkr̥ṣṇa Kāvar to Harinanda Upādhyāya Pokhrel dated Friday, 27 August 1773, and letter from Abhimānsim̥ha and Pārath Bhārārī to the same dated Ambarpur, Saturday, 26 February 1774).

2. HP, vol. 52, fo. 120.

3. Jñavālī, op. cit., p. 175.

4. HP, ibid.

5. Vide Letter no. 15, pp. 78-81.

1

Pr̥thvīnārāyaṇ'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.<sup>2</sup> 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 Cāudaṇḍī and Morang seem to have held a nominal suzerainty over the Limbus and the rest of the Kirātī tribesmen. The Limbus surrendered to Pr̥thvīnārāyaṇ's armies mainly because they had so often been attacked and oppressed by the Tibetan ruler of Sikkim.<sup>3</sup> Pr̥thvīnārāyaṇ granted some privilege to the Limbu chieftains which they enjoy till today.<sup>4</sup> They were designated Subbās.<sup>5</sup>

By the end of 1774 Pr̥thvīnārāyaṇ'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.

3. Jñavālī, op.cit., pp.175-79.

4. Imānsiṃha Cemjong: Kirāt-itihās, 2d.ed., pp. 56-57,60.

5. By these privileges they exercise some sort of authority in their lands. The authority is called Kipaṭ 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 Makwānpur to Morang were however still unsettled, though negotiations were still going on in a somewhat desultory fashion between Pr̥thvīnārāyaṇ and East India Company. This problem was not to be settled until the Nepalese Wars (1814-16). On 10 January 1775 Pr̥thvīnārāyaṇ 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

## PṚTHVĪNĀRĀYAṆ, SOLDIER AND STATESMAN

The opportunity for the original mounting and final success of PṚthvīnārāyaṇ'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 <sup>have</sup> 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 "Cāubīsī" 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, PṚthvīnārāyaṇ 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 PṚthvīnārāyaṇ the time and security he needed to capture Nuwākot, the main gateway to the Nepal Valley. Lamjung saw the danger and renounced the treaty, but it was then too late. PṚthvīnārāyaṇ had achieved his immediate objective. At a later stage he bought off the King of Tanahū by a similar appeal

to self-interest. King Raṇajitsimha of Bhātgaū was also often played off against King Jayaprakāś of Kāthmāṇḍu 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 Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ's policy of attack by erosion and blockade.

Something of Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ the man and the planning of his campaigns and the consolidation of his position there can be gleaned from his notes in the Divya upadeś 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 Bhātgāū. 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 Bāīsī and Čaubīsī, 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

---

1. Vide p. 47, n.96.

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 Prthvinārāyaṇ. 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 Čaubīsī states and Magarāt. Prthvinārāyaṇ also reappointed certain Magar officers, who had been dismissed by his father. In Divya upadeś Prthvinārāyaṇ 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 Prthvinārāyaṇ'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 Jasrām Thāpā, a minister of Jaya-

---

1. Each of the companies raised by Prthvinārāyaṇ 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 Prthvinārāyaṇ returned from Banaras he raised two companies, Sabuj and Vajravāṇī, and after the capture of Nuwākot three more, Barkandāj, Old Gorakhnāth and Rāmdal. Regmi mentions five, Śrīnāth, Sabuj, Gorakhnāth, Kālībaksa and Vajravāṇī, which were raised in 1761 (Modern Nepal, p.62). Ācārya says that two companies were raised on European lines in 1763 ('Prthvinārāyaṇ Śāhkā jīvanīko pūrvārdha', p.75), whereas Jñavālī says five (op.cit., p.135, n.1).  
Vide also p.269.

prakāś Malla of Kāṭhmāṇḍu, who was arrested by a Gorkhalese officer and sent to Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ at Nuwākot. The marriage between the two families further provided Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ with Thāpā assistants, whom he employed in his later campaigns against Makwānpur.

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

---

1. Vide pp. 153-58.

action, he ensured stability of government at home and increased his army without resentment on the part of his people. Pr̥thvīnārāyaṇ did not always behave so prudently after the death of Candraprabhāvātī, 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.

### Pr̥thvīnārāyaṇ Śāh as a Soldier

Pr̥thvīnārāyaṇ'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 1742, 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 <sup>1</sup> 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. Pr̥thvīnārāyaṇ Śāhko jīvanī, p.2

Magar and even Newār money-lenders.<sup>1</sup>

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,<sup>2</sup> and two Frenchmen<sup>3</sup> 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.<sup>4</sup> 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 Pr̥thvīnārāyaṇ, 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.

Pr̥thvīnārāyaṇ 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 re-organisation seems to have been in two phases. There was little or no

---

1. Pr̥thvīnārāyaṇ Śāhko jīvanī, p.37.

2. Vide DU Tr., p. 32.

3. Papers respecting the Nepaül War pp.80-81,88.

4. Pr̥thvīnārāyaṇ Śāhko jīvanī, pp. 25

organisation prior to the defeat at Nuwākot. After his return from Banaras, he formed two regular companies, Sabuj and Vajravāṇī; and after the capture of Nuwākot, 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, n.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<sup>1</sup>. 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<sup>2</sup>.

Soldiers, whether commissioned or not, were generously treated in the matter of pay and allowances. It was a regular feature of Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ'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<sup>3</sup>.

The use of mercenaries as expert instructors and auxiliary troops on regular pay has already been referred to.

Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ'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. NP, 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.

3. Vide pp. 29-30.

Dhāding, not to mention Nuwākoṭ, the most important of them all. In some cases they were strengthened by trench employments and road blocks. Their purpose was strategic: to protect Pr̥thvīnārāyaṇ'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.<sup>1</sup> 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 schoolēd in the warfare of the pitched battle, to know how to organise defence against them. In the course of a few years Pr̥thvīnārāyaṇ 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 Pr̥thvīnārāyaṇ on his own ground.

#### Pr̥thvīnārāyaṇ Śāh as a Diplomatist and Negotiator

The brilliance of Pr̥thvīnārāyaṇ 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

---

1. Vide pp. 19, 25.

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<sup>1</sup>.

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 Tanahū and Kāskī. The king of Tanahū was lured into captivity by his own rāj-guru, who unwittingly led him into an ambush.<sup>2</sup> It was a Brahman who bribed the king of Kāskī to help in the campaigns against Cāgu,<sup>3</sup> and there is no doubt that most of the information Pṛthvī-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.<sup>4</sup>

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

1. Vide pp. 152-53.

2. Vide pp. 202-4.

3. Vide Letter no. 6, p. 64

4. Vide Letter no. 9, p. 68 ; also Lévi: Le Népal, vol. II, p. 272.

finally alienated the unhappy king from his ministers and from his mother.<sup>1</sup>  
 In advance of his descent into the Valley Prthvīnārāyaṇ absolved certain  
 Brahmans from debts contracted there.<sup>2</sup> He bribed two Sannyāsīs to help  
 him in the Bhātḡāū country,<sup>3</sup> and some artisans to work for him in Banepā.<sup>4</sup>  
 When bribery and cajolery failed he could always resort to ferocious  
 cruelty of which Kīrtipur is the most notorious example.<sup>5</sup> 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 Bāīsī and Čaubīsī 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 upadeś 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 <sup>too</sup> 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

1. Vide pp. 191-95.

2. Letter no.8, pp. 67-68.

3. Letter no. 7, pp. 66-67.

4. Vide p p. 231-32.

5. Vide p . 248.

the code of Rām Śāh, King of Gorkhā (1609-36) and those of Sthitirāj Malla and Mahendra Malla who were kings of Kāṭhmāṇḍu 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 (Ḍiṭṭhās) should be chosen from the Ṭhakurīs, (b) their assistants (Vicārīs) should be Magars, (c) a Pandit (Dharmādhikār) should be attached to each court to expound the Dharmasāstras 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 Śāhko jīvanī, pp. 29-30, wherein it is stated that Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ had to resort to every cunning not permitted by the dharmasāstras 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, Tr., p. 27.

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 Cāutariyās, 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 Jośīs or Jāisīs (astrologers). In addition there were a number of counsellors. They were elders (Jethā Būrhās) 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),<sup>1</sup> etc. All these officials and officers met together in a state consultative assembly.<sup>2</sup>

---

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 avatār of Viṣṇu.<sup>1</sup> 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<sup>2</sup> the king's autocratic tendencies.

Certain families, the Pāres, 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."<sup>3</sup>

---

1. GVY, p.32.

2. Vide p.35, n.9.

3. DU, Tr., p.28.

Prthvīnārāyaṇ Śāh's Trade Policy

Prthvīnārāyaṇ attached significance to the development of trade and commerce. One of the major considerations that apparently weighed with him in the capture of Nuwākot and later of the region stretching from Pāṭibhanjyāng 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. Prthvīnārāyaṇ 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

---

1. Ācārya, 'Śrī Śrī Jayaprakāś Malla', p.49.

2. Vide pp. 211-13.

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.<sup>1</sup>

His aim was to exclude foreign traders from his country and maintain the policy of a closed frontier. He believed that merchants followed merchandise.<sup>2</sup> He apprehended dangers from the Indian merchants and middlemen, especially Gosāis and Kashmiri Muslims, who up till then had monopolised trade through Nepal to Tibet. They had been permitted by Malla kings to carry on trade with Nepal and Tibet and establish their business houses in Kāthmāndu. They also had business establishments in Lhasa. It appears Prthvīnārāyaṇ 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.<sup>3</sup> 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 Gosāis and Kashmiri Muslim merchants who had been expelled

---

1. Kirkpatrick, op.cit., pp. 339-40; Markham, op.cit., p.129; Walsh, op.cit., pp.691-94, 713.

2. Lévi: Le Népal, vol.II, p.276.

3. A Gosāi had actually tried to procure English help for Jayaprakāś against Prthvīnārāyaṇ (vidē p. 255, n. 2).

from Nepal met Bogle in Lhasa and sought the Company's assistance to continue their trade activities. Professedly ascetics, the Gosāīs 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 Mustāṅ 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 Cāubīsī. 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.<sup>2</sup>

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.<sup>1</sup> 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 Kāṭhmāṇḍu.<sup>2</sup> There was also one Gosāl<sup>3</sup> who was Prthvīnārāyaṇ's favourite and whom he had sent as his envoy to Tibet.

### Prthvīnārāyaṇ's Economic Policy

Prthvīnārāyaṇ'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 Kāṭhmāṇḍu, Bhātgaū and Pāṭan 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.
  3. Vide Letter no.14, p.77.

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.<sup>1</sup> 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.<sup>2</sup>

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.<sup>3</sup>

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.<sup>1</sup>

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.<sup>2</sup> He was shrewd enough to realise the economic dangers inherent in a debased coinage.

Another measure Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ 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 <sup>3</sup> 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 <sup>4</sup> 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.

2. Letters nos. 1, 4, pp. 56-58, 61-62.

3. DU, Tr., *ibid.*

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.

### Prthvīnārāyaṇ Śāh as a Hindu

Śaivism seems to have been the original creed of the Śāh kings of Gorkhā. Their tutelary 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. Prthvīnārāyaṇ 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 Prthvīnārāyaṇ 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

---

1. As is apparent from G.V.Y., pp.23,47,65,71; IP, vol.I,p.40.

2. Janaklāl Śarmā: Josmanī santa-paramparā ra sāhitya, p.427.

3. Ibid.,p.11.

of Gorkhā itself. Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ also believed in tantricism, performed Puraścaraṇ (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 Nuwākōṭ. He had also given to them timber for the construction of a church in the Valley.<sup>1</sup> 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.<sup>2</sup>

Pṛthvīnārāyaṇ 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 Gosāī traders, and he invited some Muslim families to settle in a district of Gorkhā.

---

1. Petech, op.cit., Part I, Introduzione generale, LXVII-LXVIII, Pt. II, pp.194-200, 204-5.

2. Lévi: Le Népal, vol. I, pp.111-12, vol. II, p.266.

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.<sup>1</sup> It is said too that he ordered certain Brahmans to be decapitated,<sup>2</sup> 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 Brahmans. Some members of this caste were suspected of aiding Jayaprakāś in an attempt to arrest Pr̥thvīnārāyaṇ's son, Pratāpsīṃha Śāh. He therefore demoted the whole sept and deprived them of the right to exercise their priestly function.<sup>3</sup>

Extant evidence does not give a complete account of Pr̥thvīnārāyaṇ's orthodoxy as a Hindu, but there is no doubt that his status as a Hindu was respected by a large number of Brahmans 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 Brahmans proved most useful allies. It would not be true to say that Pr̥thvīnārāyaṇ'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

Pr̥thvīnārāyaṇ 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. Pr̥thvīnārāyaṇ ascended the throne of Gorkhā, one of the smallest principalities in the Caubīsī 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 Pr̥thvīnārāyaṇ 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 Pr̥thvīnārāyaṇ's policy. The Limbus too he won over by accepting their traditional land system known as Kipaṭ, 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 PRTHVINĀRĀYAṆ ŚĀH

## LETTER NO. 1

## श्रीदुर्गा

१. स्वस्तिश्रीगिरिराजेत्यादि श्रीमन्माहाराजाधिराजश्रीश्रीश्री-
२. मत्पृथ्वीनारायणसाहदेवानां सदासमरविजयिनाम् -----
३. स्वस्तिश्रीसर्वोपमाजोगेत्यादि. श्रीहरिपंडितकेषु जेथाजो-
४. गे. पूर्वक पत्रमिदं इहां कुसल तौहौं कुसल चाहिय जेहिते परम
५. आनन्द होइ. आगे पत्र आयो अर्थ मालूम भयो. उप्रांत : ज्या [वि]-
६. न्ति गरि पठायाछौ जोगे विन्ति गरि पठायाछौ. तर अलिक ढिलो
७. गरेउ चाँडो गर्न्या काम हो अव ढिलो नगर. तांहाको जस्तो ष-
८. वर पाँउछौ तस्तो षवर चाँडो पठावन्त्या गर. उप्रांत म कु-
९. ति गर्जौ. र भोट्याहरूले स्वःहको भावमाहौं त भयन अठार
१०. भन्या दिन्छौं भन्या सुना पनि दिन तयार भया भाव-
११. माहौं नमिल्लदा म षासाको जगातसम्म उठेर आँउदा
१२. भोट्याले थामिपठाया. र म थामिजौं भोट्यासंग मै-
१३. ले यति वोल्छौं. कुटन फुकन नाहि भाव सोःह भनि मै-
१४. ले भनिराष्याको छ भनि पठायाछौ : अठार भन्या अ-
१५. लिक कपट मसूछौं भन्दा हौंमि देवा स्वध्दछौ भनेर स्वधन

१६. गइरहयाछन् भनिपठायौ. परंतु. कुटि फु कि नाहि  
 १७. उसै स्वःहलाइ दिन्या भया. पनि. अँट क्या होला. परंतु  
 १८. सुन घटिया नलेव. पीतलको धुलो मिस्याको हुन्छ.  
 १९. तस्माहाँ पनि नजर राषिकन लेव. कदाचित्त स्वःहलाइ  
 २०. त दिएनन्त. तिमिले पेटमाहाँ राषनु चाहिन्छ नकुटि  
 २१. नफु कि स्वःहउपर सुका थप्. भन्या पनि अँट. एति-  
 २२. माहाँ पनि कदाचित्त नपस्या पनि. नकुटि नफु कि स-  
 २३. त्रसम् [म भया] पनि अँट. परन्तु [तेति] सत्रको भावसम  
 २४. तेति रूपियामात्र मिजन्या भया ते [त्ति]के रष र सुन लेव.  
 २५. नाहि सुना वाःह पंघ हज्जार तोला मिलन्या भया  
 २६. एहि चासनिमाहाँ कुटि फु कि अठारसम्म भन्या प[नि]  
 २७. अँट. परन्तु. वाःह पंघ हज्जार तोला निसकन्या [भया] अँट.  
 २८. एण पत्लो छेवको कुरो हो. पेट राषि गर एण कागत-  
 २९. को बुफ भोदयाले पाया भोदया चल्हान्. तस्कार-  
 ३०. ण यो काम पेट राषि गर. परन्तु सुन आपना नजर-  
 ३१. देषि विरीवोइण भनि आपना इष्ट मित्र बुफि विन-  
 ३२. ति गरि पठाव : तँहाँ वन्दोवस्त वन्यादेशि सुना [प]-  
 ३३. नि पठाइदेव. एति रूपिया पठाइदेव ये-  
 ३४. ति सुना मिलन्या छ. भनि णिस्तुक पनि विनति  
 ३५. गरि पठाव. भोटको क्या हकिगत छ स्व पनि वि-  
 ३६. धि विस्तार विनति गरि पठाव सव.  
 ३७. उप्रांत. इहाँको हकिगत सुषेरु काठ पनि  
 ३८. सौधमाहाँ पुःयाइउ. अरु समाचार पनि

३९. आनंद छ. उप्रात. राहा त वँदै गर छो-  
 ४०. डनु छैन. विधि विस्तार नराज वस्न्या-  
 ४१. त चन्द्रभान पंडित कहनान् स्व सहि  
 ४२. तँहाँ चालिस पचास मुरि अन्न भोट  
 ४३. गयो भन्याको सुनिउ त्यो कस्को वा-  
 ४४. टोवाट गय निषेद गरिराष विज्ञप्ति कि-  
 ४५. मधिकं मिति फाल्गुण सुदि ६ रो-  
 ४६. ज ५ मुकाम नुवाकोट माडि शुभम्

LETTER NO. 2

श्रीगोरषनाथ

स्वस्तिश्री गिरिराजचक्रचूडामणिनरनारायणेत्यादिविविधविरु दावलि-  
 विराजमानमानोन्नतश्रीश्रीश्रीमन्माहाजाधिराजश्रीश्रीश्रीमन्पृथ्वीनारायण-  
 साहदेवानां सदासमरविजयिनाम्

स्वस्तिश्रीसर्वोपमायोग्यराजभारासामर्थ. इत श्रीदोलष्या देशवार  
 प्रधानकेषु. आशीषपूर्वकपत्रमिदं. यहां कुशल. तांहां कुशल चाहिय.  
 जेहिते परमानन्द होइ. आगे यहाँको समाचार निको छ. उप्रात. तिमि  
 प्रजापात हौ. नालदुमपूर्व मेरो अंवल भयो. तुमि मेरा हजुर आव. तिम्रो  
 धन तियको म रक्षा गरुंला. पिछा दि आर्को तरह गरु त ... को  
 कुदृष्टि धर्म दिक्न तुमि नआयादेशि तिम्रो जहोजात गरुला उप्रात  
 पाल्हुंग. तिष्टुंग् चितलांग्. हामिथ्यौं सोफ्त भ मित्या र उनको रछा  
 हामिले गरैको छ. किमधिकं विज्ञप्ति भाद्र वदि ४ रोज ४ मुकाम नुवाकोट  
 शुभम् -----

LETTER NO. 3

श्रीदुर्गा

स्वस्तिश्रीगिरिराजचक्रूडामणिनरनारायणेत्यादिविविधविरु दावली-  
विराजमानमानोन्नतश्रीमन्महाराजाधिराजश्रीश्रीश्रीश्रीश्रीमत्पृथ्वीनारायण-  
साहदेवानां सदासमरविजयिनां -----

आगे दोलषाका देसवान् प्रधान प्रजाप्रति. तिमिकन मडले पिछा लिआ.  
मेरो पाउ भन्या भया. घर घर वशी रहु मेरा. भाराहरु ताहि. आया  
तनसंग मित्त आया तिम्रा घन जिय. केहि हवन. तुलाराम पांडेछेउ विस्तार  
गरि पठायाको छ. चाडो मित्त आव. शुभमस्तु

श्रीतुलाराम पांडिको यथायोग्य

LETTER NO. 4

श्रीदुर्गा

१. स्वस्तिश्रीगिरिराजेत्यादि श्रीमन्महाराजाधिराज श्रीश्रीश्रीम-
२. त्पृथ्वीनारायणसाहदेवानां सदासमरविजयिनाम् -----
३. स्वस्तिश्रीसर्वोपमेत्यादि श्रीहरिदेव पंडित श्रीजमदग्नि
४. उपाध्याके. यथोचित. प्रणाम. पूर्वक पत्रं इदम्. आगे
५. ईहाको समाचार भलो छ उप्रांत. सानु ओहावृज्युछ्यौ
६. र मौजंज्युछ्यौ हज्जार रुपयाका सुना रहयाको छ त्यो
७. चाडो मागेर पठाइदेउ. उप्रांत. चासाका भोदया रविगुका
८. भोदयाले अधि ता जगातिसँग नमिलि धामपुम गज्या. प-

९. छि हाम्रो नालदुम घेदा, सभै उठिकन तलतलसंम पि-  
 १०. दया तस्कारण ति हाम्रा साइधुवा हुन्, हाम्रै प्रजा हुन्.  
 ११. तनूकन हामि तसुनस् गछीं, तसुनस् गर्दा कुतिका देवा-  
 १२. हरु महाजनहरु चमूकनान्, यो चमक मेदया, तेस्ता  
 १३. साइधुवालाइ राष्या फेरि घामधुम होला उप्रात, तौहँका  
 १४. कुरो कहनि चाँडो बुझि उत्तरा चाँडो पठार उप्रात, तौ-  
 १५. हा हाम्रा रूपयाले सुना मिलन्या भया यौहा रूपया  
 १६. भयाका छन्, यो उत्तरा चाँडो गरि पठार र रु-  
 १७. पया पठाइदिउला जति भन्छौ तति रूपया भया-  
 १८. का छन्, विज्ञेषु किमधिकं, मुहजवांनी पत्रवा-  
 १९. लाको सहि मिति भाद्र वदि १२ रोज ४ शुभम् -----

## LETTER NO. 5

.....

स्वस्तिश्री अभुदसि प्रधानके आशीषपूर्वक पत्रमिदं आहां कुशल ताहां  
 कुशल चाहि जेहिते सनंद होइ, आगे आहांको समाचार भलो छ,  
 उप्रात भडेल भन्याका परदेसि मेरा इष्ट हौ आज जसो गरि हुँछ मेरो  
 काम पुज्याव, आफनु रहेछ भनि कामैमहां, जानिँछ ताहां चिर्फार्गरि  
 यो काम पुज्याव, आफनु पट पीठ पनि पूरण गरुला, उचो तिषो  
 पनि गरुला सुरो पुरो गरि काम गर, उत्तरा चाडो पठाव, किमधिकं  
 विज्ञेषु, श्रावण शुदि २ रोज ४ मुकाम काभ्रया शुभम् -----

लि. स्वस्तिश्री सर्वोपमायोग्य निखिलगुणगरिष्ठ राजभारासामर्थ्य  
 श्रीराजीवलोचनपण्डितके प्रणामपूर्वक पत्रमिदं अहां कुशल ताहां क्षेम  
 चाहिय येहिते चित्र सानन्द होइ. पत्र आयो. पत्रार्थ विदित भयो.  
 आगे आहाको समाचार भलो छ उप्रान्त आउंदा जीवपक्षमा काज  
 हवस् भनि आग्या गरि पठारनुभएछ. भलो आज्ञा गरि पठारनुभएछ.  
 परन्तु हाफ्रा अहा चांगु साँखुको काज लाग्दा तहाका काज वलियो  
 गरि हुन्या छैन. तहावाट काज गज्या एतावाट हामिले हेरिरहोइनो.  
 जो होइ आउला काज गरौला. दोहोरो काज गरदा एतावाट वलियो  
 काज हवोइन. उप्रान्त गोर्खा चिह्नि कास्किले अर्को ठारुं कहाँ जानु छ  
 भनि अहा हाफ्रा धनिछेउं विन्ति गज्या भनि लेखनुभएछ. तहाँ भाइका  
 पाउमा भलो विन्ति गर्नुभएछ योग्यै हो. कास्किलाई छोडि गोर्खाले  
 काहा जानु छ. गोर्खालाइ छोडि कास्किले पनि कहा जानु छ. आज  
 कास्किवाट काज भएन तापनि काहल कास्किवाट काज भै गोर्खाको  
 वनला. आज गोर्खावाट काज भएन तापनि काहल गोर्खावाट काज भइ  
 कास्किको वनला. परन्तु गोर्खाको र कास्किको रेषजोष गर्नु दुंगो हो.  
 आज काज भएन तपनि काहल होला. कामले लामु छोटो पज्या पनि  
 लज्जु घटाइ भाइको काज वनाउन्थे आकांछा छ. उप्रान्त काजिका कविला  
 थाम्न्या भनि आग्या गरि पठारनुभएछ. हामिले काजिका कविला थाम्दा  
 त काजिका कविला काजिदेषि अप्सरिया हुन लाग्या र काजिका कविला  
 थाम्न सकेनौ. एक त काजि हामिसित अनुचित गज्या र जानामहा पस्या  
 दोस्रो काजिको र काजिका कविलाको फाटो पर्न्या क्यन गरौं भनेर  
 काजिका कविला जान दिअ्यौं. तहां भाइको पाउमा हुनुहुन्छ. तपाइं  
 पनि हुनुहुन्छ. अहावाट भलामानिस पठारुंछौ. तहां काजिकन बुझाइ

संक्राइ अहा पठाइदिनुहवस्. किमधिकं विज्ञेषु. माघ वदि ९ रोज  
७ मुकाम नुवाकोट माडी शुभम्.

LETTER NO. 7

श्रीदुर्गासहाय

स्वस्तिश्रीमन्महाराजाधिराजकस्य रुक्का \_\_\_\_\_  
आगे. भगवति वन्. लछ्मिन वन्. के. पीछा लिजौ. भादगाउँको सौषुमुल  
नागोसिटारको रोपनि १२ षेत. डिहिसमेत गोर्नको षेत मुरि ८००  
डिहिसमेत. भादगाउँ सहरको रोपनि ४० षेत. मठसमेत. माफ गरिवक्स्यी.  
षाउ. आनन्द गर. दरदस्तुर भेटि सलामि अरु सभैकन परला. सो दस्तुर  
तिमिहरुले पनि चन्हावनुपरला. इति संवत् १८२३ पौष वदि १० रोज  
६ मुकाम नुवाकोट राजधानी शुभम्. \_\_\_\_\_

LETTER NO. 8

.....  
आगे विसंषुका. भवानीशंकर पौड्याल. चामु पौड्याल. विरेश्वर पौड्यालके  
तिमिहरुमाथि. नेपालका भाजुदेउ टौढिक नेवारका दुइ हजार महिंद्रमलि  
छ्न् भनि लांजांथुं. ति रुपैयामध्ये. सिक्का १२० शिवानन्द पण्डितहस्ते  
सर्कार लाग्या. सिक्का १२० विरु षड्काहस्ते सर्कार लाग्या. फेरि  
सिक्का ८० विरभद्र उपाध्याहस्ते सर्कार लाग्या. वाकि भाजुदेउ टौढिक  
नेवारका दुइ हजार महिंद्रमलिवापत्. माफ गरिवक्स्यी. अवउप्रांत कसैको  
दावा धक्का नास्ति. संवत् १८२३ फाल्गुण शुदि १ रोज १ मुकाम  
चागु शुभम्.

LETTER NO. 9

श्रीदुर्गासहाय

.....

स्वस्तिश्रीसर्वोपमायोग्येत्यादि श्रीकीर्तिराजानंद उपाध्याके प्रणामपूर्वक पत्रमिदं इहां कुशल ताहां कुशल चाहिय, आगे इहांको समाचार भलो छ, उप्रान्त, तिमि भन्या वडा मनुष्य हौ, तिम्रो र हाम्रो पलासि गर्नाको इच्छा छैद थियो, हाम्रा काजिका, स्नेहले वहुतै वन्यो, अव, तिम्रा वडावावा र काकासित पेट मिलाइ काठमाडौंका तषतको काज पुज्याव, तिम्रो साँषु, चाँगु, पाटन, काठमाडौं, पर्वतको वौंघा, वृत्ता, घर्षेत जजमान्ताको पूजासमेत् माफ गरिवक्स्यौं किमधिकं आशिवन वदि ९ रोज ४ मुकाम किर्त्तिपुर शुभम्

LETTER NO. 10

स्वस्तिश्रीमन्महाराजाधिराजकस्य रुक्का

आगे रामकृस्न उपाध्या पौड्याल्का छिम्याक् वस्न्या घनदत्त्या नेवारकन हिजो हामिले पक्रिकन विश्वामित्र मिश्रलाई वक्स्याको हो, आज विश्वामित्र मिश्रले पार गरिदियो हाम्रो देशमाहां आ, जाहां तेरो सुभिता पछ ताहां वस्, कल्कला मासीयाको हो भनिकन पनि विश्वामित्र मिश्रको कमारो हो भनिकन पनि कसैको दावा धक्का नास्ति सम्बत् १८२५ भाद्र शुदी १ रोज २ मुकाम लुटिकोट सुभम्

LETTER NO. 11

## श्रीदुर्गासहाय

.....

स्वस्तिश्रीसर्वोपमाजोग्येत्यादि श्रीअभिमानसिंहके आसीकपूर्वक पत्रमिदं  
 आहा कुसल तौहा कुसल चाहिय जेहिते परम आनंद होई आगे आहाको  
 समाचार भलो छ उप्रान्त जेठा चौतरीया मदेशामा राजा हुन लाग्या  
 भनि जेठि चौतानिथै तैले क्लपिकन भनिस भनि तंसित जेठा चौतरिया  
 भगडा गर्न षोजद छन् गरे त्यो कुरा यस्तो हो जेठा चौतरीयाको  
 विजिनिस पत्र वीचमा [पक्रि]कन कहरले मेरा हजरमा चढाई पठाउदा  
 उसै चिठिका बुजले जेठा चौतरीया त राजा हुन लाग्याछन् जा समाचार  
 सुनाई आ क्या भन्छन् भनी तैलाई जेठी चौतानिछैउ नुवाकोट छदा क्लीया  
 पठायको मैले हो ष्वामिदले अरायाको सेवकले हुकुम मान्नेपछ तैले आफना  
 उचितले भन्न गयाको पनि होईन जोर गांथ गज्याको पनि होइन तेस  
 वापतमा चौतरियाको वादी उनैका विजिनिस पत्र छदैछ उहि सहिले  
 कठिया पठायको हो तेस कुरामा तलाई दोष छैन उनै दुहुदा हुन् तसित  
 तकरार गर्न आया यहि मोहर देखाईदियस् आफै कायल हुनन् उप्रान्त  
 पुरश्चरणको सराजाम नपुग्या हो मागिपठा. विज्ञेषु किमधिकं  
 कार्तिक सुदि १२ रोज ३ मुकाम भादगाउँ.

LETTER NO. 12

श्रीदुर्गासहाय

.....

स्वस्तिश्री गिरिराजचक्रवृडामणिनरनारायणोत्यादिविविधविरु दावलि-  
 विराजमानमानोन्नतश्रीमन्हाराराजाधिराजकुमारश्रीमन्महोदामकीर्तिसाहदेवेषु  
 सदासमरविजयिषु आशिषपुर्वकपत्रमिदं ईहा कुसल ताहा कुसल चाहिये  
 आगे आहाको समाचार भलो छ उप्रान्त कहर वस्न्यातमाथी दगा गर्न्या  
 डवल गर्छु गरे दगा गन्या आषा कढाई मागलासु यस कुरामा कहर साचो  
 छ तैले लेष्याको कागत र मानीसमात्र पकेर हामिछेउ पुन्यायो आफना  
 हात मुखले भनि गरी केहि विरायाको छैन आफना कर्तव्यले तहि भुटो  
 छु भुटो भयाप्रान्त चुप लागी रहनु

---

LETTER NO. 13

श्रीदुर्गासहाय

स्वस्तिश्रीपरमहंसपरिव्राजकसकलचक्राधीश्वरश्रीश्रीश्रीश्रीश्रीश्रीमद्भगवन्त-  
 नाथदेवदेवेषु. लि.

.....

अहाँवाट एक जना जेठा बुढा र थर घरसमेत कालु पांडेकन पठारैछौं. आउँछ.  
 आफ्नु कृपा भया जुमलासंग वनला. उप्रान्त, दशाइपछि आफना मानिस  
 आइपुग्याथ्या. तसै विचमहँ. विदा गरौ भनि तयार भयथ्यौं. मलाइ

विसञ्च भयो र ढील भयो. पछि मलाई संच भयो र विदा गरौं भन्दा  
 लमजुङ्गले तनहुँले घाट वाट सवै वन्द गरि छेक्या र मुषो पनि छिन  
 दियेनन्. अरु घाट वन्दै गरिराख्याछन्. तसो हुनाले आफूना मानिसकन  
 ढील भयो. उप्रान्त. पूर्वका काजलाई आशीर्वाद वक्सी पठायागयेथ्यो.  
 आशीर्वाद शिर चढाईकन किरातको काज गज्याथ्यौं. आफूना  
 आशीर्वादले अरुण सांघ लाग्यो हजार एक वैरी काटियो. सभे चार  
 वैरि नदीमहौं वगी मज्यो. सय चौध जहान वच्चा पकडिया. वत्लो  
 किरात फते भयो. किरात फते भयाको पगडि एक चढाई पठायाको  
 पहुँचला. उप्रान्त. पर्वतले कास्कीको कट्या भन्याको हान्यो. जना ४०  
 पर्वत्या काटियाछन्. जना ३३ कस्क्याली काटियाछन्. पाइन्दुरमहौं  
 पर्वतले ठाना दिराषेछ. पाइन्दुर फुट्याको छैन. वाकी लमजुङ्गले एक  
 मुषले मुग्जा हान्न गयेछ. एक मुषले कास्किको थाक हान्न गयेछ. थाकवाट  
 कास्किले घरकायेछ र जना ८० असी लमजुंग्या काटियाछन्. मुग्जामहौं  
 पनि लडाई भयेछ. लमजुङ्गले घरकायेछ र कस्क्याली नरेश .... साहसमेत  
 जना ७ कस्क्याली काटियाछन्. जना ६-७ लमजुङ्गिया काटियाछन्.  
 वाकी कास्कीमाथी लडाई लागेइको छ. कास्कीका गुहारकन हाम्रा काजी  
 चौतारा फौजसमेत गोर्षा पुगीरह्याछन्. मंशिरका दिन ४ जौंदा  
 रागिनासतिरको काज गछीं.....

श्रीदुर्गासहाय  
श्रीगोरषनाथ १

स्वस्तिश्रीपरमहंसपरिव्राजकसकलचक्रचक्राधीश्वरश्रीमन्महाराजाधिराज-  
श्रीश्रीश्रीश्रीश्रीश्रीमद्भगवन्तनाथदेवदेवेषु सदासमरविजयिषु.

स्वस्तिश्रीगिरिराजचक्रचूडामणिनरनारायणोत्पादिविविधविरुदावलि-  
विराजमानमानोन्नतश्रीमन्महाराजाधिराजश्रीश्रीश्रीमहाराजेपृथ्वीनारायण-  
साहवहादुरसन्सेरजङ्गदेवानां सदासमरविजयिनाम् साष्टाङ्गदण्डवत्-  
प्रणामपूर्वकपत्रमिदम्.

यहाँ कुशल. ताहाँ चरणारविन्द कोम कुशल नै हमारो उद्धार होला.  
आगे यहाँको समाचार भलो छ. उप्रान्त कृपापत्रसमेत शशिधर उपाध्याय  
आईपुग्या. पत्रार्थ मुहजमानी विधि विस्तार विनति गय्या. सुन्यौ. नाति  
पैदा भयो भन्दा सुन्यौ र बहुते हर्ष भयो. १ का कृपासै सदा बडती  
होला भनि हुकुम आयेछ. गर्न्या गराउन्या भन्याका १ श्रीनाथजी  
छन्. उनैका कृपाले जन्म भयोथ्यो. उनैका इच्छाले लिनुभयो. यो संसार  
भन्याको यस्तै छ. इच्छा १ श्रीनाथजीको छ. परन्तु आफ्ना पावले  
आशीर्वाद वक्स्या अरु जन्मदा पनि जन्मनन्. जन्म्याका पनि  
चिरञ्जीवी हुनन् आशीर्वाद वक्स्या जावस्. उप्रान्त. जुमला. जाजरकोट.  
संग घा गर्न्या मिठास बहुत राखन्या. भनि हुकुम आयेछ. वढिया येक  
जोत्या मानिस हाफ्रा यतावाट जुमला गयाका थिया. वाहांवाट पनि

महतारा १ बुढायोकि १ द्वि जना जुमलिया यहाँ आईरह्याछन्. गोर्षा जुमलाको एकत्व गरौं. भलामानिस लिन आञ्चू. भन्न आया र यहाँवाट पनि महेश्वर पन्थको छोरो वीरभद्र पन्थसमेत जना आठ दश मानिस जुमला जान्छन्. तैयार भैरह्याछन्. तेहि वाटो पठारो भन्दा चौविसिले मुष्य मानिस पनि जान देवनन्. मानिस जान दिया पनि सौगात त्यो वाटो जान देवनन्. भन्नानिमित्त हाम्रै उही भोटको वाटो गरि जान्छन्. आफ्ना मानिस पनि ताहाँवाट जुमला पठारुन्या. जुमला जाजरकोटसंग हाम्रो वनाईवक्सन्या. वाकी सल्याना जाजरकोटलाई पनि यहाँवाट मानिस आउछन् प्यूठाना पनि भलामानिस आउछन्. उप्रान्त. किरातका काजलाई तरवार हुकुम वक्सी पठायो गयेथ्यो. किरातको अन्वल मदेश पहाड भोट जति थियो. आफ्ना आशीर्वादले सबै फल्ल्य भयो. मधेशमाहाँ कनकाई नदी पहाडमाहाँ साभा षोलो तपोर नदीको साँघ लाग्यो. मानिस काटन पाइयेनन्. भाग्यो. कति मोगलानातिर गयो. कति सुषिमतिर गयो. अरु फार जडुलमहाँ जना ८५ वेसि काटिया. वाकी सुषिमसङ्ग हाम्रो घा हुन लागिरहेछ. घा वन्यादेखि किरातवाट भागीजान्याकन पकरेर हामिलाई साँपिदिन्याछ. घा नवन्या अव हारमिले सुषिमसंग लडनुपर्न्याछ. सुषिम आइजाला. आफ्ना आशीर्वादले कत्तल गरौला. उप्रान्त. अव मैले दाङ्ग जान्या हो कि शल्याना वसन्त्या हो. भनि हुकुम आयेछ. हाम्रो बुझ्पाको त. शल्यानामाहाँ थोरो यादर हुन्या भया दाङ्गमाहाँ ढेरै यादर हुन्या भया पनि शल्यानामाहाँ वसन्त्या हो. शल्यानाले कत्ति याद नगन्या त क्या गर्नुहोला. आदर नगर्न्या भया छाडनैपर्ला. वाकि मण्डलसित हिजैदेषी हामिले आफ्ना पाँचमाहाँ चढायाकै छ. उप्रान्त. हाम्रा विश्वामित्र उपाध्याय गङ्गानन्द आचार्य

सुखिम गयाका छन्. वृहस्पति पण्डित पुरैनियो गयाका छन्. किर्रीटमाली पटना गयाका छन्. वैकुण्ठ उपाध्याय नवाव सुजाउद्दौलाछे गयाका छन्. येति ठारै मानिस वस्येका छन्. दिनानाथ उपाध्याय कलकत्ताकन गैरहया छन्. अलीक दिनमहौ पुगनन्. बांकि लासा पनि भीमगिरिको शिक्षे राजगिरि जान्छन्. इनको कोठी काशीमहौ पनि छ. आहौ पनि घर छेत कोठि छ. उप्रान्त, लमजुहंसित पनि हाम्रो लोलोपोतो छैदछ. विश्वेश्वर उपाध्याय र सिवा घिमिज्या वस्याका छन्. कास्कीसंग पनि ललोपोतो छैदछ. हाम्रो वीरभद्र थापा कास्कि वस्याको छ. कास्किका जना द्वि बाभन यहाँ वस्याका छन्. अरु चौविसिसंग त हाम्रो जस्तो छ. आफूना पौवमहौ मालुमै छ. भरिसक्य हामिलाई हान्ने षोजछन्. उनको पुग्दैन र षुम्चीरहया छन्. विस्तार शशिधर उपाध्याय विनति गर्नान्. विज्ञेषु किमधिकमिति. भाद्रपद. शु. दि. ६ रोज मुकाम काठमाडौं शुभम्.

LETTER NO. 15

श्रीदुर्गासहाय

.....

स्वस्तिश्रीराजभारासामर्थ श्रीअभिमानसिंह. पारथ भडारि. कीर्तिसिं षवास. वलि वानिआके आशिष. पूर्वक पत्रमिदं आहा कुसल. तांहां कुसल चाहिये. आगे आहाको समाचार भलो छ. उप्रान्त. पत्र आयो अर्थ मालूम भयो. चौदंडमहा गढि तुल्याउनाको विस्तार. औ. कुहिल्यावाट. फौज हिहयाको. तिनै मुषले. गर्न्या काजको चांजो. लिम्बु. श्रृंग्याका. सुवा. सुवाले मान्न आयाको. सवै विस्तार विंति गरि पठायाछो. विधि विस्तार. सुन्यौं इसलिम्बा. चांथापु. सम्म. जति हाम्रो फौज पुग्यो त. अव. त्यो जग्गा

छोडनुछैन, वलिया गरि, गढि तांहि वनाउनाछन्, वनाव, वांकि,  
 इसलिम्बा, चाथापु, सम्म हाम्रो अम्बल भयापछि, कनकापूर्व, तिष्टापश्चिम  
 पनि अम्बल गरिहालन्त्या हो, घटिया देस आफुले षाईकन, आमद हुन्या  
 वढिया देस छोडनाको प्रयोजन केहि होईन, अम्बल गर्नु हो, तर, इसलिम्बा,  
 चाथापु, सांघ गरिकन पनि, सुषिमले, हामिसंग, घाभै गर्न पस्यो, कटक्  
 गर्नामहा पसेन त, कनका हेरि बुझि तर्नु, इसलिम्बा, चाथापु, लिदा,  
 सुषिम चमकि गयो, घा तोडिहाल्यो त, आषिर, तेत्तिमहा, पनि,  
 चटकिगयो त, मधेस छोडन्या होइन, हिंदुपतिको सांघ, तिष्टासम्म चाँडे  
 गरिहालन्त्या हो, यो काज बुझनु तांहि, पन्याको छ, उप्रात, बुद्धिकर्णको  
 हाति राम्रो छ गरे, त्यो हाति, माहुतलाइ लायेर, वांहाको माहुत  
 क्माइकन, सय ४।५ रूपैया कवोलिकन सो हाति चोरि ल्याउन पठाउन्त्या  
 हो, माहुतले, चोरि ल्याउ भन्या त, केहि वेछैन, ति, माहुतका, कुल कविला  
 त, हाभै देसमहा हुनन्, केहि कवोलि षातिर्जामा दिक्न पनि, त्यो काम  
 गर, उप्रात तेस देसमहा, बुद्धिकर्ण राइलाइ पायापछि, क्ल मरिजान्या  
 थियो, पाथियेन, केहि जुक्तिले कोहि सिपाहि क्मायेर, हजार वाइ सय  
 कवोलि, सर्सिरोपाउ कवोलि, हुन्या भया, तेसलाइ मराउन्त्या हो, तेसो  
 भयापछि, क्ल सवै मरिजान्छ, त्यो काम, षामषा गराउ, उप्रात,  
 अम्बरपुरका तरियानिका विजैपुरका तरियांनिका, रूपैयाले तांहां  
 सिपाहिहरुको षर्च, र, तांहां लगात, षर्च, उठाउना गर, वांकि हजार  
 २००१ रूपैया चढाइ पठायाछौ, आइपुग्दा, कवच गरि पठायाको छ,  
 पुगला, वांकि, इसलिम्बा, चाथापुदेषि, पुंढो, अम्बल गर्न जानु छैन,  
 सुषिम आइलाग्दा एकाठाउं, वनाईकन, कत्तल गर्नु चांजो गर,  
 सुषिमका, पुराना देसमहा गया, माथि लासा, संग विग्रन जाला, त

उपल्ला मुषतिर. लासाका देसमहा चार. अंगुल पनि. सांध चापनु छैन.  
प्रजालाइ दुष् दिनु पनि छैन. सुषिमका. पुरानो देसमहा पनि. जानु  
छैन. विज्ञेषु. आश्विन वदि ३० रोज ४ मुकाम काठमाडौं. शुभम् \_\_\_\_\_

श्रीबालकृष्ण जैसि. वीरभद्र उपाध्याकै. प्रणाम.

## APPENDIX B

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary material

Aitihāsik patrasaṅgraha (ed.) Dhanvajra Vajrācārya and Jñānmaṇi Nepāl,  
Kāṭhmāṇḍu, 1957.

Divya upadeś, 7th ed. (ed.) Bāburām Ācārya, Kāṭhmāṇḍu, 1960.

Gorkhāvamśāvalī (ed.) Kṣiprānāth Yogī, Devīnāth Yogī and Śāradāprasād  
Regmī, Kāśī, 1952.

Hodgson Papers, vols. 1, 2, 3, 6, 9, 11, 17, 26, 51, 52, 53, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 74.

Itihāsprakāś, vols. I-II, Kāṭhmāṇḍu, 1955-56.

Prthvīnārāyaṇ Śāhko jīvanī, Kāṭhmāṇḍu, 1963.

Śaṅskrtasandēśa, Year 1, nos. 1-12, Kāṭhmāṇḍu, 1953/54.

Tertiary material

Calendar of Persian Correspondence, vols. II, IV, *Calcutta, 1914, 1925*

Fort William - India House Correspondence, vols. V, VI, *Delhi, 1949, 1960*

India Office Records, Home Miscellaneous Series, vols. 515, 648.

J. Long: Selections from unpublished records of Government for the  
years 1748 to 1767 inclusive mainly relating to the social  
conditions of Bengal, Calcutta, 1869.

Public Consultations, Bengal, for the years 1770-72, India Office copies.

Secret Consultations, Bengal Select Committee Proceedings, for the years 1766-75, India Office copies.

Published sources

Bāburām Ācārya, 'Bhagavān Pārasnāth', Śāradā, year 14, no.12, Kāṭhmāṇḍu, 1948.

\_\_\_\_\_ 'Doṭīko aitiḥāsik jhalak', Hāmro Nepāl, year 1, no.6, Bhadrapur, <sup>Thāpā</sup> (Nepal), 1953.

\_\_\_\_\_ 'Kirāt nām', Nepālī, no.16, Pāṭan (Nepal), 1963.

\_\_\_\_\_ 'Lalitpurki māiyā Yogmatī' Śāradā, Nārīviśeṣāṅka, year 16, Kāṭhmāṇḍu, 1950.

\_\_\_\_\_ 'Pṛthvinārāyaṇ Śāhkā jīvanīko pūrvārdha', Pragati, no.4, Kāṭhmāṇḍu (n.d.).

\_\_\_\_\_ (ed.) : Purānā kavi ra kavītā, Kāṭhmāṇḍu, 1946.

\_\_\_\_\_ 'Śrī Śrī Jayaprakāś Malla', Pragati, no.13, Kāṭhmāṇḍu (n.d.).

\_\_\_\_\_ 'Śrī 5 Rājendralakṣmī Devī', Rūparekhā, year 5, no.6, Kāṭhmāṇḍu, 1963.

\_\_\_\_\_ 'Tanahūko Sen-vaṁśa', Bhānubhakta-smārak grantha, (ed.) Sūryavikram Jñavālī, Darjeeling, 1940.

Leonhard Adam, 'The social organisation and customary law of the Nepalese tribes', American Anthropologist (New Series), October-December 1936.

C.U. Aitchison : A collection of treaties, engagements and sunuds, relating to India and neighbouring countries, vol.II, Calcutta, 1863.

Syed Hasan Askari, 'A copy of Dastur-ul-Amal', Proceedings of meetings

Indian Historical Records Commission, vol.XVIII,  
Delhi, 1942.

E.T. Atkinson: The Himalayan districts of the North-Western Provinces of India, vol.II (forming vol.XI of the Gazetteer, N.-W. P.), Allahabad, 1884.

Thākur Bahādursimhajī: Kṣatriya Rājput jāti kī sūcī, Ajmer, 1911.  
Anilchandra Banerjee: Lectures on Rajput History, Calcutta, 1962.  
John Brough: The early Brahmanical system of gotra and pravara,  
Cambridge, 1953.

Cambridge History of India, vol.IV, Mughal Period, Cambridge, 1937.

S. Cammann: Trade through the Himalayas, Princeton, New Jersey, 1951.

O. Cavenagh: Rough notes on the state of Nepal, its government, army and resources, Calcutta, 1851.

Imānsimha Cemjong: Kirāt-itihās, 2d. ed., Sikkim, 1952.

Nandalal Chatterji, 'The downfall of Mir Qasim', Journal of Indian History, vol.XIII, pts. i-iii, 1934.

\_\_\_\_\_ 'Mir Qasim's army', Indian Historical Quarterly,  
vol.XI, 1935.

\_\_\_\_\_ Verelst's rule in India, Allahabad, 1939.

K.C. Chaudhuri: Anglo-Nepalese relations, Calcutta, 1960.

P.C. Roy Choudhury, 'A forgotten mission to Tibet and Nepal', Vigil,  
18 February 1956,

\_\_\_\_\_ (ed.): Muzaffarpur old records, Patna, 1959.

T.W. Clark, 'The Rānī Pokhrī Inscription', Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, vol.XX, 1957.

K.K. Datta: Advanced History of India, London, 1946.

D.B. Disalkar, 'Bogle's embassy to Tibet', Indian Historical Quarterly, vol.IX, no.2, June 1933.

\_\_\_\_\_ 'Tibet-Nepalese war, 1788-93', Journal of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society, vol.XIX, 1933.

E.J. Elwes : Nepal, 1915.

K.D. Erskine : A gazetteer of the Udaipur State, Ajmer, 1908.

J.M. Ghosh : Sannyasi and the Fakir raiders in Bengal, Calcutta, 1930.

Father Giuseppe, 'An account of the kingdom of Nepal', Asiatick Researches, vol.II, 1790.

G.A. Grierson : Linguistic survey of India, vol.IX, pt.iv (Specimens of the Pahārī languages and Gujurī), Calcutta, 1916.

Tony Hagen : Nepal, Berne, 1961.

\*  
B.H. Hodgson : Essays on the languages, literature and religion of Nepal and Tibet, London, 1874.

\_\_\_\_\_ Miscellaneous essays relating to Indian subjects, vols.I-II, London, 1880.

Francis Hamilton (formerly Buchanan) : An account of the kingdom of Nepal, Edinburgh, 1819.

W.W. Hunter : Life of Brian Houghton Hodgson, London, 1896.

\*  
Sūryavikram Jñavālī (ed.) : Bhānubhakta-smārak grantha, Darjeeling, 1940.

\_\_\_\_\_ Dravya Śāhko jīvancaritra, Darjeeling, 1933.

\_\_\_\_\_ Nepāl upatyakāko madhyakālīn itihās, Kāthmāṇḍu, 1963.

\_\_\_\_\_ Prthvīnārāyaṇ Śāh, Darjeeling, 1935.

\_\_\_\_\_ Rām Śāhko jīvancaritra, Darjeeling, 1933.

\*  
Bhagavanlal Indraji, 'An inscription of King Aśokavalla', Journal of the Bombay branch of the Asiatic Society, vol.XVI, 1885.

William Kirkpatrick : An account of the kingdom of Nepal, London, 1811.

- Lalitāvallabh : Bhaktavijayakāvya (composed in 1769), Kāṭhmāṇḍu, 1951.
- Perceval Landon : Nepal, vols. I-II, London, 1928.
- Sylvain Lévi : Le Népal, vols. I-III, Paris, 1905-8.
- Prembahādur Limbu : Samkṣipta Nepāl itihās ( ? Dhankuṭā), Nepal, 1955.
- C.R. Markham : Narrative of the mission of George Bogle to Tibet, and of the journey of Thomas Manning to Lhasa, 2d. ed., London, 1879.
- Keśavacandra Miśra : Candel aur unkā rājatvakāl, Kāśī, 1954.
- K.P. Mitra, 'Anglo-Nepalese relations in the last decade of the eighteenth century', Proceedings of meetings, Indian Historical Records Commission, <sup>vol. XVIII</sup> Mysore, 1942.
- Cittarañjan Nepālī 'Nepāl ra Tibbatko sambandha', Pragati, no.10, Kāṭhmāṇḍu (n.d.).
- Gaurīśamkar Hīrācanda Ojhā / Udayapur rājyā kā itihās, vol.I, Ajmer, 1928.
- R.C. Majumdar, 'An account of the Sena kings of Nepal', Bengal past and present, vol.XL, 1930.
- L.S. O'Malley : Bihar and Orissa Gazetteers: Champaran, Darbhanga, Muzaffarpur, Purnea, Patna, 1938.
- W. Brooke Northey : The land of the Gurkhas and the Himalayan kingdom of Nepal, Cambridge, 1937.
- W. Brooke Northey and C.J. Morris : The Gurkhas: their manners, customs and country, London, 1928.
- H.A. Oldfield : Sketches from Nipal, vols. I-II, London, 1880.
- Badarīdatta Pāṇḍe : Kumāū kā itihās, Almora, 1937.
- Rājbalī Pāṇḍeya : Gorakhpur janpad aur uskī kṣatriya jātiyāū kā itihās, Gorakhpur, 1946.

- Ṭek Bahādur Panthī, 'Kipaṭ vyavasthābāre rūparekhā', Rūparekhā, year 4, no.2, Kāṭhmāndu, June 1963.
- Pholānāth Pāndyāl and Dhanrajra Vajracārya (ed.): Gallimā bhjākiekākasīgar, Lalitpur (Pāṭan), Nepal, 1961.
- Papers respecting the Nepaul War, East India Company, London, 1824.
- Luciano Petech : Mediaeval History of Nepal , Rome, 1958.
- \_\_\_\_\_ I missionari italiani nel Tibet e nel Nepal, Parts I-VII, Rome, 1952- (in progress)
- Kṛṣṇacandra Upādhyāya : Pokhrelko vaṁśāvalī, Khārpā (Nepal), 1957/58.
- H.T. Prinsep : A narrative of the political and military transactions in India, <sup>vols. I-II</sup> London, 1820.
- H.C. Ray : The dynastic history of northern India, vols.I-II, Calcutta, 1931-36.
- D.R. Regmī : Modern Nepal, Calcutta, 1961.
- Viśveśvarnāth Reu : Mārwarākā itihās, vols. I-II, Jodhpur, 1938-40.
- Rāhul Sāṁkrtyāyan : Himālaya paricaya, vol.I (Gaṛhwāl), Allahabad (n.d.).
- S.C. Sarkar, 'Some notes on the intercourse of Bengal with the northern countries in the second half of the eighteenth century', Bengal past and present, vol.XLI, January-June, 1931.
- Bālcandra Śarmā : Nepālko aitihāsik rūparekhā, Banaras, 1951.
- Janaklal Śarmā : Josmāī santa-paramparā ra sāhitya, Kāṭhmāndu, 1964.
- Hara Prasād Śāstrī : A catalogue of palm-leaf & selected paper mss. belonging to the Darbar Library, Nepal, vol.I, Calcutta, 1905.
- Surendranath Sen and Umesha Mishra (ed.) : Sanskrit documents, Allahabad, 1951.
- Mesrovb J. Seth, 'Gorgin Khan', Bengal past and present, vol.XXXIV, January-June, 1928.
- Daśaratha Sharma : Early Chauhan dynasty, Delhi, 1959.

- Gaṅgāvikram Sijāpati, 'Nepāl praśāsan vyavasthāko rūparekhā', Nepālī,  
Pāṭan (Nepal), no.13, 1962.
- Maharajah Kalyan Singh : Khulasat-ut-Tawarikh (tr.) Khan Bahadur Sarfaraz  
Hussain Khan, Section III, Journal of the Bihar and Orissa  
Research Society, vol.V, 1919.
- Thomas Smith : Narrative of a five years' residence at Nepaul, vol.I,  
London, 1852.
- V.A. Smith : The Oxford History of India, 3rd. ed., Oxford, 1958.
- Śikharnāth Subedī : Gorkhā thar-gotrako sabāī, Banaras, 1951 ed.
- James Tod : Annals and antiquities of Rajasthan (ed.) William Crooke,  
vol.I, Oxford, 1920.
- Giuseppe Tucci : Nepal, London, 1962.
- Ambikāprasād Upādhyāya : Nepālko itihās, (2d. ed., Banaras, 1929.
- C.V. Vaidya : History of the mediaeval<sup>Hindu</sup>/India, Vols. I-III, Poona, 1921-26.
- Eden Vansittart, 'Tribes, clans and castes of Nepal', Journal of the  
Asiatic Society of Bengal, vol.XXIII, pt.i, 1895.
- Dhīrendra Varmā and Lakṣmīsāgar Vārṣṇeya (ed.) : Prācīn Hindī patra-  
saṁgraha, Allahabad, 1959.
- Vinod Vihari Vidyavinod, 'Two inscriptions from Bodh Gaya', Epigraphia  
Indica, vol.XII, 1913-14.
- E.H. Walsh, 'The coinage of Nepal', Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society,  
1908.
- C. Wessels : Early Jesuit travellers in Central Asia, The Hague, 1924.
- Daniel Wright : History of Nepal, Cambridge, 1877.



