

“ए०एस०आई० ने सीमित समय में मा० उच्च न्यायालय के निर्देशानुसार होरीजेंटल तथा वर्टिकल दोनों विधियों से उत्खनन कार्य पूर्ण किया, जो एक प्रशंसनीय कार्य है, किन्तु जितनी कम अवधि में यह रिपोर्ट प्रकाशित की गई है, वह प्रशंसनीय नहीं है। मेरे विचार से रिपोर्ट की प्रस्तुति के लिए ए०एस०आई० को और समय दिया जाना चाहिए था। जिस स्तर का उत्खनन कार्य ए०एस०आई० द्वारा विवादित स्थल पर किया गया था, उसकी रिपोर्ट प्रस्तुत करने के लिए ए०एस०आई० को कम से कम छः माह का समय और दिया जाना चाहिए था। कम समय में रिपोर्ट प्रस्तुत किये जाने के कारण इस रिपोर्ट में अनेक डिस्क्रेपेंसी हैं।” (पेज 290–291)

"Under the orders of Hon'ble High Court, the ASI by using both the horizontal and vertical methods completed excavation work in a limited time, which is an appreciable work; but a short span of time in which this report has been published is not appreciable. In my opinion, the ASI ought to have been given more time for submission of report. Considering the level of excavation work which had been undertaken on the disputed site by the ASI, it should have been given at least six months' more time for submission of report. On account of submission of report in less time, this report suffers from many discrepancies." (E.T.C)

“यह कहना सही है कि फ़ाइनल स्ट्रेटीग्राफी तभी सम्भव है, जब उस ट्रेंच में अंतिम स्तर तक उत्खनन पूर्ण कर लिया जाये। डे-टु-डे रजिस्टर में फ़ाइनल स्ट्रेटीग्राफी का लिखा जाना सम्भव नहीं होता है। प्रतिदिन के उत्खनन में जो सामग्रियां मिलती हैं, उसी का उल्लेख उसमें किया जाता है। प्रश्नगत उत्खनन के बारे में डे-टु-डे रजिस्टर में प्रतिदिन प्राप्त होने वाली वस्तुओं का उल्लेख किया गया है। मैंने डे-टु-डे रजिस्टर को अपनी मुख्य परीक्षा के शपथ पत्र में उत्खनन से संबंधित अपना मत व्यक्त करने के लिए एक आधार बनाया था, इसका कारण यह है कि इस दस्तावेज़ के माध्यम से हमें डे-टु-डे के उत्खनन से प्राप्त सामग्रियों का विवरण मिल

सकता था और यह जानकारी ए०एस०आई० रिपोर्ट द्वारा प्राप्त नहीं थी।”

(पेज 291–292)

"It is true to say that final stratigraphy is possible only when excavation is carried out upto the last level at the concerned trench. It is not possible to write about final stratigraphy in Day-to-Day register. Whatsoever materials are discovered at each day's excavation are mentioned therein. As far as the excavation in question is concerned, materials discovered therefrom on each day have been mentioned in the Day-to-Day register. I used the Day-to-Day register as a basis to express my opinion on the excavation, in the affidavit filed at Examination-in-Chief; its reason is that I could through this document get details about the materials discovered at Day-to-Day excavations and this information was not forthcoming from the ASI report." (E.T.C)

“यह कहना सही है कि उत्खनन के दौरान अथवा उसके बाद जब मैंने विवादित स्थल का विज़िट किया था, तब मैंने ए०एस०आई० द्वारा की गई स्ट्रेटीग्राफी या उत्खनन के बारे में कोई आपत्ति नहीं उठाई थी।” (पेज 295)

"It is true to say that when I, during or subsequent to the excavation, visited the disputed site, I raised no objection about the stratigraphy or excavation carried out by the ASI." (E.T.C)

3838. The statement extracted above shows self contradiction and lack of clarity on the part of PW-24.

3839. **PW 29, Jaya Menon,** is co-author of the objections filed on behalf of PW 1 (Suit-4) against ASI report. It is for this reason that she was examined first before re-examination of PW 16 and 24. The affidavit of PW 29 is dated 28.9.2005 and her

cross examination was conducted from 29.9.2005 to 19.1.2006. PW 24 was examined second time when he was produced in respect to ASI report by filing his affidavit dated 5.12.2005 and the cross examination conducted from 5.12.2005 to 4.1.2006. So far as PW 16 is concerned, on third occasion his affidavit is dated 20.2.2006 and cross examination held from 20.3.2006 to 28.7.2006. It is for this reason probably that the periodization/chronology vis-a-vis its co-relation with various finds and structures etc. found by ASI have been assailed in para 8 (from para 8.1 to 8.6) of the objections of plaintiff 1 (Suit-4). However, in her affidavit dated 28.9.2005, PW 29 has changed her stand and in para 4 and she says:

“4. That the ASI Report has problems with stratigraphy and chronology, which may be summarised as under:-

- (A) That as many as 15 pieces of terracotta figurines of later periods were reported from earlier levels, an impossible situation if deposits were actually stratified. In fact, deposits from Gupta period onwards are not stratified and the material is all mixed up. This is a point that is not debated by the ASI and has been repeated several times through the Report.*
- (B) That there are clearly problems with the stratigraphy which is indicated by other inaccuracies. If one calculates the total depth of deposits in different periods from a single trench such as G7, it is clear that there are gaps. Specifically, in G7, there is 1 metre deposit for Period 1(NBP), 1.6 metre for*

Period II (Sunga), 1.5 metre for Period III (Kushan), 2 metre for Period IV (Gupta), 0.9 metre for Period V (Post Gupta), 0.75 metre for Period VI (Early Medieval), 0.6 metre for Period VII (Medieval) and 0.25 metre for Period VIII and Period IX has not been indicated (as derived from Chapter III). This totals up to 8.60 metres of cultural deposits. According to the ASI, the total cultural deposit is 10.80 metre, which means that almost 2.20 metre is not accounted for. Not only this, Appendix IV, at the end of the book, mentions total depth dug for Trench G7 as 13.45 metre. Even if the ASI points out that the lower layers in G7 belong to a pit and we accept their depth for natural as 10.80 metre, it still means that there is a massive pit of about 2.65 metre depth, which is a trifle difficult to imagine. There could have been a fill as there is in Trench J3, but not a pit of such dimensions.

- (C) *That the ASI also mentions a continuous cultural occupation of the site. However, if we examine Plate 5 of the Final Report, a layer with no cultural material (termed in archaeology as a sterile layer) can be clearly seen, for example, below layer 4. The ASI has marked out this layer but has not numbered it. Sterile layers indicate periods when there was no habitation or occupation. These layers are ascribed to the Early Medieval/Sultatnate period (Period VI) in the tentative periodization of the site. **There is then a possibility that there was no Early Medieval***

occupation and there was a gap between the Gupta and the Medieval periods. This had been noted as early as 1969-70 by a team of archaeologists from the Department of Ancient Indian History and Culture, of BHU, Varanasi, which had noted a desertion of the site between the Early Historic and Medieval periods. (By neglecting to indicate the sterile layers and their implications, the ASI is trying to project a continuous occupation of the site from the Early Historic to the Medieval periods. Neither the stratigraphy nor the artefacts, however, substantiate such a claim. There is a certain bias here, which again goes against the norms of archaeological objectivity, to force a certain interpretation on the material, that from the 10th century AD onwards the area was occupied by Hindu religious structures.)

- (D) *That in the same context, the layering of fill deposits in J3, J4, J5, J6, K6, K7, L7, L8, J7, J8 was done to show continuous occupation in stratified contexts. It was only when complaints were made that these fill deposits were acknowledged but eventual registrations of artefacts from these deposits in the final Report were left uncorrected.*
- (E) *That in archaeology, structures can be dated if there are special construction techniques or material, known specifically to have been used in a particular period, such as lime-surkhi from the end of the 12th century AD. Structures can also be dated on the basis*

of associated artefactual material coming from stratified contexts in association with the structures. But when the material is all mixed up from the Gupta period onwards, it is impossible to neatly slot structural remains into periods of post-Gupta, Early Medieval or Medieval levels.

- (F) *That in this attempt to force a particular interpretation on the material that cannot be substantiated, there is bound to be confusion and discrepancies. Confusion is clearly indicated by the manner in which floors are numbered at various places in the text. The same floor is given different numbers, some floors appear and disappear, their extent keeps changing and so forth.) The numbering of floors in association with so called “pillar bases”, mentioned in the Table on pages 56-67 of the Final Report does not match with those in Fig. 8,9,10,11,12 and 13. On page 41, it is mentioned that the earliest floor extended in the eastern area up to the H series of trenches in sub-period VIIA. In sub-period VIIB, the next floor extended up to trenches J4-J5-J6. On page 42, it is indicated that in sub-period VIIC, the floor associated with the “pillar bases” is the most extensive on the mound. In Fig. 23A, however, Floor 4 (the earliest floor) is shown as extending all over the mound while Floor 3 and Floor 2 are more restricted, providing a completely contradictory picture.*
- (G) *That the tentative periodization and schematic cross-*

*section of the mound that has been provided between page 37 and 38 of the Final Report **does not provide a layer-wise description of all the trenches.** For example, no information on layers has been provided for important trenches like E8, F8, F9, G8, G9 and G1. Even for trenches that have been mentioned in the diagrams, we have no indication of the layers below Floor 4 in important trenches like F3 and F4/F5. (There should have been a concordance of the layers of trenches from the north and south of the site.)*

*(H) That in some cases **strata were marked in almost complete darkness within trenches such as G8.** A study of stratigraphy within a trench requires careful examination of the sections to discern differences in colour and texture of soil. **Obviously plenty of light is required for such a study.** Even though there were arrangements for artificial light, very often this was not used as in the case of Trench G8 and yet strata were marked and antiquities registered as from particular layers.”*

3840. PW 29, this time has taken stand which substantially conforms to that of PW 24. In cross examination, she said :

“I agree with N.B.P.W., Mughal and late post Mughal periods but with the rest of the periods I do not agree. According to my information N.B.P.W. should be dated from 600 B.C. to 100 B.C. whereas Shunga period is second century B.C. which would overlap the N.B.P.W. N.B.P.W. denotes Northern Black Polished Ware. N.B.P.W.

*is well known pottery of Northern India. From my point of view **archaeological periods should not be distinguished on the basis of dynasties** Kushan period is dated from 1st to 3rd century A.D.” (Page 71)*

“I have mentioned in para 4-A of my affidavit that deposits from Gupta period onwards are not stratified. In this regard I have to say that all the materials of earlier and later periods, were mixed up. If the material is mixed up it does not give a correct picture of the stratification.” (Page 74)

" I do not agree with the periodisation of the disputed site at Ayodhya as shown by ASI in Chart, at page No. 37-A of the ASI report, Volume-I" (Page 45)

*"In para 3 A of my affidavit I have mentioned about terminology ad periodization. The defects in terminology and periodization show confusion in the report. **Due to the defect of terminology and periodization, the report of ASI is also biased.**" (Page 70)*

“Terminology and periodization play a significant role but they are not most important. The terminology and periodization can be changed. I would also have problems with archaeologically identifying periods according to dynasties. I do not know about universal periodization.” (Page 70)

“Learned counsel drew the attention of witness towards A.S.I. Report Vol. 1, (Text) at page no. 37-A. The witness stated that in last column of page period has been mentioned but I am not in agreement with this periodization.” (Page 71)

"... I think that the stratigraphy shown in this plate, is correct. The layers are distinct in texture." (Page 111)

"Starting period of Muslim rule in India is from 1206 A.D. i.e. of Qutubuddin Aibak. I don't know whether this period is known as Illawari Turk. **According to renowned historians, the period before 1206 A.D. is known as Early Medieval period.** Since I have not read the book by B.S. Smith, therefore I cannot say whether he refers to the period from Harsha till 1200 A.D. as Rajput Period. I have not heard about Anoop Sanskrit Library of Bikaner. I don't know whether the most authentic version of Prithviraj Raso written by Chandbardai is maintained in this library. ... I would say Rigveda can be dated from 1500 B.C. Alexander invaded India in 327-325 B.C. Mauryan dynasty was established in 321 B.C. The Mauryas were succeeded by Sunga dynasty. Sunga dynasty is dated from 2nd century B.C. to 1st century B.C. **Archaeologically, the periods cannot be categorized on the basis of dynasties.**" (Page 115-116)

"I will not agree with the statement even in para 1 to 5 just because the period VI and VII have been changed in nomenclature. **In my view A.S.I.'s period V, and period VI and period VII should be considered as Early Medieval.**" (Page 129)

"Stratigraphy is a term used in Archaeology. Stratigraphy is the study of layers as they are formed over time. ... The Archaeology periods can be fixed on the basis of centuries. Centuries can be put into various periods for the purposes of study. Harappan period is dated from 2600 B.C. To 1900

B.C. from 600 B.C. various Mahajanpad period was followed by the Nandas and the beginning of Mauryan period. During 600 B.C. to 300 B.C. the two dynasties ruled while the Mauryan dynasty continued beyond 300 B.C. also." (Page 144)

*"It is correct to say that **for the purpose of periodization, the method of century-wise study is better and preferable to that of dynasty-wise.** The period 800 AD to 1200 AD falls within the Early Medieval period, which started much earlier to 800 AD. ... **Early Medieval period lasted from 600 AD to 1200 AD.** I know the periods in terms of pre-Gupta, Gupta and post-Gupta periods. According to me, Gupta period begins from fourth century AD and continued up to sixth century AD and prior to that, was the pre-Gupta period up to the time immemorial. Pre-Gupta period would date back to 600 BC and **post-Gupta is from 600 BC to 1200BC.**" (Page 150)*

*"**Medieval period would be post 1200 A.D.** According to archaeology periodisation is on the basis of stratigraphy.*

Ques- Will it not be correct to say that there are three well established norms of periodisation that ism no. 1 layer; wise 2. century wise 3. Dynasty wise. ?

*ANS- **It is not correct to say that 'periodisation' in archaeology can be done on the basis of 'dynasties'.***

***I do not agree that periodisation can be done century-wise.** Century-wise periodisation is covered by stratigraphy or layer wise study. The numbering of the layers is done from top to bottom. Where as periodisation is ascertained from bottom to top." (Page 182-183)*

“A.S.I. has mentioned about periodisation in its report. It is correct to say that A.S.I. has adopted all the three methods of periodisation mentioned above in its report. It is wrong to suggest that A.S.I. has mentioned in its periodisation by layers, century and dynasties. According to me some periods were identified on the basis of century wise and one was identified on the basis of archaeological culture. I think A.S.I. has identified nine periods in its report. According to me century has been mentioned in all the above nine periods. Dynasty wise report is not mentioned in all the above mentioned nine periods. A.S.I. has given details of dynasties of four periods. The dynasties mentioned by the A.S.I. are Shungas, Kushans, Guptas, Mughal. A.S.I. has not mentioned any dynasty other than the Mughal for the medieval period... I don't agree with the identification of the period 'post Gupta Rajput level. According to me the post Gupta Rajput part of the period should be called as early medieval period which should extend upto 1200 A.D. According to me post' Gupta Rajput period will be period from 7th century to 1200 A.D. ... The term post 'Gupta Rajput period' is used in archaeology, not in history. I have not heard about the term Medieval-sultanate period in archaeology. I do not agree that the period of 12th century is called as medieval sultanate period in archaeology. Medieval period is considered from 1200 A.D. Till the colonial period that is 13th century till 18th century.” (Page 183-185)

“I have heard about periodization on the basis of dynasty. It is prevalent and used in Archaeology.

Probably dynasty wise periodization commenced in the 1940's. It is correct to say that Medieval is a phase in history.” (Page 186)

*“I do not correlate medieval period with Islam because Islam reached the sum continent much earlier. Islam reached Sindh in 8th century AD. Islam would have reached probably in Kerala through traders in 8th or 9th century AD. I am of the opinion that in archaeology century wise periodization is possible particularly for the earlier periods. I think it will be more or less correct to say that **century wise periodization is correct method of periodization in archaeology.**” (Page 187)*

*“I have not done detail study of the periodization given in appendix 1 on the bases of carbonating. As such I am unable to express my opinion about information given in appendix 1. As regards sample no. 9, which from trench **G7 (layer 20) is dated 1680 – 1320 BC. This layer according to ASI was a pit and so these early dates have little meaning.**” (Page 188)*

“ Periodization was done on the bases of layers, centuries and dynasties. ... I will not agree with periodization. ...According to me in history the dynasty wise, century wise periodization for period is correct. In my opinion periodization in history and archaeology is different. In my opinion in archaeology the periods referred above as period I to IV is the Early Historic period. . . .I will not agree with the sun division on the basis of dynasty that has been provided by ASI.” (Page 189-190)

“According to me the terms for identification for periods in

history and archaeology are different but not altogether different. . . . It is more or less correct to say that periodization on the basis of centuries is correct." (Page 193)

3841. A few thing, which we may say immediately to show apparent false allegations are that para 4(B) of the complaint said that according to ASI, the total cultural deposit is 10.80 metre but Appendix IV, at the end of the book, mentions total depth dug for trench G7 as 13.45. The complainant probably has not seen the report properly which says that the natural soil was found at 10.80 metre but the ASI people dug the trench further to find out and ensure the presence of natural soil and this fact they have also mentioned in the report. Similarly, PW-29 on the one hand stated that she agree with N.B.P.W., Mughal and late post Mughal periods, but do not agree for rest of the period (Page 71) while PW-24 has expressed his agreement with all other periods except 5, 6 and 7. Similarly, on page 70, PW-29 says that terminology and periodization are not most important while PW-24 has expressed a different view on page 186 and says stratigraphy is the backbone of any excavation. The statement of PW-29 on page 186 is contradictory to what she has said on page 182-183.

3842. PW 30 (Dr. R.C.Thakran), though assailed ASI report on the ground of lack of integrity and manipulated nomenclature etc. but its main stress is not that of wrong interpretation but she says that ASI has interchangeably used periods VI and VII according to convenience so as to co-relate the Finds, structural or otherwise, with a period which may give it a desired result. The part of objection with respect to

periodization of PW 30, we have already noted above in para 535 from page 598 to 602. In the cross examination, however, he has said :

“पुरातात्विक उत्खनन और उत्खनित सामग्री के समुचित विश्लेषण के लिए ट्रेंच की स्ट्रेटीग्राफी का निश्चित तौर पर बहुत महत्व है।

प्र०— स्तर— विन्यास अर्थात् विभिन्न स्तरों के निर्धारण (स्ट्रेटीफिकेशन आफ लेयर्स) का क्या आधार होता है?

उ०—पुरातत्व में किसी भी स्तर (लेयर) का निर्धारण करने के लिए उस स्तर विशेष में पायी जाने वाली सामग्री का स्वरूप व परत की बनावट म जिस तरह की मिट्टी सम्मिलित होती है, यह स्तर—निर्धारण करने में मुख्य आधार का काम करते हैं।

जब भी कभी पुरातत्व में खुदाई के दौरान लेयर की पहचान की जाती है, तब यह भी जानना आवश्यक होता है कि उस लेयर की मिट्टी की संरचना क्या है, उसका रंग क्या है, उसकी कठोरता कैसी है, उसमें मानव—निर्मित सामग्री है या नहीं, इन सभी बातों का विशेष ध्यान रखा जाता है। हालांकि, उपरोक्त आधार बहुत महत्वपूर्ण हैं, लेकिन इसके बावजूद भी स्वतः पतों (लेयरर्स) से यह स्पष्ट होता है कि प्राचीन काल के अवशेषों वाली यह लेयर्स भिन्न भिन्न हैं। इनकी पहचान करने के लिए पुरातत्ववेत्ता को ही पुरातत्व नियमों के अनुसार इन लेयर्स की अलग—अलग पहचान करनी जरूरी होती है। लेयर्स की मोटाई अलग—अलग हो सकती है, मोटाई अलग होने के लिए विभिन्न कारक हो सकते हैं।” (पेज 63—64)

“Question:- What is the basis of stratification of layers ?

Answer:- In stratification of any layer, the form of the material discovered in that particular layer and the type of soil inherent in the formation of its coats, work as main bases in archaeology.

In archaeology, whenever identification of a layer is carried out in course of digging, it is also necessary to know what the soil structure of that layer is, what its colour is, how hard it is and whether man made materials

are in it or not. All these facts are specially taken into account. Despite the afore-said bases being very important, it is not clear from layers themselves that these layers comprised of remains of the ancient time are different. For their identification, it is necessary for an archaeologist to separately identify them in accordance with rules of archaeology. The width of layers may be different which may be due to several factors.” (E.T.C.)

“ट्रेन्च के खोदे जाने पर स्ट्रेटीग्राफी की लेयर्स की मार्किंग (नम्बरिंग) ऊपर से नीचे की ओर की जाती है जबकि उत्खनन से प्राप्त विभिन्न सांस्कृतिक कालों की मार्किंग नीचे से ऊपर की तरफ की जाती है। अगर लेयर सं० 2 पर लेयर सं० 3 स्थापित है तो यह माना जायेगा कि “लेयर 2 रेस्टिंग आन लेयर थी। (पेज 66)

"On trenches being dug up, stratigraphical layers are marked from top to bottom; whereas several cultural periods discovered as a result of excavation are marked from bottom to top. If layer no. 3 is placed on layer no. 2, it will taken to mean 'layer-2 resting on layer-3.’” (E.T.C.)

“शुंग के बाद कन्नव व कुषाण काल आते हैं और कुषाण काल के बाद मोटे तौर पर गुप्ता काल आता है। गुप्तकाल का अंत 600 ईस्वी में आकर खत्म हो जाता है। गुप्तकाल के बाद सामान्य तौर पर अर्ली मिडिवल पीरियड की इतिहास में शुरुआत मानी जाती है। अर्ली मिडिवल पीरियड 600 ए 0डी0 से शुरू होता है और दिल्ली सल्तनत के स्थापित होने तक यही काल चलता है। दिल्ली सल्तनत की स्थापना 1206 ईस्वी में हुई इसीलिए 600 ए0डी0 से लेकर 1206 ए0डी0 को अर्ली मिडिवल पीरियड के नाम से जाना जाता है। 600 ए0डी0 से 1200 ए0डी0 के बीच में दिल्ली पर अनेक वंशों के राज्य समय-समय पर रहे। मुख्य तौर पर गहड़वाल, चौहान, गूजर प्रतिहार, चालुक्य आदि के राज्य दिल्ली व दिल्ली के आस पास में रहे। फिर कहा कि चालुक्य का क्षेत्र दिल्ली के आस-पास नहीं था, वह उत्तरी महाराष्ट्र में होता था। यह ठीक है कि उपरोक्त चारो वंशज अपने को राजपूत कहते थे। यह ठीक

है कि कोई इतिहासकार यदि किसी विशेष क्षेत्र को अर्ली मिडिवल काल के राजपूत काल से संबोधित करना चाहे, तो कर सकता है, परन्तु इतिहास में वृहद रूप में इस काल को अर्ली मिडिवल काल के नाम से ही जाना जाता है।" (पेज 111-112)

"The Shunga period is followed by Kannav and Kushana periods and the Kushana period is, roughly speaking, followed by the Gupta period. The Gupta period comes to an end in 600 AD. Generally, the history of early medieval period is considered to have started after the Gupta period and this very period continues up to the emergence of Delhi Sultanate. The Delhi Sultanate came to be established in 1206 AD and hence the period spanning between 600 AD to 1206 AD is known as early medieval period. Between 600 AD to 1200 AD Delhi was under the reign of several dynasties from time to time. Mainly, Gahadwals, Chauhans, Gujar-Pratihars, Chalukyas, etc. had their reigns in Delhi and its adjoining areas. (Further Stated) The territory of Chalukya was not in and around Delhi; it was in northern Maharashtra. It is true that those belonging to the afore-said four dynasties called themselves Rajputas. It is true that if any historian wants to name a particular period as the Rajput period under early medieval period, he can do so but this period, under the broader division in history, is known only as early medieval period." (E.T.C.)

“डायनेस्टिक पीरियड में शुंग, कुषाण, गुप्ता तथा पोस्ट गुप्ता पीरियड आता है। पोस्ट गुप्ता पीरियड में ही राजपूत पीरियड को सम्मिलित कर लिया जाता है। इसके बाद का काल सल्तनत काल कहा जाता है। सल्तनत काल के बाद मुगल काल आता है। मुगल काल के बाद उत्तर मुगल काल आता है। उत्तर मुगल काल के बाद आधुनिक

भारत काल, जिसे ब्रिटिश काल भी कहा जाता है, आता है।

मुगल डायनेस्टी सन् 1526 ई० से लेकर 1707 ई० तक मुख्य तौर पर मानी जाती है मुगलवंश का प्रारम्भ बाबर ने किया।" (पेज 192)

*"The dynastic periods include Shunga, Kushana, Gupta and post Gupta periods. **The Rajput period is included in the post Gupta period itself. Its subsequent period is called Sultanate period.** This Sultanate period is followed by the Mughal period. The Mughal period is followed by later Mughal period. The later Mughal period is followed by modern Indian period, which is also called the British period.*

The Mughal dynasty is mainly dated from 1526 to 1707. Babur ushered in the Mughal dynasty." (E.T.C.)

"मिडिवल काल अपने में विस्तृत काल है जो सन् 600 ए०डी० से शुरू होकर सन् 1707 तक चलता है और इस पूरे काल के अन्तर्गत कई उप काल हैं, जैसे सन् 600 से 1200 तक अर्ली मिडिवल कहलाता है और सन् 1206 से 1526 तक सल्तनत काल कहा जाता है व सन् 1526 से 1707 तक मुगल काल कहलाता है।" (पेज 113)

*"The medieval period in itself is a broad period which begins from 600 AD and continues up to 1707 and the whole of this period has many sub-periods, for example- the period between 600 to 1200 AD is called **Early Medieval period**; the period between 1206 to 1526 is called Sultanate period and the period between 1526 to 1707 is called the Mughal period."* (E.T.C.)

"भारतीय पुरातत्व इतिहास में मुस्लिम पीरियड शब्द का प्रयोग नहीं हुआ है, लेकिन ब्रिटिश इतिहासकारों ने भारतीय इतिहास के मध्य काल को मुस्लिम काल साबित करने की कोशिश की है। जेम्स मिल ने इस काल को मुस्लिम काल का नाम दिया है। जेम्स मिल ने सल्तनत काल

व मुगलकाल को मुस्लिम काल के अंदर रखा है अर्थात् मुस्लिम काल के अंदर उपकाल के अन्तर्गत उसे माना है।” (पेज 113–114)

“The words 'Muslim period' are not used in Indian archaeology and history but British historians have tried to establish the Medieval period of Indian history as the Muslim period James Mill has named this period the Muslim period. James Mill has placed the Sultanate period and the Mughal period under the Muslim period, that is to say, he has taken them to be sub-periods of the Muslim period.” (E.T.C.)

“11वीं शताब्दी में गहड़वाल शासकों का राज्य कन्नौज पर था।” (पेज 113)

“In the 11th century, Kannauj was under the reign of Gahadwal rulers.” (E.T.C.)

“भारतीय इतिहास में किसी पीरियड को “इस्लामिक पीरियड” नहीं कहा जाता है। मैंने अपनी मुख्य परीक्षा के शपथ पत्र में एक जगह पर “इस्लामिक पीरियड” शब्द का प्रयोग किया है, मेरा इससे तात्पर्य यह है कि इस काल में ग्लेज्ड टाइल्स, ग्लेज्ड पॉटरी का मस्जिद में प्रयोग किया गया है। यह कहना सही नहीं है कि इतिहास में पीरियडाइजेशन के नामकरण का कोई महत्व नहीं है। मैंने अपने शपथ-पत्र में “इस्लामिक पीरियड” शब्द का प्रयोग इतिहास तथा पुरातत्व के सन्दर्भ में नहीं किया है, बल्कि कुछ खास तथ्य, जिनकी चर्चा ऊपर की गई है, के सम्बन्ध में किया है। मैंने इस शब्द का प्रयोग इस्लामिक प्रचलनों के लिए किया है। ... मैंने अपना शपथ-पत्र एक पुरातत्ववेत्ता के रूप में प्रस्तुत किया है।” (पेज 228–229)

“No period of Indian history, is called ‘Islamic period’. I have used the term ‘Islamic period’ at one place in the affidavit of my examination-in-chief, by which I mean that glazed tiles, glazed pottery were used in mosques in this period. It is not correct to say that nomenclature of periodisation has no importance in history. The term

'Islamic period' has not been used by me in my affidavit with reference to history and archaeology, and instead has been used for certain particular facts, which have been discussed above. I have used this term for Islamic practices. ...I have filed my affidavit as an archaeologist.” (E.T.C)

“इतिहास में तथाकथित इस्लामिक शासकों के राज्य का काल सन् 1206 ई0 से शुरु होकर 18वीं शताब्दी के मध्य तक माना जाता है। यहाँ पर तथाकथित से मेरा तात्पर्य यह है कि मध्यकाल के इस भाग को इस्लामिक पीरियड के नाम से भी समझते हैं। बहुत से इतिहासकारों ने इस पीरियड को इस्लामिक पीरियड कहा है। मैं किसी ऐसे प्रसिद्ध इतिहासकार का नाम अथवा उनकी पुस्तक का नाम नहीं बता पाऊँगा, जिन्होंने अथवा जिनकी पुस्तक में “इस्लामिक पीरियड” शब्द का प्रयोग किया हो। ... इतिहास में डायनेस्टी के आधार पर काल निर्धारित किये जाने को मैं ठीक नहीं मानता हूँ, परन्तु इतिहासकारों ने डायनेस्टी के आधार पर काल-निर्धारण किया है।” (पेज 229)

“In history, the period of the alleged Islamic rulers is taken from 1206 AD to mid of 18th century. By ‘alleged’, I mean that this portion of the medieval period is taken as ‘Islamic period’. Many historians have termed this period as ‘Islamic period’. I will not be able to name any famous historian or his book, where the term ‘Islamic period’ has been used. ... I do not approve determination of periods in history, on basis of dynasty but historians have determined periods on basis of dynasties.” (E.T.C)

(Note: The statement on page 229 is contrary to what the witness has said on page 228)

“प्र0-क्या इतिहास में किसी विशेष समुदाय या कम्युनिटी अथवा किसी विशेष वर्ग या किसी विशेष धर्म के आधार पर कालक्रम का निर्धारण किया जाता है?”

उ०—बहुत से इतिहासकार इन आधारों पर इतिहास का विभाजन व नामकरण करते हैं, लेकिन इतिहास के वैज्ञानिक दृष्टिकोण से इसे उचित नहीं माना जाता है। (पेज 231)

“Question:- Is period determined in history on basis of any particular community, class or religion?”

Answer:- Many historians divide and name history on these bases, but from scientific view of history, it cannot be considered proper.” (ETC)

प्र०—आपके उपरोक्त उत्तर से क्या मैं यह समझूँ कि आप द्वारा प्रयुक्त “इस्लामिक पीरियड” शब्द का प्रयोग उचित नहीं है?

उ०— यह कहना सही नहीं है, क्योंकि मैंने इस सन्दर्भ में इस काल के विकास—क्रम के विशेष प्रचलनों की तरफ इशारा करते हुए ऐसा लिखा है।” (पेज 231)

Question:- Should I infer from your above reply that the use of term ‘Islamic period’ by you, is not proper?”

Answer:- It is not correct to say so, because in this reference I have mentioned so by referring to the particular practices of development-chain of this period.” (E.T.C)

“उत्खनन में लेयर्स की नम्बरिंग ऊपर से नीचे की ओर होती है तथा पीरियड का फिक्सेशन नीचे से ऊपर की ओर होता है।” (पेज 345)

“At excavation, layers are numbered from the top to the bottom and fixation of periods is done from the bottom to the top.” (E.T.C.)

“ए०एस०आई० ने जो पीरियडडाइज़ेशन लेयर्स के अनुसार किया है, वह सही है, परन्तु नामकरण के हिसाब से सही नहीं है और न ही वंशावली के आधार पर किया गया नामकरण उचित है। पीरियडडाइज़ेशन की डेटिंग की मुख्य तौर पर दो विधियाँ हैं—

1. सापेक्षिक विधि
2. वैज्ञानिक विधि

रिलेटिव पीरियडडाइज़ेशन एक तो स्टेटीग्राफी के मुताबिक और दूसरी पहले की संस्कृति की सामग्री तुलनात्मक विश्लेषण के आधार पर।

एब्सोल्यूट व साइंटिफिक विधियाँ एक ही हैं। इस विधि को क्रोनोमिटिक भी कहते हैं। कार्बन डेटिंग मेथड व थर्मोल्यूमिनेसेंस मेथड, डेडोक्रोनोलॉजी डेटिंग मेथड आदि हैं। यह कहना हमेशा के लिए सही नहीं होगा कि एब्सोल्यूट डेटिंग या वैज्ञानिक विधि से किया गया पीरियडाइज़ेशन एकदम ठीक होगा। यह कहना भी सही नहीं है कि साइंटिफिक विधि का पीरियडाइज़ेशन प्रायः सही ही होगा। स्तरीकरण द्वारा किया गया पीरियडाइज़ेशन भी शत प्रतिशत निर्णायक नहीं होता। दोनों विधियों द्वारा किया गया पीरियडाइज़ेशन तथा दोनों विधियों द्वारा तुलनात्मक विश्लेषण करीब-करीब सही माना जा सकता है, परन्तु एब्सोल्यूटली कनक्लूजिव नहीं। यह कहना गलत है कि आर्कियोलॉजी में साइंटिफिक विधि द्वारा किया गया पीरियडाइज़ेशन कनक्लूजिव ही होगा। क्योंकि इन विधियों के द्वारा जो तिथिकरण किया जाता है वह उत्खनन में उत्खनित किए गए सैम्पल का प्रयोगशाला में किए गए विश्लेषण पर आधारित हैं और सैम्पल लेते वक्त उचित सावधानियों बरतना, सैम्पल्स की सही पैकिंग करना, सैम्पल्स की सही मार्किंग करना और सैम्पल्स का एकदम प्राकृतिक शक्तियों से प्रभावित होना आवश्यक है।” (पेज 351-352)

“The periodization which ASI has done on the basis of layers, is correct, but the same, when based on nomenclature, is not correct, nor is it proper to name them (i.e. periods) on the basis of genealogies. There are mainly two methods of dating through periodization -

1. Relative method

2. Scientific method

Relative periodization may be based on stratigraphy and on the comparative analysis of the materials of the earlier culture. Absolute and scientific methods are one and the same. This method is also called chronometric. There are methods known as carbon-dating method, thermoluminescence method, dendro-chronology dating method, etc. It will not always be correct to say that periodization carried out through absolute dating or scientific method

will be entirely correct. It is also not correct to say that scientific method of periodization will often be correct . The periodization carried out through stratification is also not cent percent conclusive . Periodization and comparative analysis through both the methods, may be considered to be almost correct . But they are not absolutely conclusive . It is wrong to say that in archaeology the periodization carried out through scientific method will certainly be conclusive , because the dating done through these methods is based on analysis done in laboratories ,of samples excavated in course of excavations . And while taking samples, proper care should be exercised, samples should be properly packed and they should be properly marked. And it is natural for samples to get absolutely influenced by natural forces.” (E.T.C.)

“ए०एस०आई० ने स्टेटीग्राफी के चैप्टर में कार्बन डेटिंग के आधार पर जिस डेटिंग का उल्लेख किया है, उसे मैं सही नहीं मानता, क्योंकि ए०एस०आई० के द्वारा जो पीरियडाइजेशन किया गया है, वह ही अनुचित है। ... ए०एस०आई० द्वारा सेन्चुरीज के आधार पर की गई काल गणना की विधि को मैं सही मानता हूँ।

प्रश्न— क्या आपको इस बात की जानकारी है कि ए०एस०आई० ने अपनी रिपोर्ट में विभिन्न लेयर्स की कालगणना जो शताब्दी में किया है, उसमें कार्बन डेटिंग के रिजल्ट को आधार बनाया है?

उत्तर— संभवतः यह सही है, परन्तु मेरा मत है कि केवल मात्र कार्बन डेटिंग द्वारा प्राप्त की गई डेटिंग के आधार पर काल विभाजन को सही नहीं माना जा सकता है।” (पेज 354)

“I do not take to be correct the dating, done through carbon dating method, about which A.S.I. has mentioned in a chapter on stratigraphy, because the periodization itself carried out by ASI is improper. ... I take to be correct

the method of century-based reckoning done by ASI.

Question:- Do you have the knowledge that the dating of several layers which ASI has in its report done in terms of centuries, is based on the result of Carbon-dating method applied to them ?

Answer:- It is perhaps correct but my opinion is that the division of time done on the basis only of Carbon-dating cannot be treated to be correct.”(E.T.C.)

(Note: The statement of witness is contrary to what PW 24 has said as also this very witness has stated on page 351 and 352)

3843. PW 31 did not make any comment with respect to stratification but PW 32 has virtually towed the line as that of PW 24 and 29 in her affidavit. She has said in para 6 of her affidavit dated 27.3.2006 about stratigraphy as under:

*“That one of the most important concepts in archaeology is stratigraphy. “The law of superposition states that the book at the bottom of the stack was put there before, and is therefore older, than the one placed at the top. Sediments generally obey this principle as well as the archaeological materials they contain ... The essence of stratigraphic analysis is determining discrete, superimposed layers of features and then examining their contents.” It was so stated by Clive Gamble in his book entitled as “Archaeology: The Basics”, published by Routledge (London & New York) 2001. A true copy of the relevant extract of the aforesaid book is enclosed herewith as **ANNEXURE No. 1**. An examination of the stratigraphy as indicated by the sections of various trenches at the site of*

Ayodhya revealed the following three important features:

- (i) That **only the archaeological deposits of Periods I, II and III are stratified and hence found in a primary context, that is in their original place of use or discard.***
- (ii) That **the deposits from Period IV till Period IX are not stratified and the material found is in a secondary context.** In other words the archaeological deposits that have been described of Periods IV to IX mostly comprise of fill deposits brought from elsewhere for the purpose of construction in the Medieval Period. Hence this is not their original place of use or discard. The deposits from the Gupta Period onwards are not stratified is substantiated by the fact that as many as 15 pieces of terracotta figurines of later periods were reported from earlier levels, an impossible situation if deposits were actually stratified. **The ASI was Stratifying the layers incorrectly was even pointed out through a complaint filed on 26.06.2003 regarding Trench G8.** In Trench G8, under the top floor are the brick courses of a wall foundation. Under these brick courses is a fill deposit. Neither the foundation nor the fill deposit can be ascribed a layer. It appears that this stratification was done on the basis of the calcrete and brick filling that lies to the east. However, this method of stratification is completely wrong. The calcrete and brick filling visible in trench G8 belongs to a single construction*

phase and cannot be ascribed separate layers. Moreover, the area that was excavated on 25th June lies to the west of the calcrete and brick filling. Thus, if stratification of the filling is wrong, stratifying a structure in relation to it is also incorrect. The whole principle behind stratification is to identify chronologically distinct phases. Thus, a brick wall of six courses of brick can not be ascribed six different layers. Similarly, six rows of calcrete alternating with brick, sandwiched with thick mortar, cannot be ascribed six different layers, the reason in both cases being a single construction phase.

- (iii) *That there is a possibility that there was no Early Medieval occupation and there was a gap between the Gupta (Period IV) and the Medieval Periods. If we examine Plate 5 of the Final Report, a layer with no cultural material (termed in archaeology as a sterile layer) can be clearly seen, for example, below layer 4. The ASI has marked out this layer but has not numbered it. Sterile layers indicate periods when there was no habitation or occupation. These layers are ascribed to the Early Medieval/ Sultanate Period (Period VI) in the tentative periodization of the site. A gap in occupation of the site between the Early Historic and Medieval Periods had been noted as early as 1969-70 by a team of archaeologists from the Department of Ancient Indian History and Culture, at BHU, Varanasi, and later in 1976-77 by Professor, B.B. Lal and his team from the A.S.I. The*

ASI is trying to falsely project a continuous occupation of the site from the Early Historic to the Medieval Periods. Neither the stratigraphy nor the artefacts, however, substantiate such a claim. There is a certain bias here, which again goes against the norms of archaeological objectivity, to force a certain interpretation on the material, that from the 10th century AD onwards the area was occupied by Hindu religious structures.

In the same context, the layering of fill deposits in J3, J4, J5, J6, K6, K7, L7, L8, J7, J8 was done to show continuous occupation in stratified contexts. It was only when complaints were made that these fill deposits were acknowledged but eventual registrations of artefacts from these deposits in the final Report were left uncorrected.”

3844. In her cross examination, however, she (PW-32) says:

“There is no period known as early medieval Saltanate period. I have not heard any period which is called as 'Early Mughal period'. I came across the 'Early Medieval Rajput Period' in the ASI report filed in this case. Process of periodization is based on certain features found in polity, society and economy. Stratification is based on discerning layers in sections that have formed due to either geological or human activities.”(Page 31)

“I mean to say that ASI people have flouted the principles and methods of stratification, such as the fill deposit has to be reported as a fill deposit and a pit has to be reported as a pit but in the excavation in question, the ASI was wrongly

stratifying a pit and in the report they themselves have gone on record saying that pits in J-3 and also in K-7 and K-8 were wrongly identified as layers and they themselves admitted that pits were stratified and they have stated so in the report.” (Page 93)

“Marking of different layer is done on the basis of soil colour, soil texture, compactness of the soil and cultural material.” (Page 110)

“It is correct that several layers put together comprise one cultural period. Contemporary, layer means it is in relation to some other layers, e.g. Layer 14 in J-3 could be contemporary with layer 18 in trench G-7, both belonging to NBPW period. Similarity of number is not necessary because it may vary from trench to trench.” (Page 111)

“Method of association in archaeology means associated cultural material in a layer. In a layer, so many different articles may be found, such as bangles, potteries, bones etc.” (Page 112)

“I have learnt from the report of Prof. A.K. Narain that the entire Ayodhya is one site and stratification can be similar. In archaeology entire Ayodhya would be referred to as one site.” (Page 130)

“‘Stratigraphy’ means a study of layers of different chronological periods indicating what comes earlier is at the bottom and what follows will be above it and so the sequences gets built up ‘Early historic period’ is a term used by historians to describe the period between sixth century B.C. and sixth century A.D. and ‘medieval’ is used by the historians for the period between 12th and 18th

centuries. The period between sixth century A.D. to 12th century A.D. is called 'early medieval period'. The medieval period has been further sub-divided into two periods, namely 'Sultanate period' and 'Mughal period'. There is no period like pre-Sultanate period.” (Page 23)

“This chronological order was created by James Mill who wrote the book 'History of India in 1830. 'Filling' means that for the purpose of construction activities, a ground has to be levelled and while doing so, some earth is brought from outside to fill up the uneven ground. ”(Page 23)

“...the whole issue of periodization in history and archeology is contested and debates are there.”(Page 36)

“Early medieval-6/7th century up to 12th Century A.D.

Medieval-Generally 12th to 18th Century A.D.

late medieval-Generally 18th century or late Mughal period.” (Page 107)

*“As far as I know **Century wise periodization is recognised under archaeology** because certain diagnostic material do establish chronology in terms of centuries. **Dynasty-wise** periodization is a subject of historians although **sometimes Archaeologists do follow it**. It is true that in excavation on the disputed site **the ASI has adopted all the three methods for the purpose of periodization.**” (Page 125-126)*

“Volunteers that she does not agree with the periodization given by the ASI.” (Page 126)

3845. PW 32 in general appreciated function of ASI:

"It is true that each trench was being supervised by an archaeologist. It is also correct to say that excavation was

*being conducted as per norms of grid system of excavation- which is one of the accepted system of excavation. It is correct to say that the excavation work was going on in presence of the parties and their nominees; and two judicial officers under the orders of the court were also supervising the excavation. **So long I was there, the presence of the parties, their nominees and supervision of the judicial officers continued.** Generally, for antiquities, it was three dimensional recording but for other finds, just a depth was recorded. Photography and Video recording of trenches and also of antiquities were also being done.” (Page 121)*

“It is true that at the site in dispute, excavations were made horizontally as well as vertically.” (Page 123)

“It is correct to say that the ASI excavated up to the required depth.” (Page 125)

“It is correct to say that for getting result in compliance of court orders excavation by horizontal and vertical methods were necessary which has been done by ASI. In this case only vertical excavation was not sufficient.” (Page 147)

3846. From the statement of the six expert witnesses produced on behalf of plaintiff (Suit-4), we find that all of them are not unanimous in saying that the entire stratigraphy or periodization made by ASI is bad or incorrect or suffers with such material illegality or irregularity that the same deserves to be rejected, which would ultimately may result in rejection of the entire report itself. Their statements are also contradictory, vague, confused and based on more of conjectures.

3847. PW 16 on the one hand says that he has no objection

to the categorization of period 1 to 5 (page 455), tried to dispute the ascertainment of period 6-7 (page 454), then on page 456 made some unclear statement by observing that period 7 should come after period six as Sultanate period. What appears to us is that in the ASI report the period 6 has been termed as "Medieval Sultanate" and period 7 as Sultanate but PW 16 wanted that period 6 should not be termed as "Sultanate" at all since it started in 13th century. He, however, suggested that in another manner period 6 ought to have started with 13th century if it is related with "Sultanate period".

3848. PW 24 on the contrary stated that after the first four periods there appears to be total dissolution for a long time and this has disturbed the continuity of the period. The 4th period (Gupta period) ended in 6th century and thereafter there is a gap of about 700 years since the further layer of natural deposition with the evidence of habitation appears to be related to 13th century hence total periodization instead of 9 ought to have been 5. He says that 5th, 6th and 7th period has been determined arbitrarily. The gap of 7th century to 12th century he has tried to justify on the ground of flood on account whereof the people abandoned the place for along time. However, on page 156 he himself admits that there is no evidence of any disastrous flood witnessed at Ayodhya between 600 AD to 1200 AD and further that there are evidence revealing that efforts were made to prevent such devastating floods. This shows that there had to be habitation otherwise who took steps for preservation of disastrous flood and why, if there was no habitation and the place stood abandoned. His statement on his own is ex facie contradictory, reflects on a total confusion to his part. Then he

tried to justify his conclusion by stating on page 170 that all the finds were not discovered from the levels as claimed by ASI and that is why it could not have determined the period correctly. PW 16 has not disputed that the finds discovered by ASI were actually found by them. Then PW 29 says that except NBPW Mughal and late post Mughal period she disagree for the rest of the periods (page 71). She pointed out that the ASI had made some change in the nomenclature inasmuch as in the Chapter of stratigraphy, period six has been termed as Medieval Sultanate but in the subsequent chapter of result they have termed period 7 as medieval Sultanate and period 6 has been termed as early medieval period.

3849. PW 30 on his own evolved a different theory by suggesting that periodization made on the basis of carbon dating is not correct though the process of carbon dating has been appreciated by PW 16 and 24 both. PW 24 on page 170 has justified layer 5 and 6 as that belonging to early Medieval Sultanate period but then on page 271 disagrees with centurywise periodization made by ASI.

3850. Two more witnesses namely, Prof. Shereen F. Ratnagar, PW 27 and Dr. Sitaram Roy PW-28 were also examined by the plaintiffs (Suit-4). Both of them claimed to be Expert (Archaeologist). Both were examined before ASI proceedings. PW 27 basically sought to contradict Dr. B.B. Lal's observation about Ayodhya based on his excavation thereat made in 1976-77 and supported the book Exhibit 63 (Suit-4), ("Ayodhya: Archaeology after Demolition") written by Prof. D. Mandal criticising Dr. B.B. Lal's report with respect to Ayodhya.

3851. **Exhibit 14 (Suit-5) (Register 20, pages 125-127)**

contains two pages number 52 and 53 of Indian Archeology 1976-77- A Review. At Sl. No. 75, it talks of excavation at Ayodhya, District Faizabad conducted by Dr. B.B. Lal and Sri K.V. Soundra Rajan. It reads as under:

“75. Excavation At Ayodhya, District Faizabad.- In continuation of last year's work which was taken up under the project called 'Archaeology of the Ramayana Sites', excavation as resumed under Professor B.B. Lal of the Indian Institute of Advanced Study' Simla and Sri K.V. Soundra Rajan of the Survey, assisted by Sarvashri B. Narasimhaiah, Rambabu, M. S. Mani, R.K. Sehgal, J. C. De and A.K. Mishra of the Survey and Surya Kant Srivastava and R.N. Kaw of the Institute. The work was concentrated on two important sectors in the ancient part of the city, namely Ram Janma Bhumi mound and the open area to the west of Hanuman Garhi, besides a few trenches at Sita-ki-Rasoi.

The excavation revealed a fairly compact and working sequence for the antiquity of the place from its first settlement over the natural soil. This began with the use of the well-known Northern Black Polished Ware, in all its shades. At the lowest levels, alongside the Northern Black Polished Ware, were also found a few sherds of grey ware, painted with fugitive bands in black pigment along the rim or obliquely on the exterior. This is taken, on a consideration of the position of this ware at Sarvasti, Piprahwa, Kausambi, etc., as the very late and degenerate phase of the well-known Painted Grey Ware found at Hastinapura, Mathura, Ahichchhatra, etc. On the basis of

the date available from other sites like Mathura, Sravsati, Kausambi, etc., it would seem reasonable to ascribe the first occupation of the Janma Bhumi area to circa seventh century B.C."

3852. The statement of PW 27, may not be relevant for the purpose of testing ASI report. But even otherwise we find that her deposition and opinion does not inspire confidence and it is short of the "expert's opinion" which may be termed "relevant" under Section 45 of the Evidence Act. She admits of having never visited the disputed site till she appeared as witness in these cases. She had written "introduction" to Prof. Mandal's book (Exhibit 63). From her cross-examination it is evident that she had no experience of field excavation.

"It is correct that in India I have not done any digging and excavation on my own." (page 52)

3853. She admits of writing things giving hypothetical sketches with respect to the disputed site:

"It is also correct that at pages 7, 8, 11, 12, 13 and 14 some sketches are given in my Introduction. Those sketches are purely by way of Introduction to the book as they are hypothetical. It is correct that from pages 16 to 69 is the book itself." (page 53)

3854. Merely on the basis of a photograph entire book and article etc. has been written. About her own work PW 27 says:

"It is substantially correct that I wrote my critique on the basis of the said sole photograph." (page 63)

3855. Her lack of knowledge about disputed site is evident from page 67:

"I am not absolutely certain of the area and extent of

the disputed site at Ayodhya. I do not know in which part of Ayodhya the disputed site is located."

3856. Though she came to support the book written by Dr. Mandal criticising Dr. B.B.Lal's report but when specifically asked whether she agree with the report of Dr. B.B. Lal relating to Ayodhya on page 75 she says:

"I cannot say in terms of whether I agree or disagree with them."

3857. She (PW-27) also admitted that there is a possibility of some structure of the earlier period at the disputed site. On page 84 she said:

"It is correct to say that I do not rule out the possibility of any other structure of any other early period at the disputed site."

3858. Similarly, PW 28, Dr. Sitaram Roy, a retired Director, Archaeology from the State of Bihar was also examined in 2002, i.e., before the excavation proceedings commenced. He tried to make a statement that according to his studies and as a student of Archaeology he can say that neither Ram Janam Bhumi temple nor any other kind of temple ever existed at any point of time, therefore, the question of construction of mosque after demolition of temple does not arise. He also tried to dispute stone inscription found in December, 1992 that the script therein is not of 12th century as is being claimed by other side. On archaeological evidence he can say that Lord Rama was not being worshipped at Ayodhya in 12th century and in 12th-13th century no temple of Lord Rama existed at Ayodhya. On the one hand he appeared as Expert (Archaeologist) and on the other hand he has tried to make

various statements on History and other subjects.

“मैं एक इतिहासकार के रूप में अथर्ववेद को इतिहास का प्रमाणिक ग्रन्थ नहीं मानता हूँ।” (पेज 13)

“As a historian, I do not recognise Atharvaved as an authoritative book.” (E.T.C.)

“अयोध्या के जितने भी वर्तमान मंदिर हैं मंदिर के अवशेष हैं उनमें आज से तीन सौ वर्षों के पूर्व का एक भी उदाहरण नहीं मिलता है। फैजाबाद में करमदण्डा अभिलेख से मैं परिचित हूँ। संभवतः यह गुप्त पीरियड का है इस समय याद नहीं है। करमदण्डा अभिलेख में मंदिर का जिक्र है।” (पेज 19)

“The temples which are existing at present at Ayodhya are the remains of the temples, out of them no instance of any temple dating back to three hundred years from today is found. I am aware of the Karamdanda inscription of Faizabad. Probably, it relates to Gupta period, presently, I do not remember. There is reference of a temple in Karamdanda inscription.” (E.T.C.)

“सातवीं शताब्दी के अफसरह के मंदिर की दीवार पर चूने से बनायी गयी राम, लक्ष्मण, सीता, हनुमान की आकृतियाँ थीं जो अब नहीं हैं। यह आकृतियाँ दसवीं, ग्यारहवीं शताब्दी की नहीं, बल्कि सातवीं शताब्दी की थीं।

पुरातत्ववेत्ता इस मंदिर को सातवीं शताब्दी का मानते हैं क्योंकि इसमें उस काल का अभिलेख मिला है जिसका नाम है राजा आदित्यसेन का अफसरह से प्राप्त अभिलेख।” (पेज 20)

“On the walls of temple of Afsarh of 7th century, there existed images of Ram, Lakshman, Sita, Hanuman made of lime, which do not exist now. These images were not of 10th-11th century but of 7th century.

The archaeologists recognize this temple as of 7th

century because it contains the inscription of that period, named as inscription of King Adityasen recovered from Afsarh." (E.T.C.)

“मैंने शिलालेख का पूर्ण फोटोग्राफ, स्टैम्पेज या उसका डिजाइफरमेंट नहीं देखा है। मैंने अपना लेख लिखते समय शिलालेख को या उसके पूरे फोटोग्राफ को देखने की जरूरत समझी थी, परन्तु मेरे पास जो साधन थे उसे कारगर न होने की दशा में मैं पूर्ण फोटोग्राफ देख नहीं पाया था।” (पेज 24)

“I have not seen full photograph, stampage of the inscription or its decipherment. At the time of writing my article, I felt need to see the inscription or its full photograph, but for wants of means I could not see the full photograph. ” (E.T.C.)

3859. He tried to dispute the very factum of place of birth of Lord Rama in Ayodhya. This statement now goes against the stand of the plaintiffs (Suit-4) in view of the statement made under Order 10 Rule 4 in April 2009. This witness has no experience of field Archaeology as is evident from page 66. The credibility of the said witness, based on his archaeological conduct is tried to be dislodged by the defendants, in the following manner:

“यह कहना गलत है कि जब मेरी आर्कियोलॉजिकल सर्वे आफ इंडिया में नौकरी हुई तो प्रो० आर०एस०शर्मा उस सेलेक्शन बोर्ड में सदस्य थे। यह कहना बिल्कुल गलत है कि जब मैं बिहार सरकार में एक्सप्लोरेशन एंड एक्सक्वेशन में आफीसर के पद पर कार्यरत था तो कुछ मूर्तियां गायब हो गयी थीं। मैंने श्री धर वासुदेव सोहनी का नाम सुना है वह बिहार के लोकायुक्त थे। मेरे कार्यकाल में मूर्तियां गायब नहीं हुई थी। यह कहना बिल्कुल गलत है कि “तथाकथित मूर्तियों के चोरी ” के बाद कोई सर्च पार्टी बनी थी और इस सम्बन्ध में मैं स्पष्ट करना चाहूंगा कि एंटीक्वीटी एण्ड आर्ट ट्रेजर्स एक्ट के तहत कोई भी प्राइवेट इंडिविजुअल अपने पास पुरा अवशेषों को निबन्धन कराकर रख सकता है। इसी के

अर्न्तत डा० आर०बी०सोहनी के पुत्र श्रीनिवास राव, आई०ए०एस०, के नाम से कुछ पुरा अवशेष निबन्धित कराने के लिए आवेदन पत्र देकर डा० सोहनी, लोकायुक्त से सेवानिवृत्त होते ही उन पुरा अवशेषों के साथ पूना चले गये। वहीं पुराअवशेष डा० सोहनी ने बिहार सरकार को अपने नाम में दीर्घा खोलने की शर्त पर सशर्त ऋण पर बिहार सरकार को सौंप दिया। यह बात गलत है कि मेरी पेंशन से 20 प्रतिशत की कटौती हो गयी। यह ठीक है कि मेरी पेंशन से बिहार सरकार ने 5 प्रतिशत कटौती की बात कही थी पर न्यायालय के आदेश से वह आदेश निरस्त हो गया। आज मैं पूरी पेंशन पा रहा हूँ। मेरी पेंशन की उपरोक्त कटौती का आदेश इस आधार पर हुआ था कि मैंने सोहनी साहब को एन्टीकुटी ले जाने से रोका नहीं।” (पेज 83)

“It is wrong to say that when I got job in Archaeological Survey of India, Prof. R.S. Sharma was a member in that Selection Board. It is totally wrong to say that while I was posted as Exploration and Excavation officer in Bihar Government, some idols had been stolen away. I have heard the name of Sri Dhar Vasudev Sohani. He was Lokayukt in Bihar Government. The idols were not taken away during my period. It is wholly incorrect to say that any search party was constituted after the 'alleged theft of idols' and in this connection, I would like to make it clear that under the Antiquity and Art Treasures Act, any private individual can keep with him any archaeological remains after getting it registered. Under this very Act, Dr. R.B. Sohini soon after his superannuation from the post of Lokayukt and after submitting an application for registration of certain archaeological remains in the name of his son Sri Niwas Rao I.A.S., went to Pune with the aforesaid archaeological remains. Dr. Sohini handed over the said archaeological remains to the Bihar Government

on the condition to allot a gallery in his name on conditional loan it is incorrect that the 20 % of my pension was deducted. It is correct that the Bihar Government had said for deduction of 5% from my pension but by the order of the Court tht order was cancelled. Today I am drawing full pension. The order for the aforesaid deduction from my pension was passed on the ground that I had not prevented Sohini Saheb from carrying away the antiquity.” (E.T.C.)

3860. However for our purposes, we do not find the above facts relevant in any manner.

3861. PW-28 has admitted that Dr. R.S. Sharma has been his teacher and when he was selected for the post of Director Archaeology and Museum, Bihar by Public Service Commission Dr. R.S. Sharma was the Expert Member in the selection board. He also admitted his acquaintance with Dr. Sharma since 1953 when he was in Post-Graduation (page 83). His Article (Paper No. 199 C 2) was published in 1996 in a book where Prof. K.M. Shreemali of Delhi University was Editor.

3862. Supporting stratificaton/periodization made by ASI, Sri M.M.Pandey submitted that:

I. Archaeology provides scientific factual data for reconstructing ancient historical material culture, understanding Archaeology for the past is a multi disciplinary scientific subject and requires a team of workers for effective results. Excavation of ancient sites is one of the major works of Archaeologists. As it is a scientific discipline, it uses scientific methods in its working.

II. *All Archaeological excavations are revealing and also at the same time destructive; revealing in the sense they yield unknown data like structures, antiquities etc, destructive that as one digs layer after layer, the upper layer have to be removed to go deeper and deeper to know more.*

III. *The area proposed to be excavated is divided into squares rising grid system and all available latest recording by documentation system, i.e., photography, video-recording etc. is done before starting excavation at desired and appropriate stages so that discovery of all structural remains and important finds to maintain a proper record for all future purposes.*

IV. *In archaeological context, layers (strata) are occupational and deposits caused by human and natural activities are generally distinguishable by their colour and texture as one digs.*

V. *Layers (strata) are important as they establish the relation between the structures and antiquities that help in establishing chronology provided the layer remained undisturbed.*

VI. *The thickness of a layer (stratum) also indicates the time span of activities and occupation..*

VII. *In some places long walls may pass through several trenches but these are easily seen through the layers, the baulk and are retain.*

VIII. *Archeological excavations and its methods have been referred in various books. According to the views referred to by Mr. Brain M. Faigan in his book styled as "In the*

beginning an introduction Archeology" as well as according to the famous archeologist who is considered to be father of Archeology Sir Mortimer Wheeler in his book "Archeology from the earth" have settled certain norms of excavation. According to them archaeological excavation work is a scientific investigation which is be conducted on sound research methodology.

IX. Here laboratory work also includes the process of writing report.

X. Detailed records and accurate measurement are the foundations of a sound, scientific excavation. Documentation (recording) throughout the excavation includes site diary, antiquity register and daybook. This day book records all events which have meticulously maintained in this case also. Moreover the day-today register has been duly signed by their advocates and expert nominees present on the spot in presence of Judge Observers.

XI. The antiquity Register is maintained to contain a special number of each small find, numbered with its level, trench number, depth below surface and additional information relating to the layer in which the object was found. This procedure provides a permanent record of significant artifacts which must be described individually in the final report and whose preservation is important. Lists of 'bag of finds' found during excavation are also recorded in this register; each bag, especially of common artifacts like pottery, animal bones, and stone implements receives a serial number which is recorded in a list in the

back of the small-finds register.

XII. Recording of Site Plan, structures and stratigraphic sections are equally important. Accurate plans provide a record of measurement and grid set up before excavation to provide a metrical framework for trenching. A system of radial coordinate measurements is used to record the position of horizontal features, with the radial lines forming an accurate network of reference points.

XIII. Three dimensional recording of major features and important artifacts is also a vital part of the excavation process. Many huts, pits or burial groups are important merely because of their association with other features or artifacts. Such information can be recovered only by 3-dimensional measurements, i.e. by recording the feature's horizontal and vertical coordinates with reference to the site grid.

XIV. In Archeology period of construction and stratigraphy is most important. Stratigraphy is itself a scientific basis of periodization. It is based on Geological law of superimposition. Position of layers and their relation with structures is the basis for the same. Layers (strata) have to be worked out on the basis of texture, behaviour, colour, etc. It has to be seen whether the deposit is normal or flood deposit, layer (stratum) is disturbed or undisturbed, relationship of layer with structures, its contemporary deposit etc. For determination of age of the layer carbon dating is considered to be most scientific method. Periodization is done on the basis of finds that includes pottery, epigraphic materials, artifacts etc.

complied with C-14 dating.

XV. A perusal of chapter 3 of the report makes it clear that ASI has adopted all the three methods of periodization and has based its report on sound archeological norms. It is well settled that periodization is done mainly in either of the three ways: - (1) Century wise (timeframe periodization) (2) Dynasty wise periodization (3) Layer (stratum) wise (Stratigraphically). The dating are of two types i.e. absolute dating and relative dating. The carbon dating is considered to be absolute dating being periodization by scientific investigation. Relative dating is base on stratigraphical observation. There may be variation in nomenclature of the periodization amongst the scholars but there may be no point of controversy in century wise periodization. However the report mentions about all the three methods in its reports as is evident from the report at pages 38, 39, 40, 41, 43 & 44 (volume 1).

XVI. To begin with, i.e. historically the year 1192 A.D., i.e. 12th century, is the end of the Hindu rule in Delhi when Prithviraj Chauhan was defeated by Muhammad Ghori in the 2nd battle of Tarain and Ghori appointed Qutabuddin Aibak as his nominee to look after the territory of Delhi which he did although formally he proclaimed himself to be the ruler (Sultan) only in 1206, after the death of his master. Thus, for all practical purposes, in Delhi the Sultanate started during the closing years of the 12th century A.D.

XVII. Another world fame renowned scholar of Indian History professor A.L. Basham used the term

"Medieval Hindu India for Chapter 6, pp. 51-59 in his book "Cultural History of India", Oxford, 1975".

XVIII. On the basis of well established datable artifacts, cermacised and C-14 dates, the ASI report has followed the cultural sequence of Ayodhya as under:-

NBPW= Northern Black Polished Ware

RW= Red Ware

BSW= Black Slipped Ware

GW= Grey Ware

*Late & Post Period IX Glazed Ware + RW+BSW
(p.109)*

Mughal

*Mughal (p.41) Period VIII Glazed Ware + RW+BSW
(p.109)*

Medieval Period VII (1200-1600 A.D.) " " (p.109)

*Medieval (p.40) Period VI (1000-1200 A.D.)-
RW+BSW+GW (p.104)*

Sultanate

*Post-Gupta(p.40) Period V (700-1000 A.D.)-
RW+NBPW+GW (p.98)*

Rajput

Level

*Gupta Period IV (400-600 A.D.)—RW+BSW+NBPW
Earlier material of pd. III is in pd. IV (p.40)*

*Kushan(p.39) Period III (100-300 A.D.) – RW
-Triratna Sample (p.85)*

-Spouted wide open mouth of Makar (p.85) &

Plate 69/71

Sunga Period II (300-100 B.C.)-

NBPW+RW+BSW+GW (p.39)

NBPW Levels Period I (600-300 B.C.)–

NBPW+BSW+GW+RW (p.38)

It is pertinent to mention here that

The pottery sequence of pd. VII, VIII & IX are the same. (p.108)

XIX. A perusal of the report submitted by ASI shows that the excavations were conducted by the ASI in a most standardized settled norms of excavations, Recording and writing of the reports were strictly followed. The excavations were conducted in vertical and horizontal manners by way of grid system of layout for excavation. Three dimensional recording were done and principal of stratigraphy was strictly followed. The Archaeological excavation being a scientific investigation was conducted on spot in accordance with settled norms. The trench supervisor's note book, diary, daily register antiquity registers were maintained regularly in presence of the parties. Three dimensional records were done and principles of stratigraphy were strictly followed.

XX. The objection of the plaintiffs that in view of the evidence drawn from the despositional history of the site there was no habitation at this site after Gupta Period for a long time. It was reoccupied after a long desertion in 13th century A.D.

XXI. In this connection it may be submitted that the source of this 'evidence drawn' can only be a figment of malicious mind. The Report mentions on page 271 para one:

"Another noteworthy feature is that it was only during

and after Period IV (Gupta level) onwards upto Period IX (late and post Mughal level) that the regular habitational deposits disappear in the concerned levels".

XXII. In the same para it further mentions:

"The area below the disputed site thus, remained a place for public use for a long time till the Period VIII (Mughal level) when the disputed structure was built".

XXIII. From where and on what basis 'a long desertion' is established and how the site is shown as 'reoccupied in 13th century A.D.' is neither clear nor justified.

XXIV. The objection of the plaintiffs that essential requirement in an excavation report is a chapter that describes, one after the other, the main strata or levels found in the excavation, their nature (soil texture, colour, etc.) and contents. But there is no such section, level alone a chapter, in the Ayodhya report.

XXV. Periodization has been done on the basis of finds of a particular layer or set of layers that is on the basis of contents of the layers.

XXVI. The Chapter III covers all the salient points required for defining and study of layers and their respective periods.

XXVII. It is again the 'ostrich attitude' of the objector who wishfully do not want to acknowledge the existence of all these features in the Chapter III "Stratigraphy and Chronology" from pp. 37-47 in the Report.

XXVIII. The objection of the plaintiffs that descriptions given in the report are not always matched by the sections. The reverse is also true. The report does not states the period to which layer 6 of J3, layers 4-6 in ZE1-ZF1 And layers 3-6 in e7 belong.

XXIX. In this connection it may be submitted that on page 46 of Report in 5th line form top it is mentioned that the material marked those from layer 1 to 6 "belongs to a pit and the layers are superficial". So far as the period of the pit is concerned the data unearthed from the excavation is too scanty to determine, as the successive digging of pits for later construction in the same spot has obliterated the earliest pit line that could have dated the pit.

XXX. In any excavation report it is neither required nor possible to include each and every layer of every trench excavated while describing the stratigraphy of the site. However, in general walls 16 and 17 have been defined along with their associated layers to definite periods.

XXI. The objection of the plaintiffs that the numbering of the floors and other details are not according to the stratigraphy and the report is full of confusion.

XXXII. In this connection it may be submitted that confusion does not exist in the report rather it has been created out of lack of understanding of the subject and because facts are seen in isolation of one another and not in the right perspective. Archaeological evidences at any given site are found in different trenches and then they are put to gather to reach a meaningful conclusion. It is like

completing a jigsaw puzzle. Therefore, any description of it should be seen and read in the same way.

XXXIII. There is no single trench which has produced all the floors and layers. Evidence of different trenches has been shown in the Schematic Cross Section.

XXXIV. The objection of the plaintiffs that the text fails to mention which particular layers in these (Tr. G2, G7, J5-J6 and E8-F8) and other trenches pertain to Period VII.

XXXV. In this connection it may be submitted that since the layers of this period are not regular depositional layers rather are the filling material brought from outside to level the area as a preparatory to lay the successive floors, these floors have been described to belong to this period. The layers of fill, which are sandwiched between these floors, naturally become contemporary layers and therefore, have been defined as belonging to this period. The excerpt from page 42 of the Report is incomplete and should be read with the remaining part of the same paragraph which reads as:

XXXVI. As some places due to differential coverage area of the floor itself while at some other places due to destruction or decadence one of these was found missing. During excavation in different trenches they were named according to their occurrence from one onwards. The relative levels can be seen in the cross-sections of the mound and in the schematic cross section of the mound".

XXXVII. The confusion disappears as it never existed rather is a concocted one. The division of five areas of eastern, northern, western, southern and raised platform

are treated in Chapter II "Cuttings" which defines the limits of each area. Therefore, there is no need to "count" any trench in any area, rather it should be verified from the relevant chapter.

XXXVIII. In G2, a narrow strip (about 1 m wide) was excavated and in that small area with some top layer disturbances all the floors top floors (upto Fl.4) were found, since the dividing line for different periods is floors all the layers in between shall belong to the respective period, so the layer 3 and 4 also belong to the Period VII.

XXXIX. The objection of the plaintiffs that nowhere is there any section showing floors numbered "4" or "5" and no section shows a sequence of floors numbered "1" and "5".

XL. Prof. Dhaneswar Mandal, who was examined as PW 24 by the plaintiff as an archaeologist of pre-history, has been re-examined after submission of excavation report by the Archaeological Survey of India by the plaintiff Sunni Central Waqf Board to support the objections filed by them. It is pertinent to mention that Prof. Dhaneswar Mandal, who has written a book styled as "Archaeology after Demolition", had never visited the disputed site before writing the book. During excavation the disputed site was visited by him twice as stated by him in his examination in chief from 10.06.2003 to 15.06.2003 and from 27.09.2003 to 29.09.2003. The entire evidence given by Prof. Mandal makes it clear that the book was written by him on the basis of news published in newspapers, magazines, booklets, particularly paper 118/C. This fact has been admitted by

him. Regarding excavations also he has very clearly stated that his observations are based on his own observations without any measurement or actual verification of the site. Prof. Mandal admits that he has no knowledge about the disputed site nor ever attempted to see the artifacts, inscriptions, etc., found at the time of leveling or excavation of the disputed site. Prof. Mandal in his statement has admitted that the process of excavation, i.e., grid system excavation was perfectly correct which is internationally accepted mode of excavation. He further admits the circular sign found during the excavation to be of Gupta period i.e. 4th-6th century AD which is undisputedly a non-Islamic construction of pre-Islamic era.

XLI. Dr R.C. Thakran was examined as PW 30 by SCWB in support of their objections against report of ASI, who, according to him, has not carried any excavation, rather during his masters degree course had attended some excavation at the sites of Mirzapur Karan ka Quila. The witness, in para 1 of his affidavit, has stated that he is involved in archaeological research since 1976 and had not excavated any site. The witness has given various details of the report in his examination in chief and annexed various documents but has failed to establish the same, rather the cross examination proved his statement to be false and baseless. The witness was in full agreement with the method of excavation, its marking, recording and listing. The witness stated that comparative study of archaeological finds was not possible on his part at the site and the witness could know about the alleged defects only

after submission of the report. Regarding periodisation, the witness stated that periodisation from period 7th to 10th century A.D., as mentioned in page 40 period 5 in report of ASI is correct but the witness expressed his disagreement with the nomenclature only. According to the witness early medieval period started from 600 AD and continues up to 1200 AD. But at page 112 the witness admits that early medieval period may be termed as Rajput period. Further, contradicting his own admission at page 113, the witness states that the medieval period starts from 600 AD and continues up to 1707 AD although further clarifies that period from 600 AD to 1200 AD is called early medieval period where as period from 1206 AD to 1526 AD is called Sultanate period and period from 1526 AD to 1707 AD is said to be Mughal period. Admitting existence of pillar bases at the disputed site, the witness states at page 116: **"Maein us report mein likhi ish baat se sahmata hoon ki pillar bases patthar ke pedestal par tikey huwey thei....Maeine Ayodhya ki khudai ke dauran sabhi pillar bases ko dekha thaa. Usmein pedestal stones kahin par nahin haein, kewal Mata Sita ki Rasoi ki taraf kuchh pillar bases ke upar patthar paye gaye haein jo pedestal se bhinna haein."** Regarding manufacturing of pillar bases the witness stated: **"Jabtak maein khudai sthal par raha aisa nahin hai ki ASI walon nein pillar base banaye hon, Baad mein agar unhone kuchh kiya ho to mujhe is baat ka gyan nahin hai. Yadi sabhi trenches mein lagatar videography ho rahi hon to pillar base banana sambhav nahin hai. "** Regarding use of Chuna

and Surkhi, the witness admitted the same being used in 7th-8th century and also in Gahadwal period. The witness supporting the third stand taken by SCWB regarding existence of old mosque/Idgah underneath the disputed structure stated at page 69: "Khudai ke dauran diwar ko dekhne se tatha ASI ke report dekhne se mujhe aisa laga ki Babri masjid ya uske poorva ke masjid/idgah banne mein jo material punah prayog mein laya gaya wah kahin aas paas se laakar istemal kiya gaya hai. The witness admitted existence of Kapot padi door jamb, lotus motif at the disputed site and has also stated that he has not seen any such thing in any mosque. The witness who is an atheist stated that: "Maein Ishwar ya devi devta mein astha nahin rakhta hoon." The witness admitted that he has no knowledge nor had ever studied about differences of masjid and idgah. At Page 187 the witness states: "Masjid wa idgah ke antar ke barey mein maine avashya suna hai, parantu iske barey maein maine adhyayan nahin kiya. Yah kahna sahi hai ki masjid wa idgah ke sambandh mein mainey sa-sapath apna bayaan mukhya pariksha ka prastut kiya hai ish vidha mein maein vishesh gyan nahin rakhta hoon.... Keval neemv ki diwar ko dekhkar uparokt donon antar bata pana mere liye sambhav nahin." The witness admitted existence of taakh or niches in temples. The witness at page 191 states: "Mandiron ki khudai ki reports mein animal bones paye jane ke barey mein maine padha hai." The witness admits importance of Kalash and floral motifs for temples and stated that it is used in temples only. The witness admits circular structure and wall belonging to

Gupta period. A perusal of the cross examination of the witness at page 356 to 360 makes it clear that the witness has no idea of the walls and has not identified the same in spite of filing detailed affidavit and going through the same. The entire cross examination of the witness makes it clear that the witness has no idea of excavation and has tried to support the objection of SCWB merely on the basis of some bookish knowledge as well as under some extraordinary circumstance.

XLII. At page 251, the witness (PW 31) admitted that the ASI had adopted all the three methods of periodisation and the carbon dating was a scientific mode which was considered to be absolute dating method. But according to the witness the Sultanate period was confined to 10th and 11th centuries only. The only objection against periodisation, according to the witness, was as stated by him at page 252: "I do not have any objection regarding periodisation of ASI in which they did not mention early Sultanate period from 10th to 11th century. In my opinion one of the objections regarding periodisation is the mention of early medieval Sultanate period, The periodisation should not be made on the basis of dynasty-wise." Regarding periodisation, the witness stated that he was in full agreement with the periodisation done by ASI but he was not agreeable to the periodisation of period 6 which is shown as medieval Sultanate period.

XLIII. The witness (PW-32) has categorically stated about her presence on the spot during excavation although so many things have been stated in her affidavit filed by

way of examination in chief. But the cross examination of the witness proves that, although the witness is not a field archaeologist, the excavations were conducted by A.S.I. as per settled norms. Describing fill deposits, the witness confirmed in her cross examination at page 24 that no stratification is possible in fill deposit.

3863. From the above, it is evident that the entire chronology/stratification of ASI has not been condemned/objected/criticized by Experts of Plaintiffs (Suit-4) but basically it is confined to 5, 6 and 7 period. PW 16 on page 54 stated that the determination of period 6 and 7 is contrary to the facts on the basis of pre-conceived ideas and have been antedated. On page 455 it says that he has no objection to the determination of periods 1 to 5. PW 24 does not dispute periods 1 to 4 but then has made comments against the periods 5, 6 and 7, as determined by ASI but then on page 170 in cross examination stated that layer 5 and 6 have rightly been shown belonging to early medieval Saltnat period and then on page 271 says that he does not agree with the century-wise periodization made by ASI and tried to explain the same on page 273-274, and, concluded that except period 5, 6 and 7 he agrees with rest of the determination made by ASI. PW 29 on page 71 while agreeing with N.B.P.W. Mughal and late post Mughal expressed for her disagreement with the rest of the periods. PW 30 without raising any serious objection with respect to periodization has said that the periods 6 and 7 have been mentioned in report by ASI interchangeably creating confusion. PW 31 remained silent with respect to stratification but PW 32, who is co-author of the objection filed by the plaintiffs (Suit-4) against ASI report,

claims that period 6 to 9 are not based on the deposits but the material found therein is a secondary context and therefore, the determination of the said period is not correct. These witnesses have given their different version in support of their opinion or understanding which are not in general harmony with each other and therefore, it cannot be said that all the witnesses have provided similar or common reasons against that part of stratification/chronology of the ASI which they have challenged. On the contrary, most of them admit that determination of stratigraphy/chronology can be done in one or more method which are well recognized and they are three (1) Dynasty wise, (2) Century wise and (3) Layer wise, and the ASI has followed all the three systems (PW 16 page 454, PW 24 page 269, PW 29 page 144, 150, 183, PW 30 page 351/352,)

3864. Sri Arun Kumar Sharma, OPW 18 has supported ASI report in its entirety. He retired in 1992 from the post of Superintending Archeologist from ASI. Having done M.Sc. in Physical Anthropology in 1958 from University of Sagar and Post Graduate Diploma in Archaeology in 1968 from Institute of Archaeology, Government of India, he served ASI Department for about 33 years and had the experience of exploration, excavation of archeological sites. Some of the excavation work he has undertaken has been detailed in para 5 and 6 of his affidavit. He has clearly averred that the three ways of periodization is well established in the field of Archaeology and the ASI has adopted all the three methods. Regarding 6 and 7 period determined by ASI, he has explained that suggestion by some of the witnesses that the medieval period in India must be co-related with Islam only is not correct and is not a universally

accepted proposition. He has referred to the opinion of Ram Sharan Sharma, a Historian, recorded in his book "**Perspectives in Social and Economic History of Early India**" published in 1983 by Munshiram Manoharlal Publishers Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi, where on page 228 Chapter XVI the author says "

"An important problem in the general history of India is that of transition from the ancient to the mediaeval. Certain dates such as AD 647, 711, 750, 916, 997, and 1206 have been suggested as landmarks in political history. But since politics was the preoccupation of a small section of society in early times, it has to be shown whether any of the above-mentioned dates or whether any other date or point of time is equally significant in the history of land system, crafts and commerce, polity, society, language, art, religion, etc. There has taken place a lot of discussion whether Harsavardhana's death in AD 647 marks the end of one and the beginning of another era in Indian history. The statement of Vincent Smith that the death of Harsavardhana set in the process of decline in Indian history has been ably refuted by a number of scholars, and especially by H.C. Ray. But for those who wish to investigate patterns of social and economic life, the real point to look for is not the presages of decline and prosperity but the nature of change in the existing way of life. If the change is of a fundamental nature, it should be regarded as heralding the advent of a new period. If it is a minor change it would not necessitate any new characterization of the period. Even the question of decline and prosperity has to be examined in relation to the process

of change involved in it. We have to carefully consider how far the decline of the existing system of life shows symptoms of the rise of a new pattern of life. None of these points has been taken into account by V. Smith when he says that the death of Harsavardhana in AD 647 begins a period of decline nor by those who try to refute his theory.

On the grounds of dynastic and political history H.C. Ray suggests that AD 916 should be accepted as the line of demarcation between the two periods in the history of northern India. In his opinion: 'these may be called the ancient and the mediaeval periods; but it would be perhaps more reasonable to call them simply the Hindu period and the period of the Turks and Afghans.' A similar approach has been adopted by some other scholars. In the fifth volume of the History and Culture of the Indian People it is said at one place that ancient India came to an end in AD 997, and again, at another, that in Indian history the mediaeval factor was introduced in the thirteenth century. Both views are based on the assumption that the Muslim conquest ushered in mediaevalism in India. Does it mean that without the Muslim conquest there would have been no mediaevalism in India? Does it imply that the countries of Europe which escaped this conquest had no mediaeval period in their history? In Europe it is difficult to think of mediaevalism without feudalism, the origins and nature of which have to be examined in the case of India. In our opinion the beginnings of a feudal way of life can be sought in the age of the Guptas and Harsa, which marks a period of transition in the history."

3865. He has also referred to the opinion of another learned Historian A.L.Basham's book "**A Cultural History of India**" (first published in 1975) Oxford University Press (Eighth Indian Impression in 1992) contained in Chapter VI, titled as "Medieval Hindu India". While giving details of various Hindu kings ruling different parts of the country, even after Muslim invasion, Dr.Basham has observed that it is not that the entire Indian Continent got influenced by Muslims from 7, 8 or 9th century but from time to time different parts were ruled by different Hindu kings of great vitality.

3866. We have copy of the entire book of **A.L. Basham, i.e., "A Cultural History of India"** (first published in 1975) and 10th impression 2006 by Oxford University Press, New Delhi (Book No. 112). Sri Basham in Chapter VI which runs from page 51 to 59 has noticed that the Gupta Empire disappeared by the middle of 6th century. In the second half of 6th century, a city on Upper Ganga, before its confluence with Jamuna, Kanyakubja (later known as Kanauj), rose to prominence as the capital of the Maukhari kings. The city of Sthanvisvara, now Thanesar, in the watershed between the Ganga and the Indus, became the capital of a rising family of rulers descended from a certain Pushyabhuti. Gujarat and Malwa were in the power of the Maitraka Dynasty, founded by the general of the Guptas. In the Deccan the Chalukya Dynasty was gaining in strength, while in Tamilnadu the Dynasty of the Pallawas was also enlarging its boundaries. This is the pattern of Indian politics until the Muslim invasion. It further says:

"The political history of India between the end of the Gupta Empire and the coming of the Muslims can be traced

in some detail from thousands of inscriptions which contain the genealogies and brief accounts of the reigns of kings, and in the panegyrics which form the preambles to records of land-grants, mostly to religious bodies-temples, monasteries, or groups of learned brahmans."

3867. In 7th century (606-47 AD) Harshavardhana gained control of Kanyakubja (Kannauj). After heirless demise, his empire also died with him. The subsequent period by Sri A.L. Basham is described as under:

"The succeeding period is very obscure and badly documented, but it marks the culmination of a process which had begun with the invasion of the Hunas in the last years of the Gupta Empire. The sixth and seventh centuries saw the rise of many new dynasties, small and great, in the northern part of the sub-continent. Few of these ruling families are to be found mentioned in sources from periods before the Guptas, and many of their genealogies begin with names which do not seem Sanskritic. These people appear to have been new-comers. Some of them may have been related to the Hunas. A new people, who began to make their presence felt towards the end of the sixth century, the Gurjaras, gave their name to the present Gujarat and founded several important ruling dynasties. Since place-names containing a similar element can be found as far to the north-west as Pakistan and Afghanistan, it is commonly suggested that the Gurjaras entered India in the wake of the Hunas. Their name has been linked with that of the ancient people of the south Russian steppes called Khazars, and with the Georgians (Gruz) of the

Caucasus. Other obscure tribes of Central Asians may also have followed the Hunas, and wilder peoples from outlying areas may have profited from the unsettled conditions to gain political control of important regions. In any case, new ruling houses arose in the post-Gupta period and many of their names survive to the present day as those of the Rajput clans.

Towards the end of the eighth century three of the recently arisen dynasties contended for Kanyakubja, by now the acknowledged metropolis of northern India. These were the Palas of Bihar and Bengal, the Rashtrakutas of the Deccan, and the Gurjara-Pratiharas, who controlled parts of Malwa and Rajasthan. The great city was for a time occupied by the Palas, whose Buddhist king Dharmapala drove up the Ganga valley and exacted tribute from many kings of the area. The Rashtrakuta Govinda III, whose policy of raiding the north, continued by his successors, was to have many repercussions, drove Dharmapala out, but was forced to return to his base owing to trouble at home. The vacuum was filled, very early in the ninth century, by Nagabhata II of the Gurjara-Pratiharas.

*For about a hundred years the Gurjara-Pratiharas of Kanyakubja restored a little of the glory of the earlier empires. Under their greatest kings, **Mihira Bhoja** (c. 836-90) and **Mahendrapala** (c. 890-910), they received tribute from rulers from Gujarat to the borders of Bengal, and Muslim travellers were much impressed by the peacefulness and prosperity of their quasi-feudal*

empire. But their old enemies, the fierce Rashtrakutas from the Deccan, were constantly worrying them, and in about 916 Kanyakubja was again temporarily occupied by Indra III of the Rashtrakutas, whose lightning raids provided a foretaste of the similar attacks of the Marathas 800 years later.

*Indra III soon returned to the south; but his effects were longer-lasting than those of previous Rashtrakuta raiders. Though the Pratiharas returned to their capital, they were humiliated and weakened, and their vassals ceased to respect them. Within a generation or two the greater vassals had thrown aside their allegiance, and were fighting with their former masters and among themselves. It was in these circumstances that Mahmud or Ghazni, in the early years of the eleventh century, carried out his seventeen raids on India; but **though the Turkish raiders ransacked and destroyed palaces and temples, and returned to their headquarters in Afghanistan with immense caravans of riches and slaves, India resumed her traditional political ways as if nothing had happened.***

The Turks overwhelmed the Sahi kingdom, which had controlled a large area of the north-west, from Kabul to Lahore. The rulers of this realm had also been Turks, but Turks who had adopted Hindu traditions, and who offered no serious threat to their neighbours to the east. The Ghaznavids also conquered the Muslim kingdoms of Sind, occupied by the Arabs early in the eighth century, whose chiefs had long ceased to trouble the hindu kingdoms on

their frontiers. Thus the hindu states of the Gangetic basin and Rajasthan now had on their borders a young aggressive kingdom with new methods of warfare and with a religious ideology which might be expected to encourage aggression.

The most remarkable feature of the situation was that, as far as surviving records show, nobody whatever in hindu India recognised the menace of the Turks. The Ghaznavids made a few further raids, but these were far less impressive than those of Mahmud. The Turks were soon torn by internal strife and, though they continued to hold the Panjab, it must have seemed to the hindu politicians of the time that, like that Arabs before them, they would be contained indefinitely. Having no real historical tradition, the Indian memory, of earlier conquerors coming from the north-west-Greeks, Sakas, Kushanas, and Hunas-was so vague that it was quite ineffectual as a warning to the rulers of the time.

In the involved situation arising from Mahmud's raids, five larger kingdoms shared most of northern India between them, the Chahamanas (Chauhans) of Rajasthan, the Gahadavalas (Gahrwals) of Kanyakubja (Kanauj) and Varanasi (Banaras), the Chaulukyas or Solankis of Gujarat, the Paramaras (Parmars) of Malwa, and the Chandellas (Chandels) of Bundelkhand, to the south of the Ganga. These dynasties bore names which are among the best-known of the thirty-six Rajput clans. Their kings had already acquired something of the traditional Rajput character-gallant, extremely sensitive to

points of honour, glorifying war, but war of a gentlemanly kind, intensely devoted to tradition, and quite incapable of serious co-operation one with another. The Palas, who governed Bihar and Bengal, had been quite untouched by Mahmud's invasions. Early in the twelfth century they were replaced by the Sena Dynasty, which reversed the Palas' traditional support of Buddhism and encouraged hindu orthodoxy. They seem to have played little or no part in the politics of the western part of India, where the five major kingdoms and numerous lesser tributary realms fought honourable among the themselves, basing their strategy and tactics on principles inherited from epics.

In 1173 Ghazni was captured by Ghiyas-ud-din, whose headquarters were Ghur in Afghanistan. From his new capital Ghiyas-ud-din turned his attention to India. His brother, Muhammad bin Sam, occupied the Panjab and deposed the last ruler of the line of Mahmud. Then in 1191 Muammad bin Sam attacked Prithviraja, king of the Chahamanas, the hindu ruler on his eastern frontier. Prithviraja, fighting on his own ground with a larger army, defeated Muhammad at Tarain, and he retreated. In the following year, 1192, Muhammad came again with stronger forces, and on the same field of Tarain Prithviraja lost the day, and the Ganga valley was open to the invaders. Before the century was over Turkish control was established along the whole length of the sacred river.

It is easy to suggest reasons why the Hindus were unable to resist the Turks, and many such suggestions have been put forward. In dealing with the question it must be

remembered that the invasion of the Turks was only one of numerous attacks through the north-western passes which took place in historical times. The Aryans, by a process not fully known to us, gained control of the Panjab from the decadent Harappans. The Achaemenians of Iran occupied part at least of the Indus valley; Alexander's troops reached the Beas, but were compelled to retreat; in the second century B.C. the Greeks from Bactria occupied the Panjab; they were followed in the next century by the Sakas or Scythians; in the first century A.D. came the Kushanas, and in the fifth the Hunas. Mahmud's raids in the early eleventh century were precursors of the even stronger Turkish attacks of Muhammad bin Sam, which led to the protracted domination of most of India by Muslim rulers.

*These were not by any means the last attacks from the north-west, however. Soon after the Turkish occupation, Mongol hordes swept into India and occupied much of the territory west of the Indus. In 1398 Timur, the great Mongol conqueror, sacked Delhi and raged through western India, causing tremendous carnage and destruction. In 1526 Babur the Mughal defeated the Afghan rulers of Delhi and occupied the country. In 1555 his son, Humayun, reconquered it from his base in Afghanistan. **During the eighteenth century Persians and Afghans raided India in turn, both sacking Delhi before returning to their homelands.**"*

3868. The above clearly shows that in the period of Mahmood Gaznavi raids and thereafter, the northern India was shared by five larger kingdoms namely, Chauhans (Rajasthan),

Gahadavalas (Kannauj and Banaras), Chalukyas or Solanki (Gujarat), Parmaras (Malva) and Chandellas (Bundelkhand). The said dynasties have been titled by learned author as one of "the best known of 36 Rajput clans". The Palas, who governed Bihar and Bengal remained untouched by Mahmud Gazanavi's invasion but early in the 12th century they were replaced by Sena dynasty which reversed the Palas traditional support of Buddhism and encouraged Hindu orthodox religion. The Chauhans rule came to end with the defeat of Prithvi Raj Chauhan in 1192 AD by Mohammad Ghuri at Tarain leaving the Ganges valley open to invaders/foreigners. In 1206 AD Gaharwals (King Jai Chand) was also defeated by Ghuri.

3869. The details of Maukhary, Pushyabhuti, Pratihar, Gaharwal etc. rulers have also been given in "**Ayodhya Ka Itihas Evam Puratatva**" (supra) (Book No. 141), Chapter-7, pages 81 to 105 which is a minute and detailed study on the subject and except some observations made therein based on 1992 inscriptions found at Ayodhya which for the time being we can exclude, the rest of the contents of the said chapter as such have not been shown inaccurate or incorrect, hence may be referred hereunder:

“मौखरी, पुष्यभूति, परवर्ती गुप्त, प्रतिहार एवं गहड़वालों का युग

गुप्त साम्राज्य के पतन के बाद से अयोध्या का राजनीतिक महत्व उतना अधिक नहीं रह गया था। सत्ता का गुरुत्व केन्द्र अयोध्या से हटकर कन्नौज अथवा कान्यकुब्ज पहुँच गया। गुप्त साम्राज्य के पतन के काल में सामन्तों का महत्व उसी अनुपात में बढ़ता गया जिस अनुपात में अयोध्या के गुप्त सम्राटों की केन्द्रीय सत्ता में बिखराव आने लगा था। पांचवी शताब्दी के अंतिम चरण तक तो गुप्त सम्राट् किसी प्रकार साम्राज्य की एकता बनाए रख सके थे तथा छठी शताब्दी के प्रथम चरण में केन्द्रीय सत्ता के लिए

होने वाले संघर्षों के कारण गुप्त साम्राज्य के अन्तर्गत अनेक अधीनस्थ राजवंश अस्तित्व में आ गए। ईसा की छठी-सातवीं शताब्दियों में जिन राजवंशों का उदय हुआ और उन्होंने उत्तर भारत की राजनीतिक गतिविधियों पर प्रभाव डाला उनमें तीन राजवंश मुख्य रूप से उल्लेखनीय हैं— (1) कन्नौज के मौखरी, (2) थानेश्वर के पुष्यभूति तथा (3) मालवा के परवर्ती गुप्त, जिन्होंने बाद में मगध पर शासन किया। इनके बाद प्रतिहारों एवं गहड़वालों का युग आता है जिसमें गहड़वालों ने अयोध्या में विशेष रुचि ली।

कन्नौज के मौखरी

कन्नौज के मौखरियों में सबसे पहला राजा हरिवर्मा हुआ। ईशानवर्मा के हरहा अभिलेख में मौखरियों की वंशावली हरिवर्मा से प्रारम्भ होती है। उसके पूर्वज संभवतः बिहार से यहां आए होंगे, क्योंकि बिहार के गया जिले के बराबर और नागार्जुनी पहाड़ियों से मौखरी राजाओं के तीन अभिलेख प्राप्त हुए हैं। इन अभिलेखों में तीन राजाओं के नाम मिलते हैं—यज्ञवर्मा, शार्दूलवर्मा तथा अनन्तवर्मा। अनन्तवर्मा को कोई उपाधि नहीं दी गई है किन्तु उसके पिता शार्दूलवर्मा को सामन्त चूणामणि कहा गया है। शार्दूलवर्मा के पिता यज्ञवर्मा को भी नृप मात्र कहा गया है। इस प्रकार छठी शताब्दी के प्रारम्भ में ये सामन्त मौखरी नरेश गया के क्षेत्र में शासन कर रहे थे। इसमें कोई सन्देह नहीं है कि गया के ये तीनों मौखरी राजा गुप्त सम्राटों के अधीनस्थ सामन्त थे, किन्तु इनका कन्नौज के मौखरियों से क्या सम्बन्ध था, इस विषय पर कुछ कहना संभव नहीं है। अधिक-से-अधिक यही संभावना की जा सकती है कि गुप्त सम्राटों के निर्देश पर बिहार के मौखरियों के वंश में उत्पन्न हरिवर्मा को कान्यकुब्ज अथवा कन्नौज में सामन्त के रूप में नियुक्ति मिली हो। हरहा के अभिलेख में हरिवर्मा को मात्र राजा कहा गया है तथा उसे आदि नरेश माना गया है। लेकिन इस अभिलेख से यह स्पष्ट नहीं होता कि मौखरियों ने अपना शासन कहां से शुरू किया था अथवा उनकी राजधानी कहां पर थी। राधा गोविन्द बसाक का यह मत है कि प्रारम्भ में मौखरियों ने अयोध्या से शासन किया था तथा बाद में अवन्तिवर्मा के काल में उन्होंने अपनी राजधानी कन्नौज को बनाया। मौखरियों की राजधानी कन्नौज में थी, इसकी सूचना हमें हर्षचरित से प्राप्त होती है जिसमें यह कहा गया है कि मौखरी रानी राजयश्री, जो हर्षवर्धन की बहन थी, मालवराज के द्वारा कन्नौज में ही बन्दी

बना ली गई थी। इसके अतिरिक्त चीनी स्रोतों में भी इस बात के संकेत मिलते हैं कि कन्नौज मौखरियों की राजधानी थी और राज्यश्री को मुक्त कराने के बाद हर्ष से कन्नौज का शासन संभालने का आग्रह किया गया था। **मौखरियों के अभिलेख जौनपुर (पूर्वी उत्तर प्रदेश) तथा हरहा (जिला बाराबंकी, पूर्वी उत्तर प्रदेश) से प्राप्त हुए हैं।** इसके अतिरिक्त बिहार में नालन्दा, से शर्ववर्मा की एक मिट्टी की मुहर तथा मध्य प्रदेश में असीरगढ़ से इसी राजा की एक तांबे की मुहर प्राप्त हुई है। गोरखपुर जिले के सोहनाग नामक स्थान से अवन्तिवर्मा की एक मुहर प्राप्त हुई है तथा इसी राजा की एक मिट्टी की मुहर नालन्दा से भी प्राप्त हुई है। कन्नौज से ही अवन्तिवर्मा की एक मिट्टी की मुहर प्राप्त हुई है। नालन्दा से ही मिट्टी की एक अन्य मुहर प्राप्त हुई है जिस पर अवन्तिवर्मा के पुत्र 'राजाधिराज श्री सु . .' नाम उल्लिखित है। खण्डित हो जाने के कारण राजा का पूरा नाम नहीं पढ़ा जा सका है। इसके अतिरिक्त **कई मौखरी राजाओं के सिक्के भी अहिच्छत्रा, अयोध्या और भिटौरा (अयोध्या के निकट, जिला फैजाबाद) से प्राप्त हुई हैं। इन प्रमाणों से यह स्पष्ट ज्ञात होता है कि गुप्त राजवंश के बाद अयोध्या तथा उसके बाद कोशल प्रदेश मौखरी शासनान्तर्गत आ गया था।**

मौखरियों ने अपनी राजधानी अयोध्या में क्यों नहीं बनाई होगी, इस संबंध में केवल अनुमान ही प्रस्तुत किए जा सकते हैं। पहली संभावना यह है कि गुप्त सम्राटों ने प्रारंभिक मौखरी सामन्तों को कन्नौज में स्थापित होने का निर्देश दिया हो और परम्परागत रूप में जब मौखरी अधिक शक्तिशाली हो गए और गुप्त साम्राज्य का अन्त हो गया तो भी उन्होंने लगभग उन्हीं कारणों से अपनी राजधानी अयोध्या में बनाने का विचार न किया हो जिनके कारण पुष्यमित्र शुंग ने मौर्य राजवंश का अन्त हो जाने के बाद अपनी राजधानी पाटलिपुत्र में नहीं बनाई।

हरिवर्मा के बाद उसका पुत्र आदित्यवर्मा मौखरी वंश का राजा हुआ। उसका विवाह हर्षगुप्ता से हुआ था। नाम साम्य के आधार पर यह माना जाता है कि हर्षगुप्ता परवर्ती गुप्त राजवंश के दूसरे शासक हर्षगुप्त की बहन थी। हर्षगुप्त का समय 505-515 ई० के बीच माना जाता है। इस प्रकार आदित्यवर्मा का भी यही समय मानना चाहिए। आदित्यवर्मा का पुत्र ईश्वरवर्मा हुआ जिसकी पत्नी का नाम उपगुप्ता बताया गया है। बी०पी०

सिन्हा ने यह मत व्यक्त किया है कि उपगुप्ता अयोध्या के गुप्त सम्राट विष्णुगुप्त की बहन रही होगी। यह विष्णुगुप्त राजवंश का अन्तिम शासक माना जाता है और इसका समय 543-550 ई० तक बताया गया है। लेकिन किरण कुमार थपलियाल का यह मानना है कि ईश्वरवर्मा की पत्नी उपगुप्ता देवी संभवतः परवर्ती गुप्त राजवंश की राजकुमारी थी। ईश्वरवर्मा के जौनपुर अभिलेख से यह ज्ञात होता है कि उसने आन्ध्र के राजाओं को भी पराजित किया था तथा धारा से आने वाले किसी आक्रमण को विफल कर दिया था। संभवतः धारा से आने वाला यह आक्रमण हूणराज मिहिरकुल के द्वारा किया गया आक्रमण था और ईश्वरवर्मा ने गुप्त सम्राट के सामन्त के रूप में इस युद्ध में भाग लिया हो तो कोई आश्चर्य नहीं। लेकिन ऐसा लगता है कि इस समय तक मौखरी गुप्त राजवंश द्वारा शासित प्रदेशों में सबसे शक्तिशाली सामन्त के रूप में स्थापित हो रहे थे।

उत्तर भारत में मौखरियों की शक्ति का पूर्ण उदय श्री ईशानवर्मा के समय में होता है। ईशानवर्मा के हड़हा पाषाण अभिलेख (श्लोक 13) में यह कहा गया है कि उसने आन्ध्रपति को जीतकर, शूलिकों की सेना को परास्त करके तथा गौड़ों का सम्बन्ध पृथ्वी से छुड़ाकर उन्हें समुदाश्रयी होने के लिए बाध्य करके, सिंहासन को अधिकृत किया था। इस प्रकार ऐसा लगता है कि ईशानवर्मा ने यह विजयें अपने युवराज काल में प्राप्त की थीं और इसी कारण उसके पिता के काल में लिखवाए गए जौनपुर अभिलेख में विन्ध्य और आन्ध्र के राजाओं को परास्त करने की जो बात कही गई है उसमें ईशानवर्मा का भी सहयोग था। जहां तक गौड़ों को परास्त करने की बात है उसके सम्बन्ध में विद्वानों की यह राय है कि मौखरियों ने यह अभियान अयोध्या के गुप्त सम्राटों की अधीनता में चलाया होगा। आदित्यसेन के अफसाह अभिलेख में यह उल्लेख आया है कि जीवितगुप्त ने, वह भी गुप्तों का सामन्त रहा होगा, कदली वृक्षों की शाखाओं से आवृत्त समुद्र तटों पर रहने वाले शत्रुओं को परास्त किया था। सिन्हा ने तो यहां तक कहा है कि यह गुप्त शासक विष्णुगुप्त चन्द्रादित्य रहा होगा।

ईशानवर्मा के बाद उसका पुत्र शर्ववर्मा शासक हुआ। लेकिन हड़हा अभिलेख से यह ज्ञात होता है कि ईशानवर्मा का एक और पुत्र सूर्यवर्मा हुआ। किन्तु सूर्यवर्मा ने शासन किया था अथवा नहीं, यह प्रश्न विवादास्पद

है क्योंकि ईशानवर्मा के पुत्र शर्ववर्मा और उसके उत्तराधिकारियों ने सूर्यवर्मा का उल्लेख नहीं किया है। लेकिन, मध्य प्रदेश से प्राप्त महाशिवगुप्त बालार्जुन के मल्हार ताम्रपत्राभिलेख से यह ज्ञात होता है कि मौखरी राजवंश का सूर्यवर्मा मगध का राजा था। इस प्रकार यह स्वीकार किया जा सकता है कि ईशानवर्मा ने अपने जीवनकाल में ही मगध को अपने अधीन कर लिया था और संभवतः ईशानवर्मा के बाद उसके पुत्र सूर्यवर्मा ने कुछ समय तक शासन किया। यद्यपि सिरपुर से प्राप्त एक अभिलेख में सूर्यवर्मा को केवल नृप कहा गया है लेकिन इससे इस तथ्य पर कोई अन्तर नहीं पड़ता कि यह सूर्यवर्मा मौखरी नरेश ईशानवर्मा का पुत्र था।

मौखरी अभिलेखों में केवल हड़हा अभिलेख एकमात्र ऐसा लेख है जिस पर तिथि दी हुई है और वह विक्रम संवत् 611 है जो ईस्वी सन् 554 में पड़ता है। यह अभिलेख यद्यपि ईशानवर्मा के पुत्र सूर्यवर्मा द्वारा लिखवाया गया था फिर भी उस समय मौखरी सिंहासन पर ईशानवर्मा ही आसीन था। ईशानवर्मा का उत्तराधिकारी उसका एक अन्य पुत्र शर्ववर्मा हुआ जिसको मुहरों पर 'परम माहेश्वर महाराजाधिराज' कहा गया है। शर्ववर्मा का शासन मगध से लेकर मध्य प्रदेश में असीरगढ़ तथा बुन्देलखण्ड तक फैला था। पश्चिम में उसका शासन कांगड़ा तक विस्तृत था। कुछ लोगों ने यह विचार व्यक्त किया है कि चूंकि कन्नौज और कांगड़ा के बीच पुष्यभूति वंश का भी शासन पड़ता है इसलिए कांगड़ा में मौखरियों का शासन संभव नहीं है। किन्तु इस बात को मान लेना चाहिए कि संभवतः उस समय तक पुष्यभूति वंश अपनी सामन्त अवस्था में ही था जबकि मौखरी वंश के नरेश 'महाराजाधिराज', 'परमेश्वर' आदि उपाधियों से विभूषित किये जाते थे। भोजदेव के बाराह ताम्रपत्राभिलेख में इसे 'परमेश्वर शर्ववर्मदेव' कहा गया है और यह बताया गया है कि 'परमेश्वर शर्ववर्मदेव' ने कालंजर मंडल के उदुम्बर विषय में कुछ भूमिदान किया था। परवर्ती गुप्त शासक जीवितगुप्त द्वितीय के देववर्णार्क अभिलेख में 'परमेश्वर श्रीशर्ववर्मा' तथा 'परमेश्वर श्री अवन्तिवर्मा' तथा एक अन्य 'महाराजाधिराज परमेश्वर' का उल्लेख मिलता है। इस प्रकार यह स्पष्ट है कि मौखरी वंश अपने समय में उत्तर भारत का सबसे शक्तिशाली राजवंश था और उनका

प्रभाव क्षेत्र भी लगभग पूरे उत्तर भारत में विस्तृत था।

इस काल-खण्ड के इतिहास को लिखने वाले विद्वानों ने परवर्ती गुप्त राजवंश और पुष्यभूति राजवंश को मौखरियों के समान ही महत्व दे रखा है। फ्लीट ने सबसे पहले आदित्यसेन के अफसाढ़ अभिलेख का संपादन किया था और उन्होंने इस अभिलेख में प्राप्त परवर्ती गुप्त राजवंश के शासकों को मौखरियों का प्रतिद्वंदी राजवंश बताया। उसके बाद जितने भी इतिहासकारों ने परवर्ती गुप्त राजवंश के विषय में लिया है उन सभी ने इस मत को महत्व दिया है। लेकिन, वास्तविकता यह है कि **अयोध्या के गुप्त सम्राटों के राजवंश के पतन के बाद कन्नौज के मौखरी राजवंश ने लगभग वही स्थिति प्राप्त कर ली थी जो गुप्त सम्राटों की थी।** छठी शताब्दी के प्रारम्भ में परवर्ती गुप्त और पुष्यभूति राजवंशों की स्थिति छोटे-मोटे सामन्तों जैसी ही थी। अयोध्या के इतिहास के सम्बन्ध में विचार करते समय यह बात प्रमुख रूप से कही जा सकती है कि मौखरी राजवंश के गृहवर्मा के राज्यकाल तक कोशल उनके शासनान्तर्गत बना रहा। कुछ विद्वानों ने परवर्ती गुप्त शासकों को मगध से उद्भूत हुआ माना है जिससे यह धारणा बनती है कि संभवतः कोशल भी किसी समय परवर्ती गुप्तों के अन्तर्गत रहा होगा। किन्तु यहां यह बता देना आवश्यक है कि छठी शताब्दी ई० में परवर्ती गुप्त राजवंश राजस्थान के मालव जनपद की स्थानीय और सामान्य शक्ति थी। आदित्यसेन का अफसाढ़ अभिलेख सातवीं शताब्दी में लिखवाया गया था जिस समय वह मगध का एक महत्वपूर्ण शासक बन गया था। उसने इस अभिलेख में अपने पूर्वजों का विवरण दिया है जिसमें अपने पूर्व के सात राजाओं का उल्लेख किया है। आदित्यसेन का अफसाढ़ लेख उन महत्वपूर्ण लेखों में है जिन्हें प्रारम्भ से ही गलत संदर्भ में समझा गया है। उल्लेखनीय है कि अभिलेख में आदित्यसेन अपने पूर्वजों को साधारण 'नृप' अथवा 'श्री' आदि नाम से ही अभिहित करता है जिससे उनके सामान्य स्थानीय शासक होने की बात मानी जानी चाहिए। कुछ स्थानों पर उसके पूर्वजों के मौखरी राजवंश के साथ प्रतिद्वंद्विता और प्रतिस्पर्धा की बात कही गई है। अफसाढ़ अभिलेख के आठवें श्लोक में यह कहा गया है कि आदित्यसेन के चौथे पूर्वज कुमारगुप्त ने राजाओं में चन्द्रमा के समान श्री ईशानवर्मा की सेना को मंदराचल पर्वत की भांति विमथित (मथ) कर दिया था। किन्तु इस युद्ध का क्या परिणाम हुआ यह नहीं बताया गया है। लेकिन अगले ही श्लोक में यह अवश्य

सूचित किया गया है कि 'शौर्यसत्यव्रतधारी' ने प्रयाग जाकर करीष (कन्डे या उपले) की अग्नि में प्रवेश करके आत्महत्या कर ली थी। यह किस कारण किया गया यह स्पष्ट नहीं बताया गया है। सिनहा ने यह सुझाव दिया है कि कुमारगुप्त ने ईशानवर्मा पर प्राप्त विजय की प्रसन्नता में देवताओं के प्रति कृतज्ञता ज्ञापन के रूप में आत्मदाह किया था। किन्तु इस प्रकार के विचार हास्यास्पद हैं क्योंकि किसी भी विजय के उपरांत विजयी राजा स्वयं का आत्मदाह नहीं करता। ऐसा लगता है कि कुमारगुप्त इस युद्ध में पराजित हो गया था जिसके कारण उसे आत्महत्या करनी पड़ी। इसके बाद के श्लोकों में कुमारगुप्त के पुत्र दामोदरगुप्त के विषय में कहा गया है कि वह मौखरियों के युद्ध में हूणों की गजसेना को विघटित करते हुए मूर्च्छित हो गया था (मारा गया था) तथा उसकी नींद स्वर्ग में जाकर सुरवधुओं के कर-स्पर्श से खुली। इस श्लोक का अर्थ फ्लीट ने इस प्रकार किया है 'युद्ध में (कुचलकर मार डालने के उद्देश्य से) हूणों की सेनाओं को उखाड़ फेंक देने वाले मौखरी के आगे बढ़ते हुए मदमत्त शक्तिशाली हाथियों के व्यूह का विघटन करके वह मूर्च्छित हो गया। (तथा पुनः स्वर्ग में) सुरवधुओं के बीच चयन करते हुए, तथा (अमुक अथवा अमुक) मेरी है यह कहते हुए उनके कर-कमलों के सुखद स्पर्श से चेतन हुआ।' फ्लीट द्वारा किए गए इस अनुवाद में उनका यह आग्रह झलकता है कि यह युद्ध भी मौखरियों और परवर्ती गुप्तों के बीच हुआ था। लेकिन वास्तव में ऐसा लगता है कि ईशानवर्मा से युद्ध में कुमारगुप्त के पराजित होने के बाद दामोदरगुप्त को मौखरियों की अधीनता स्वीकार करनी पड़ी थी और ईशानवर्मा अथवा उसके उत्तराधिकारी के साथ हूणों के युद्ध में दामोदरगुप्त एक सामन्त के रूप में लड़ते हुए मारा गया था। इसमें गजसेना का जो उल्लेख आया है वह हूणों की गजसेना का लगता है, और युद्ध हूणों और मौखरियों के बीच लड़ा गया था। इसका संकेत हमें जौनपुर के ईश्वरवर्मा के पाषाण लेख में मिलता है जिसमें 'धारामार्गविनिर्गताग्निकणिका' का उल्लेख आया है। यह संभवतः हूण आक्रमण का ही उल्लेख है।

मौखरी राजवंश का शासन इस क्षेत्र पर कम-से-कम अवन्तिवर्मा और उसके पुत्र गृहवर्मा के समय तक चला। इतिहासकारों का ऐसा अनुमान है कि हर्षवर्धन ने गृहवर्मा की हत्या के बाद कन्नौज का शासन स्वयं संभाल लिया था और इस प्रकार कन्नौज के मौखरियों का वंश समाप्त हो

गया था। ह्वेनसांग ने भी यह उल्लेख किया है कि शत्रुओं का दमन करने के बाद कन्नौज के मंत्रियों ने हर्ष से कन्नौज का शासन संभालने का अनुरोध किया था। इसके अतिरिक्त हर्ष की विजयों और कामरूम के शासक भास्करवर्मा के साथ हर्ष के दौत्य सम्बन्ध की बात को ध्यान में रखते हुए यह स्वीकार करना पड़ेगा कि कुछ समय के लिए अयोध्या तथा कोशल क्षेत्र भी, हर्ष के साम्राज्य का अंग बन गया था। यह भी संभव है कि हर्ष ने कन्नौज को केवल अपनी गतिविधियों का केन्द्र मात्र बनाया हो। लेकिन, मौखरी राजवंश का विनाश हो गया था यह स्वीकार नहीं किया जा सकता। नालन्दा से प्राप्त एक मुहर में अवन्तिवर्मा के पुत्र के नाम का उल्लेख हुआ है जिसके नाम का केवल प्रथम अक्षर 'सु' पढ़ा जा सका है। कुछ विद्वानों ने इस 'सु' को 'सुचन्द्रवर्मा' मानने का सुझाव दिया है। यहां यह उल्लेखनीय है कि इस मुहर में अवन्तिवर्मा के पुत्र गृहवर्मा का कोई उल्लेख नहीं है। बहुत संभव है कि गृहवर्मा के बाद अवन्तिवर्मा के दूसरे पुत्र 'सु' ने राज्य किया हो। आर्यमुजुश्रीमूलकल्प में 'गृह' के बाद 'सुव्र' के शासक होने की बात कही गई है। 'सु' के बाद मौखरी राजवंश का इतिहास पुनर्निर्मित करना कठिन कार्य है। कुछ विद्वानों ने पूर्णवर्मा को मौखरी राजा माना है तथा ह्वेनसांग भी उसे अशोकराज का अंतिम उत्तराधिकारी मानता है। पूर्णवर्मा या तो मगध का स्वतंत्र शासक था अथवा मौखरी वंश का कोई उत्तराधिकारी था।

630 ई० में नालन्दा की यात्रा करने वाले ह्वेनसांग ने पूर्णवर्मा को पूर्वकाल का राजा बताया है। कुछ विद्वानों ने यह भी सुझाव दिया है कि पूर्णवर्मा हर्ष द्वारा नियुक्त मगध का शासक था और उसकी मृत्यु के उपरांत ही माधवगुप्त हर्ष द्वारा मगध का शासक नियुक्त किया गया। इसी माधवगुप्त का पुत्र आदित्यसेन था जिसने अफसाढ़ का पाषाणखण्ड अभिलेख लिखवाया था। मौखरी वंश आदित्यसेन के समय में भी नष्ट नहीं हुआ था, इस बात की सूचना हमें नेपाल के जयदेव द्वितीय के पशुपति अभिलेख से प्राप्त होती है। यह अभिलेख नेपाली संवत् 157 (773 ई०) में तिथ्यांकित है। इसमें यह कहा गया है कि मगध के शासक आदित्यसेन ने अपनी पुत्री का विवाह मौखरी नरेश भोगवर्मा से किया था और इस भोगवर्मा की पुत्री वत्सदेवी नेपाल के लिच्छवी नरेश जयदेव द्वितीय की माता तथा शिवदेव द्वितीय की पत्नी थी।

इस प्रकार यद्यपि हर्ष के पुष्यभूति वंश के विषय में सातवीं शताब्दी में हमें कोई जानकारी उपलब्ध नहीं है किन्तु मौखरी वंश सातवीं शताब्दी के अंतिम चरण में भी अस्तित्व में था, इसकी सूचना नेपाल के इस अभिलेख से ज्ञात होती है। सिन्हा ने यह सुझाव दिया है कि भोगवर्मा ने कन्नौज पर अधिकार कर लिया था तथा इसी कारण आदित्यसेन ने उससे अपनी पुत्री का विवाह कर दिया। उन्होंने यहां तक कहा है कि भोगवर्मा आदित्यसेन का सामन्त रहा होगा। किन्तु ये दोनों बातें काल्पनिक लगती हैं।

इसी सन्दर्भ में कन्नौज के यशोवर्मा का भी उल्लेख किया जा सकता है जिसका वर्णन वाकपतिराज के प्राकृत काव्य गौड़वहों में किया गया है। यशोवर्मा का एक पाषाण अभिलेख नालन्दा से प्राप्त हुआ है। यह अभिलेख वास्तव में यथोवर्मा के एक मंत्री, मालाद के द्वारा लिखवाया गया था जिसमें राजा के बारे में कुछ विशेष नहीं कहा गया है, सिवाय इसके कि वह उदार और सदाशय राजा था। तथा अनेक युद्धों का विजेता था। इसके अतिरिक्त यशोवर्मा नाम वाले कुछ सिक्के भी प्राप्त हुए हैं जो इसी राजा के बताए गए हैं। किन्तु इस सम्बन्ध में विद्वानों ने शंका व्यक्त की है, क्योंकि ये सिक्के कश्मीर और पंजाब से प्राप्त हुए हैं और इण्डो-सीथियन प्रकार के हैं जिनको दुर्लभक प्रतापादित्य द्वितीय (700ई०) तथा जयापीड विनयादित्य (772 ई०) के बीच रखा गया है। लेकिन इस काल में कश्मीर में इस नाम का कोई अन्य राजा न होने के कारण ये सिक्के कन्नौज के यशोवर्मा के माने जा सकते हैं।

यशोवर्मा को इस काव्य में चन्द्रवंश में उत्पन्न राजा बताया गया है तथा यह भी कहा गया है कि उसकी राजधानी कन्नौज में थी जिसके कारण विद्वानों ने यह स्वीकार किया कि यह यशोवर्मा मौखरी वंश का हो सकता है। लेकिन मौखरी वंश चन्द्रवंशीय नहीं था। इसके अतिरिक्त वर्मन नाम भी केवल मौखरी राजवंश में प्रचलित रहा हो, यह बात भी नहीं है। अयोध्या के इतिहास की दृष्टि से यह बात उल्लेखनीय है कि यशोवर्मा ने हरिश्चन्द्र की नगरी (हरिअंद नअरिऐ) में एक ही दिन में एक मंदिर का निर्माण करवाया था। यहां हरिश्चन्द्र नगरी से अयोध्या का तात्पर्य है। संभवतः कन्नौज के यशोवर्मा ने अपनी दिग्विजय के दौरान यह कार्य किया था। वाकपतिराज के इस ग्रंथ का समय 735 ई० माना जाता है।

ईसा की सातवीं शताब्दी में अयोध्या के इतिहास के सम्बन्ध में कोई अन्य साहित्यिक अथवा अभिलेखिक साक्ष्य उपलब्ध नहीं है। छठी शताब्दी के अन्त में अथवा सातवीं शताब्दी के प्रारम्भिक वर्षों में, एक ऐसी घटना घट गई जिसके कारण मौखरियों के प्रशासन पर कुछ समय के लिए ग्रहण लग गया। मौखरी सम्राट गृहवर्मा का विवाह पुष्यभूति वंश के राजा प्रभाकरवर्धन की पुत्री राज्यश्री से हुआ था। मालवा के राजा देवगुप्त और गौड़ के राजा शशांक ने मौखरी वंश की राजधानी कन्नौज पर आक्रमण करके गृहवर्मा को मार दिया तथा उसकी रानी राज्यश्री को वहीं के कारागार में डाल दिया। बाण के हर्षचरित से यह जानकारी मिलती है कि इसकी सूचना मिलने पर थानेश्वर से राज्यवर्धन एक सेना लेकर मौखरी वंश के शत्रुओं से लड़ने के लिए निकला लेकिन वह स्वयं शत्रुओं के विश्वासघात के कारण मारा गया। इसकी सूचना मिलने पर हर्ष ने शत्रुओं को परास्त करने का निश्चय किया। इसी बीच में राज्यश्री कारागार से निकलकर विन्ध्य के जंगलों में चली गई थी। हर्ष से उसकी भेंट वहीं पर होती है। हर्षचरित की कहानी यहीं पर समाप्त हो जाती है। लेकिन चीनी यात्री ह्वेनसांग ने इसके आगे भी विवरण दिया है क्योंकि वह लगभग 636 से 640 ई० के बीच हर्ष के साथ उसकी राजधानी कन्नौज में रहा था। इसके साथ वह यह भी सूचना देता है कि कन्नौज के मंत्रियों ने यह निवेदन किया था कि वह कन्नौज का राज्यभार संभाल ले। हर्ष के शासन का प्रारम्भ 606 ई० में माना जाता है और इसके लगभग तीस वर्षों के बाद ह्वेनसांग ने उसके दरबार में पहुंचता है। इस प्रकार यह समय हर्ष के शासनकाल का सर्वाधिक महत्वपूर्ण और वैभव का युग था। ऐसी स्थिति में यदि ह्वेनसांग हर्ष की विजयों से तथा उसके प्रभाव से प्रभावित होकर उसे कन्नौज का शासक मानता है तो इसे अस्वाभाविक नहीं कहा जा सकता। लेकिन हम यह भी नहीं मान सकते कि मौखरी वंश समाप्त हो गया था और उसके ध्वंसावशेष पर हर्ष ने अपना साम्राज्य निर्माण किया था। हर्ष के बाद पुष्यभूति वंश का क्या हुआ इसके विषय में कोई जानकारी नहीं मिलती। लेकिन विभिन्न स्रोतों से हम यह जानते हैं कि मौखरी राजवंश सातवीं और आठवीं शताब्दियों में भी जीवित रहा। इस आधार पर यह कहा जा सकता है कि सातवीं शताब्दी के पूर्वार्द्ध में हर्ष का उदय एक

आकस्मिक घटना थी और उसके बाद पुनः उत्तर भारत की राजनीति अपनी स्वाभाविक स्थिति में आ गई। ऐसा लगता है कि हर्ष ने मालवा के परवर्ती गुप्त राजवंश के माधवगुप्त को मगध में स्थापित किया था और इस प्रकार मौखरियों को मगध पर से अपना अधिकार छोड़ना पड़ा होगा। इसके बावजूद कोशल का क्षेत्र मौखरियों के ही शासनान्तर्गत रहा। इसे मानने में कोई कठिनाई नहीं होनी चाहिए।

हर्ष एवं परवर्ती गुप्तों का काल

सातवीं शताब्दी के पूर्वार्द्ध में कोसल क्षेत्र में भी हर्षवर्धन का शासन था इसकी पुष्टि फैजाबाद के निकट भिटौरा से प्राप्त एक निधि से होती है। इस निधि में 248 चांदी के सिक्के हर्षवर्धन के माने जाते हैं जिन पर "श्रीशलदत्त" (श्रीशीलादित्य) लेख उत्कीर्ण है। आर० बर्न ने इन्हें हर्ष का सिक्का माना है। डॉ० देवहूति भी इसे स्वीकार करती हैं।

चीनी यात्री ह्वेनसांग भी इसी समय भारत आया था और उसने इन क्षेत्रों की विस्तृत यात्रा की थी तथा अपने विवरण एक पुस्तक के रूप में लिखे थे। पाश्चात्य विद्वानों ने तथा उनके अनुकरण पर अनेक भारतीय इतिहासकारों ने भी, ह्वेनसांग के विवरणों को सन्देहातीत ढंग से स्वीकार किया है। लेकिन, ह्वेनसांग के सभी विवरण पूर्णरूप से विश्वसनीय नहीं हैं। सबसे बड़ी बात तो यह है कि उसने अपने विवरणों में इधर-उधर से सुनी-सुनाई बातों को अत्यधिक स्थान दिया है। जिसमें ऐतिहासिक तथ्यों के साथ-साथ आनुषांगिक कहानियां, विशेष रूप से बौद्ध धर्म से सम्बन्धित, अधिक महत्व के साथ उद्धृत की गई हैं। दूसरी बात यह है कि उसका दृष्टिकोण बौद्ध धर्म के एक अनुयायी भक्त की भांति था जिसने प्रमुख रूप से केवल बौद्ध धर्म से सम्बन्धित स्थानों, स्मारकों तथा अवशेषों का विवरण दिया है। अन्य धर्मों से सम्बन्धित विवरण बहुत संक्षेप में और चलताऊ ढंग से दिए गए हैं। तीसरी बात यह है कि उसके द्वारा दिये गए भौगोलिक विवरण बहुत अधिक विश्वसनीय नहीं हैं। तथा दूरियों के विवरण भी कभी-कभी अविश्वसनीय लगते हैं। ह्वेनसांग ने कोशल से सम्बन्धित दो स्थानों का विवरण अपने यात्रा वृत्तान्त में दिया है। पहला स्थान ओ-यु-तो का है जिसे, विवरण को संकलित करने वालों ने, अयोध्या माना है तथा

सभी इतिहासकारों ने इस विवरण को अयोध्या का ही विवरण स्वीकार किया है। कन्नौज से नवदेवकुल (न-पो-ति-पो-कु-लो) की दूरी एक सौ ली बताते हुए वहां से दक्षिण-पूर्व की दिशा में छः सौ ली चलकर गंगा पार करने के बाद वह ओ-यु-तो पहुँचता है। उसका जो यात्रा मार्ग है उसके अनुसार ओ-यु-तो से तीन सौ ली पूर्व जाने के बाद गंगा के उत्तर में वह हयमुख (ओ-यि-मु-खि) पहुँचता है और वहां से सात सौ ली गंगा के दक्षिण जाकर प्रयाग (पो-लो-ए-किया) पहुँचता है। प्रयाग से पांच सौ ली चलकर वह कौशाम्बी पहुँचता है तथा कौशाम्बी से सात सौ ली उत्तर चलकर वह कसपुर (शि-किया-शि-ओ-लो) पहुँचता है और वहां से 170 अथवा 180 ली उत्तर दिशा में विशाख (पि-सो-किया) की स्थिति बताता है। इस पि-सो-किया को कनिंघम द्वारा अयोध्या से समतुलित किया गया है क्योंकि अयोध्या का एक नाम विशाख भी था।

अब ह्वेनसांग के अयोध्या (ओ-यु-तो) तथा विशाख (पि-सो-किया) की पहचान के सम्बन्ध में भ्रम उत्पन्न होना स्वाभाविक है क्योंकि अयोध्या (?) से वह विशाख पहुँचने के लिए जिस टेढ़े-मेढ़े मार्ग को अपनाता है उसके अनुसार इन दोनों स्थानों को एक-दूसरे से काफी दूर होना चाहिए। कनिंघम ने दन्तधावन कुण्ड अर्थात् बुद्ध की दातौन से उपजे वृक्ष की कथा के कारण पि-सो-किया को अयोध्या माना है जिसका विवरण हम पीछे दे आए हैं। अब यदि यह अयोध्या था तो ओ-यु-तो कौन-सा स्थान रहा होगा, यह विचारने की बात है। लेकिन हमारे इतिहासकारों ने बिना इस विषय पर विचार किए ओ-यु-तो को अयोध्या स्वीकार कर लिया है तथा उसके विवरण को भी।

ह्वेनसांग के अनुसार ओ-यु-तो 5,000 ली के क्षेत्र में विस्तृत था और इसकी राजधानी 20 ली क्षेत्र में फैली थी। यहां पर 100 संघाराम थे तथा 3,000 भिक्षु थे जिनमें हीनयान और महायान दोनों के ही भिक्षु सम्मिलित थे। ओ-यु-तो के क्षेत्र में 10 देवमंदिर थे। लेकिन उसमें रहने वाले विभिन्न पंथों को मानने वाले विद्वानों की संख्या बहुत कम थी। इसी अयोध्या के सम्बन्ध में ह्वेनसांग ने वसुबन्धु बोधिसत्व की कथा का विवरण दिया है। अयोध्या का वर्णन करने वाले आधुनिक विद्वान् इसे ही अयोध्या मानते हैं। लेकिन कनिंघम ने भौगोलिक

कठिनाइयों को देखते हुए कानपुर से उत्तर-पश्चिम की ओर काकूपुर नामक एक कस्बे से इसकी पहचान की है। सबसे बड़ी बात तो यह है कि इस ओ-यु-तो को गंगा के किनारे स्थित बताया गया है। प्रश्न यह है कि क्या इसकी पहचान अयोध्या से कर सकते हैं? तथा ओ-यु-तो में जिन स्तूपों, संघारामों और विहारों का विवरण ह्वेनसांग ने दिया है क्या उन्हें अयोध्या पर आरोपित कर सकते हैं? यदि इसका उत्तर 'हाँ' में दिया जाए तो पि-सो-किया अर्थात् विशाखा के विषय में क्या कहा जाएगा जो भौगोलिक दृष्टि से ओ-यु-तो से काफी दूर है तथा जहाँ पर बुद्ध के दातौन से उत्पन्न वृक्ष का विवरण मिलता है। इन दोनों स्थानों के विवरण और पहचान में कठिनाई के कारण पूरा यात्रा विवरण ही सन्देह के घेरे में आ जाता है।

प्रतिहार काल

आठवीं से दसवीं शताब्दियों के अयोध्या के इतिहास के विषय में कोई विशेष सूचना आभिलेखिक एवं साहित्यिक स्रोतों से नहीं मिल पाती। किन्तु उत्तर भारत के राजनीतिक इतिहास में कन्नौज का महत्व बना रहा क्योंकि गुर्जर-प्रतिहार राजाओं ने नवीं शताब्दी ई० में कन्नौज से शासन किया था। नागभट्ट द्वितीय जो पहले गोविन्द तृतीय से पराजित हो चुका था, कन्नौज पर अधिकार करने के बाद अपने को सम्राट घोषित करता है तथा 'परम भट्टारक महाराजाधिराज परमेश्वर' की उपाधियां धारण करता है। उसी के वंश में नागपाल के बाद रामभद्र तथा उसका पुत्र मिहिरभोज शासक बनता है। प्रतिहार काल में कन्नौज के प्रतिहारों के संघर्ष दक्षिण में राष्ट्रकूटों के साथ तथा पूर्व में बंगाल के पालों के साथ निरन्तर चलते रहे। मिहिरभोज के बाद उसका पुत्र महेन्द्रपाल शासक हुआ जिसकी शासन तिथि 885-915 ई० तक मानी जाती है। महेन्द्रपाल के बाद भोज द्वितीय, तत्पश्चात् महीपाल और उसके बाद महेन्द्रपाल द्वितीय और देवपाल शासक बनते हैं। देवपाल की अंतिम ज्ञात तिथि 948 ई० है और उसने संभवतः 950 ई० तक शासन किया। देवपाल संभवतः अन्तिम महत्वपूर्ण राजा था क्योंकि गहड़वाल राजा चन्द्रदेव के चन्द्रावती अभिलेख से यह ज्ञात होता है कि उसके पितामह यशोविग्रह ने देवपाल के वंशजों के नष्ट हो जाने के बाद बलपूर्वक कान्यकुब्ज पर अधिकार कर लिया था। यह एक विचार करने की

बात है कि देवपाल, जो अपेक्षाकृत एक कमजोर शासक था और बहुत ही अल्प समय के लिए राजगद्दी पर बैठा, किस प्रकार गहड़वाल अभिलेखों में उद्धृत किया गया है। वास्तव में देवपाल के बाद प्रतिहार वंश नष्ट नहीं हुआ था तथा अभिलेखों से ज्ञात होता है कि उसके बाद विजयपाल और तत्पश्चात् उसका पुत्र राज्यपाल शासक हुआ। किन्तु इस अवधि में प्रतिहार वंश के राज्य क्षेत्र को हड़पने वाले कई राजवंश उठ खड़े हुए थे। **राज्यपाल के शासनकाल में ही 1019 ई० में कन्नौज पर महमूद गजनवी के इस आक्रमण हुआ था।** मुस्लिम आक्रमणों का विवरण हम अगले अध्याय में देंगे। इसलिए यहां पर महमूद गजनवी के इस आक्रमण की विवेचना नहीं की जा रही है। उल्लेखनीय बात यह है कि इस आक्रमण से भी प्रतिहार वंश का समूल विनाश नहीं हुआ था क्योंकि **विक्रम संवत् 1184 (1027 ई०) के इलाहाबाद जिले में स्थित झूँसी से प्राप्त होने वाले एक अभिलेख में राज्यपाल के पुत्र त्रिलोचनपाल को 'परमभट्टारक महाराजाधिराज परमेश्वर' कहा गया है।** लेकिन त्रिलोचनपाल का कितना राजनीतिक महत्व था, यह नहीं कहा जा सकता। 1019 ई० में महमूद के आक्रमण में त्रिलोचनपाल ने भी काफी वीरता दिखायी किन्तु वह पराजित हो गया। त्रिलोचनपाल के बाद यशःपाल नामक एक अन्य प्रतिहार शासक का नाम मिलता है जिसे 'महाराजाधिराज यशःपाल' कहा गया है लेकिन यह नहीं कहा जा सकता कि इस यशपाल का त्रिलोचनपाल से क्या संबंध था। **इस प्रकार कन्नौज के गुर्जन-प्रतिहारों का ईसा की ग्यारहवीं शताब्दी के पूर्वार्द्ध में पतन हो गया और उनका स्थान गहड़वालों ने ले लिया।**

प्रतिहार काल में जहां तक अयोध्या और कोशल के इतिहास का प्रश्न है, यह निश्चयपूर्वक नहीं कहा जा सकता कि यह क्षेत्र प्रतिहार राजाओं के सीधे प्रशासन के अन्तर्गत था अथवा उनके किसी सामन्त द्वारा प्रशासित हो रहा था। इसके अतिरिक्त यह भी निश्चय के साथ नहीं कहा जा सकता कि सम्पूर्ण कोशल प्रदेश एक ही सामन्त अथवा अधिकारी द्वारा प्रशासित होता था अथवा इस क्षेत्र में कई छोटे-मोटे सामन्त शासन कर रहे थे। भौगोलिक निकटता की दृष्टि से यह स्वीकार करने में संकोच नहीं होना चाहिए कि कोशल सीधे गुजर-प्रतिहार शासकों के अन्तर्गत था।

गहड़वाल काल

अयोध्या के इतिहास की दृष्टि से गहड़वाल युग अत्यधिक महत्वपूर्ण है। यद्यपि इस समय भी अयोध्या के सम्बन्ध में अधिक आभिलेखिक अथवा साहित्यिक साक्ष्य उपलब्ध नहीं है फिर भी अनेक स्थलों पर ऐसे उल्लेख मिलते हैं जिनसे अयोध्या के इतिहास पर थोड़ा बहुत प्रकाश पड़ता है। गहड़वाल शासक स्वयं को काशी और उत्तर कोसल आदि तीर्थों का पालन करने वाला कहते हैं और उनका यह कथन इस दृष्टि से और महत्वपूर्ण हो जाता है कि इस युग में पश्चिम से मुस्लिम आक्रमण बार-बार हो रहे थे। अभी हाल ही में 6 दिसम्बर 1992 को अयोध्या में राम-जन्मभूमि स्थल स्थित ढांचे को गिराते समय उसकी दीवारों के अन्दर चिने गए पत्थर के फलक पर उत्कीर्ण बीच पंक्तियों का एक गहड़वाल कालीन अभिलेख प्राप्त हुआ है। इसमें यह कहा गया है कि पश्चिम से आने वाली भीति (आक्रमणों) को प्रत्यावर्तित किया गया तथा अयोध्या में विष्णुहरि का एक विशाल मंदिर बनवाया गया। इस प्रकार अयोध्या गहड़वाल राजवंश के शासनकाल में उनके द्वारा ही आरक्षित रही।

यशोविग्रह

गहड़वाल अभिलेखों के अनुसार, इस वंश के प्रथम पुरुष का नाम यशोविग्रह था जो चन्द्रदेव का पितामह था। उसके विषय में कहा गया है कि उसने पृथ्वी को जीतकर उसे अपनी दण्डप्रणयिनी बनाया। प्रायः यह माना जाता है कि **यशोविग्रह ने ग्यारहवीं शताब्दी ई. के मध्य में शासन किया था।** किसी अन्य प्रमाण के अभाव में यही भी माना गया है कि **उसने लगभग 25 वर्ष शासन किया होगा।**

महीचन्द्र

यशोविग्रह का पुत्र महीचन्द्र का पिता था। इसका वर्णन भी गहड़वाल अभिलेखों में साधारण ढंग से एक विजयी राजा के रूप में किया गया है तथा यह कहा गया है कि उसका यश समुद्र के पार तक फैल चुका था। महाराजपुत्र गोविन्दचन्द्र के ताम्रपत्राभिलेख में उसे 'नृप' कहा गया है तथा यह बताया गया है कि उसने अनेक शत्रुओं पर विजय प्राप्त की थी। इस अभिलेख में उसे महीतल नाम दिया गया है। इस प्रकार इतिहासकारों का यह मानना है कि यशोविग्रह तथा महीचन्द्र दोनों ही सामन्त शासक थे और किसी बड़े राजा की अधीनता स्वीकारत करते थे। संभवतः इनका स्वामी कल्चुरि शासक लक्ष्मीकर्ण (1042-1070 ई०) था जिसका

उत्तराधिकारी यशःकर्ण था। महीचन्द्र ने भी संभवतः ग्यारहवीं शताब्दी ई० के तीसरे चरण में शासन किया होगा।

चन्द्र देव

चन्द्रदेव गहड़वाल राजवंश का प्रथम प्रतापी राजा था। उसका पहला अभिलेख चन्द्रावती से मिला है और उस पर विक्रम संवत् 1148 (1090 ई.) की तिथि पड़ी हुई है। इस अभिलेख में उसे 'परम भट्टारक महाराजाधिराज परमेश्वर परमाहेश्वर निजभुजोपार्जित श्रीकान्यकुब्जाधिपत्य श्रीचन्द्रदेवविजयी' कहा गया है। इससे यह अनुमान लगाया जा सकता है कि 1090 ई० के काफी पहले ही उसका शासन प्रारम्भ हो चुका था। प्रायः सभी गहड़वाल अभिलेखों में उसे काशी (वाराणसी), कुशिक (कन्यकुब्ज या कन्नौज), उत्तरकोशल (अयोध्या) तथा इन्द्रस्थानीयक आदि तीर्थों का पालन करने वाला कहा गया है। अधिकांश विद्वान् इन्द्रस्थानीयक को इन्द्रप्रस्थ अथवा दिल्ली ही मानते हैं। इस समय दिल्ली पर तोमरों का राज्य था और उसके बाद चाहमानों का शासन हुआ। तोमरों के किसी भी अभिलेख से इस बात की झलक नहीं मिलती कि दिल्ली पर गहड़वालों ने शासन स्थापित किया हो और तोमरों को अपदस्थ किया हो। फिर भी, चन्द्रावती अभिलेख में उल्लिखित इन्द्रस्थानीयक को यदि दिल्ली माना जाए तो यही स्वीकार करना पड़ेगा कि चन्द्रदेव तुर्कों के आक्रमण के विरुद्ध अभियान करते हुए दिल्ली तक पहुँचा होगा और उसकी रक्षा की होगी।

चन्द्रदेव ने किन परिस्थितियों में इस विस्तृत भू-भाग पर शासन प्रारम्भ किया, इसके विषय में कुछ संकेत महाराजपुत्र गोविन्दचन्द्र के बसाही ताम्रपत्राभिलेख से प्राप्त होता है जिसमें यह कहा गया है कि भोज की मृत्यु के पश्चात् तथा कर्ण की कीर्ति के अवशेष के नष्ट होने पर जब पृथ्वी कठिनाई में पड़ गई थी तो चन्द्रदेव ने उसकी रक्षा की। चन्द्रावती अभिलेख में यह भी कहा गया है कि उसने अपने उदार प्रताप से समस्त प्रजोपद्रवों को शान्त करके गाधिपुर आधिराज्य को अर्जित किया तथा शत्रुओं को विध्वस्त कर दिया।

वसाही दानपत्र लेख में उल्लिखित भोज की पहचान भोज परमार से की गई है जिसने 1000 से 1050 ई० तक शासन किया था, तथा कर्ण की पहचान कल्चुरि शासक लक्ष्मीकर्ण से की गई है जिसने युद्ध में कई बार पराजित होने के बाद अपना सिंहासन 1073 ई० के पूर्व अपने

पुत्र यशःकर्ण के लिए छोड़ दिया था। लक्ष्मीकर्ण की पराजयों के बाद अन्तर्वेदी में कोई शक्तिशाली प्रतिरोध न रह जाने के कारण तथा पश्चिम से मुसलमानों के निरंतर होने वाले आक्रमणों के कारण प्रजाजनों में भय व्याप्त हो गया था। इसको शान्त करने का श्रेय चन्द्रदेव को प्राप्त हुआ। मुसलमान इतिहासकारों के उल्लेखों से यह ज्ञात होता है कि समकालीन गजनी के सुल्तान इब्राहिम ने (1059-99 ई० तक) भारत पर कई बार आक्रमण किए थे। हबीबुस्सियर नामक इतिहास लेखक का यह कहना है कि 'उसने हिन्दुस्तान पर कई बार आक्रमण किया और हर बार विजयी होकर गजनी लौटा।' ऐसे में समय में चन्द्रदेव ने तुरुष्क आक्रमणों से इन देवतीर्थों की सुरक्षा करने के लिए तथा प्रजा में व्याप्त उपद्रवों को शान्त करने के लिए शासन अपने हाथ में ले लिया।

चन्द्रदेव के शासनकाल के चार अभिलेख उपलब्ध हैं जो विक्रमी संवत् 1048, 1050, 1054 में तिथ्यांकित हैं। चन्द्रदेव को वाराणसी से दिल्ली तक के क्षेत्र का स्वामी बनने के लिए कई युद्ध करने पड़े होंगे। गहड़वाल अभिलेखों में शत्रु को नष्ट करने वाला (क्रान्तद्विषन्मण्डलः) तथा उद्धत योद्धाओं के द्वारा फैलाए गए अन्धकार को नष्ट करने वाला (विध्वस्तोद्धतधीरयोधतिमिरः) कहा गया है। चन्द्रावती के विक्रम संवत् 1150 (1093 ई०) वाले लेख में उसे नरपति, गजपति, गिरिपति तथा त्रिशंकुपति को जीतने का श्रेय दिया गया है। इनके विषय में निश्चयपूर्वक कुछ विशेष नहीं कहा जा सकता। संभवतः यह कल्चुरि राजाओं की उपाधियां थीं अथवा ये सामन्तों के कुछ विशेष वर्ग थे।

चन्द्रदेव की सबसे महत्वपूर्ण उपलब्धि कान्यकुब्ज अथवा महोदय पर अधिकार करना रहा है। कन्नौज मौखरी काल से ही अन्तर्वेदी पर शासन करने वाले शक्तिशाली सम्राटों की राजधानी रही है। हर्ष और प्रतिहार सम्राट भी कन्नौज से शासन कर रहे थे। इसी कारण प्रायः सभी आधिकारिक गहड़वाल अभिलेखों में कान्यकुब्ज की विजय को दो बार संदर्भित किया जाता रहा है। ('श्रीमद्गाधिपुराधिराज्य समदोर्विक्रमेण अर्जित' तथा 'निजभुजोपार्जित श्री कान्यकुब्जाधिपत्यं)। चन्द्रदेव के पौत्र गोविन्दचन्द्र द्वारा अपने पिता मदनपाल के शासनकाल में महाराजपुत्र के रूप में लिखाए गए बसाही अभिलेख में चन्द्रदेव के विषय में यह कहा

गया है कि उसने कान्यकुब्ज को अपनी राजधानी बनाया (कान्यकुब्जेद्राजा राजधानीमनिंदिताम)। प्रायः विद्वानों ने इस विषय पर विचार करने में अधिक समय व्यतीत किया है कि गहड़वालों की राजधानी कन्नौज में थी अथवा वाराणसी में, और इस प्रकार की संभावनाएं व्यक्त की हैं कि पहले कन्नौज को राजधानी बनाया गया और बाद में उसे वाराणसी वापस ले आया गया क्योंकि विक्रम संवत् 1101 के बसाही अभिलेख में चन्द्रदेव के द्वारा कान्यकुब्ज को राजधानी बनाने का उल्लेख आता है जबकि विक्रम संवत् 1162 के कमौली अभिलेख में इसका कोई उल्लेख नहीं मिलता । यहां पर उल्लेखनीय है कि ये दोनों ही अभिलेख चन्द्रदेव की मृत्योपरांत उसके पुत्र मदनपाल के शासनकाल में महाराजपुत्र गोविन्दचन्द्र द्वारा लिखवाए गए थे। यह एक हास्यास्पद अनुमान मात्र है। वास्तव में गहड़वालों की मुख्य राजधानी वाराणसी ही रही होगी तथा कान्यकुब्ज उनकी द्वितीय राजधानी मानी जा सकती है और उसका कारण कान्यकुब्ज को परम्परागत राजधानी के रूप में प्राप्त प्रतिष्ठा को बताया जा सकता है। ऐसा लगता है कि कान्यकुब्ज में उस समय गाधिपुराधिपति गोपाल का वंशज सामन्त के रूप में शासन कर रहा था और समय-समय पर गहड़वाल नरेश कान्यकुब्ज में भी रहते रहे होंगे।

कुछ विद्वानों ने चन्द्रदेव की पहचान उस चोदराय से करने की कोशिश की है जिसके विषय में मुस्लिम इतिहासकारों का यह कहना है कि वह गजनी के शासकों का हस्तिपाल था। डी० सी० गांगुली ने इस बात का सर्वप्रथम उल्लेख किया है और यह कहने की कोशिश की है कि चन्द्रदेव मुस्लिम आक्रमणकारियों का हस्तिपाल था और उनका करद राजा था। यद्यपि यह सिद्धान्त संदेह से परे नहीं है तथा इसका खण्डन भी किया जा चुका है फिर भी, हैन्स बेकर ने अभी हाल में ही इसकी पुनरुक्ति की है। ऐसा लगता है कि उन्होंने रोमा नियोगी द्वारा लिखित गहड़वाल राजवंश के इतिहास को देखा ही नहीं।

गांगुली ने इस घटना को अपने तर्क का आधार बनाया है जिसके अनुसार गाधिपुराधिपति गोपाल के शासनकाल में एक बार पुनः मुसलमान सेना ने अन्तर्वेदी पर आक्रमण किया था। हबीबुस्सियर के अनुसार इस आक्रमण का नेतृत्व इब्राहिम ने स्वयं किया था। लेकिन सलमान के अनुसार

उसका पुत्र महमूद इस सेना का नेतृत्व कर रहा था। जयपाल के वीरतापूर्वक प्रतिरोध के बावजूद पराजय के बाद चारों दिशाओं से राजा लोग अमीर के लिए उपहार लेकर आने लगे। उपहारों में इतने अधिक हाथी मिले कि सुल्तान को कान्यकुब्ज में एक हस्तिशाला स्थापित करनी पड़ी और चॉदराय नामक एक व्यक्ति को उसका हस्तिपाल नियुक्त किया गया। यहां पर इस चॉदराय की पहचान गहड़वाल नरेश चन्द्रदेव से की गई और गांगुली द्वारा यह सुझाव दिया गया कि

“भाग्य को चमकाने के लिए चन्द्रदेव ने मुसलमानों का साथ स्वीकार किया। प्रारम्भ में उसने महमूद के अधीन कन्नौज में हस्तिपाल के रूप में सेवा करना स्वीकार किया। लेकिन मुस्लिम सेना के प्रस्थान के तुरन्त बाद उसने बलपूर्वक कन्नौज पर अधिकार कर लिया और देश का शासक बन गया । चन्द्रदेव ने कन्नौज की राज्यसत्ता महमूद के समर्थन से इस शर्त पर प्राप्त की थी कि वह गजनी के सुल्तान को वार्षिक कर देगा। बारहवीं शताब्दी में मुसलमानों ने गहड़वाल प्रदेशों पर बार-बार आक्रमण किए। स्पष्टतः ये हमले चन्द्रदेव के वंशजों को सुल्तान को बराबर कर देने को बाध्य करने के लिए किए जाते थे।”

रोमा नियोगी ने डा०सी० गांगुली द्वारा चन्द्रदेव गहड़वाल की पहचान चॉदराय से किए जाने की आलोचना की है क्योंकि यह कई प्रकार से पूर्वअवधारणाओं पर आधारित है। सबसे पहली बात यह है कि हस्तिपाल चॉदराय के ऊपर किसी प्रकार के कर का निर्धारण किया गया था, इस बात की सूचना दीवान-ए-सलमान हबीबुस्सियर अथवा जमीउत्तवारीख में नहीं दी गई है। दूसरी बात यह है कि गहड़वाल अभिलेखों में संदर्भित 'तुरुष्क दण्ड' नामक कर की प्रकृति के विषय में कोई स्पष्ट जानकारी नहीं है लेकिन यहां यह मान लिया गया है कि गहड़वाल राजा अपनी प्रजा से 'तुरुष्क दण्ड' इसलिए वसूल करते थे कि गजनी के शासकों को कर दे सकें। तीसरी बात यह है कि गहड़वालों के राज्य क्षेत्र में तुर्कों के निरंतर आक्रमण उनसे कर वसूलने के लिए होते थे इसका भी कोई मुस्लिम अथवा भारतीय प्रमाण नहीं मिलता। उस काल में मुस्लिम आक्रमण प्रायः सभी हिन्दू राजाओं पर होते थे और उन्हें केवल गहड़वालों पर हुए आक्रमण के संदर्भ

में नहीं देखा जाना चाहिए। दीवान-ए-सलमान में मुसलमानों के गहड़वाल क्षेत्र पर होने वाले आक्रमण का विस्तार से उल्लेख किया गया है लेकिन उसमें यह कहीं नहीं कहा गया कि यह आक्रमण चॉदराय के वंशजों से कर वसूलने के लिए किया गया था। वास्तविकता तो यह है कि दीवान में चॉदराय को कन्नौज की हस्तिशाला को हस्तिपाल नियुक्त करने के उल्लेख के बाद उसके जीवन के विषय में किसी प्रकार का कोई उल्लेख नहीं किया गया है और न यह कहा गया है कि उसने कन्नौज पर जबरदस्ती कब्जा कर लिया था अथवा कर वसूलने के लिए गजनी की सेनाएं चॉदराय पर आक्रमण करती थीं। इन कारणों से चॉदराय की पहचान चन्द्रदेव से नहीं की जा सकती। यहाँ यह स्मरणीय है कि चन्द्रदेव के पिता और पितामह दोनों ही 'नृप' कहे गए हैं तथा प्रायः सभी विद्वान स्वीकार करते हैं कि वाराणसी तथा अयोध्या के क्षेत्र में चन्द्रदेव के पिता और पितामह दोनों ही 'नृप' कहे गए हैं तथा प्रायः सभी विद्वान स्वीकार करते हैं कि वाराणसी तथा अयोध्या के क्षेत्र में चन्द्रदेव के पूर्वजों का पहले से राजनीतिक अस्तित्व रहा होगा। इस प्रकार चन्द्रदेव की पहचान चॉदराय से नहीं की जा सकती जिसने मुस्लिम आक्रमणकारियों से हस्तिपाल की नौकरी स्वीकार की थी। यह चॉदराय कोई सामान्य व्यक्ति रहा होगा। दूसरी ओर चन्द्रदेव प्रारम्भ से ही मुस्लिम आक्रमणकारियों के आक्रमणों का उत्तर देने के लिए इतिहास में जाना जाता है।

विक्रम संवत् 1150 के आश्विन वदी 15 रविवार, तदनुसार 23 अक्टूबर 1093 की तिथि में अंकित चन्द्रदेव के चन्द्रावती ताम्रपत्राभिलेख में अयोध्या का कुछ उल्लेख मिलता है। चन्द्रदेव ने अयोध्या में विष्णुहरि के मंदिर में अनेक सोने के अलंकरण करवाए तथा काशी में आदिकेशव की प्रतिमा प्रतिष्ठापित कराई। इसके अतिरिक्त उत्तर कोसल स्थित अयोध्या में उसने संकल्पपूर्वक (कृतनिश्चै) भूमिदान दिया। यह कार्य आश्विन मास की अमावस्या को किया गया था जो रविवार होने के साथ-साथ सूर्यग्रहण का भी अवसर था। उल्लेखनीय है कि इसके दूसरे दिन से शारदीय नवरात्र का प्रारम्भ होता है। इस अवसर पर चन्द्रदेव ने सरयू घर्घरा नदी के तट पर स्थित स्वर्गद्वारा नामक तीर्थ पर स्नान किया (सरयूघर्घराघमर्षणे

स्वर्गद्वारनाम्नि तीर्थे स्नात्वा)। तदोपरान्त सूर्य की उपासना की (उष्णरोचिषमुपस्थाय), फिर उसने भगवान शिव की अर्चना की (ओषधीपतिशकलशेखरं समभ्यर्च्य), फिर तीन लोकों के स्वामी रक्षक वासुदेव की पूजा करके (भगवतस्त्रिभुवनत्रातुर्व्वासुदेवस्य पूजां विधाय) हवन करने के पश्चात् (प्रचुरपायसेन हविषा हविर्भुजं हुत्वा), उसने पितरों का पिण्डदान किया (पितृपिण्डयज्ञत्रिर्व्वर्त्य)। यहां यह उल्लेखनीय है कि चन्द्रदेव ने दान देने के पूर्व ऊपर उल्लिखित जो धार्मिक विधान किए जैसे ही धार्मिक विधि-विधान उसके वंशजों गोविन्दचन्द्र आदि के अभिलेखों में भी किए जाने का उल्लेख मिलता है। इस कारण यह समझना उचित नहीं होगा कि अयोध्या में दान देते समय चन्द्रदेव ने कोई विशेष प्रक्रिया अपनाई थी।”

चन्द्रदेव के उपरोक्त ताम्रपत्र से यह ज्ञात होता है कि कम-से-कम स्वर्गद्वार नाम का तीर्थ गहड़वाल युग में भी अस्तित्व में था। इससे यह भी ज्ञात होता है कि सरयू उस समय भी सरयू घर्घरा नाम से प्रचलित थी। दिनेश चन्द्र सरकार का यह मत समर्थनीय नहीं है कि अयोध्या स्वर्गद्वार तीर्थ सरयू और घाघरा के संगम पर स्थित था। वास्तविकता यह है कि सरयू-घाघरा नाम उस नदी का है जिसके किनारे अयोध्या नगर बसा हुआ है। सरयू को सरयू-घर्घरा नाम क्यों मिला इसके विषय में हम पहले अध्याय में विचार कर चुके हैं।

इस अभिलेख से यह ज्ञात नहीं होता कि चन्द्रदेव (चन्द्रादित्यदेव) ने शिव और वासुदेव की पूजा किन मन्दिरों में जाकर की थी। लेकिन इस अभिलेख के आठवें श्लोक में यह उल्लेख किया गया है कि चन्द्रदेव ने मणियों से जड़े हुए सोने के आभूषण अयोध्या में विष्णुहरि के मंदिर में चढ़ाए तथा काशी में आदिकेशव की प्रतिमा को भी स्वर्णरत्नों के आभूषणों से विभूषित किया। इस प्रकार चन्द्रदेव के समय में अयोध्या में विष्णुहरि के मंदिर के अस्तित्व में होने का निश्चय होता है। बाद में गाविन्दचन्द्र के काल में उसके पुनर्निर्माण का उल्लेख 1992 में प्राप्त अयोध्या अभिलेख में मिलता है जिससे यह स्पष्ट होता है कि विष्णुहरि का मंदिर जन्मस्थान मन्दिर ही था।

मदनपाल देव

चन्द्रदेव के पश्चात् उसका पुत्र मदनपाल सिंहासनरुढ़ हुआ। चन्द्रदेव के

शासनकाल का अन्तिम अभिलेख 1156 विक्रम संवत् में तिथ्यांकित है (1100 ई०) और मदनपाल के शासन काल का पहला अभिलेख 1161 संवत् (1103 ई०) में तिथ्यांकित है। इस कारण यह माना जाता है कि मदनपाल 1100 और 1103 ई० के बीच में किसी समय शासनारूढ़ हुआ था। लेकिन सबसे उल्लेखनीय बात यह है कि 1103 ई० में जारी किया गया बसाही का ताम्रपत्राभिलेख मदनपाल के पुत्र गोविन्दचन्द्र के द्वारा जारी किया गया था। उसी प्रकार संवत् 1154 (1097 ई०) में जारी किया गया बंगाल एशियाटिक सोसाइटी का ताम्रपत्राभिलेख मदनपाल के द्वारा अपने पिता के जीवनकाल में लिखवाया गया था। इस अभिलेख में मदनपाल को समस्त राजकीय उपाधियों से उल्लिखित किया गया है (श्रीचन्द्रदेवपादानुध्यात परम भट्टारक महाराजाधिराजपरमेश्वर परममाहेश्वर श्रीमन्मदनपाल देव)। इससे यह सिद्ध होता है कि मदनपाल का राज्याभिषेक चन्द्रदेव के जीवनकाल में ही 1097 ई० के पहले ही हो चुका था। यद्यपि यह दान चन्द्रदेव ने ही किया था किन्तु इसका प्रकाशन मदनपाल ने अपनी मुद्रा से करवाया था और निबन्धित करवाया था। ऐसा लगता है कि चन्द्रदेव काफी वृद्ध हो चुका था और इस कारण अपने जीवनकाल में ही उसने अपने पुत्र को राज्याभिषिक्त करवा दिया था। चन्द्रदेव इस अभिलेख के कम-से-कम दो वर्ष के बाद तक भी जीवित रहा। इसका प्रमाण उसके चन्द्रावती ताम्रपत्राभिलेख से प्राप्त होता है जो विक्रम संवत् 1156 (1100 ई०) में तिथ्यांकित है।

मदनपालदेव के शासनकाल से कुल छः अभिलेख प्रकाश में आए हैं जिसमें बंगाल एशियाटिक सोसाइटी का ऊपर उल्लिखित ताम्रपत्राभिलेख, उसने अपने पिता के जीवनकाल में प्रचलित करवाया था। इसके अतिरिक्त उसका विक्रम संवत् 1164 में प्रकाशित बड़ेरा ताम्रपत्राभिलेख मात्र ऐसा अभिलेख है जो उसके द्वारा अकेले नाम पर जारी करवाया गया था। इसके अतिरिक्त तीन अन्य ताम्रपत्राभिलेख मदनपाल के शासनकाल में प्रचारित किए गए और ये तीनों ही राजपुत्र गोविन्दचन्द्र के द्वारा लिखवाए गए थे। बसाही के ताम्रपत्राभिलेख में उसे राजपुत्र तो कहा ही गया है साथी ही राजाओं का तिलक भी कहा गया है। इसके अतिरिक्त विक्रम संवत् 1066 में तिथ्यांकित राइन ताम्रपत्राभिलेख में भी उसे महाराजपुत्र कहा गया है। मदनपाल के काल का छठा दानपत्र विक्रम संवत् 1164 का बताया जाता है जिसमें महारानी पृथ्वीश्रीका के दान का उल्लेख है। इसे 'टेरीएण्ड कम्पनी'

का अभिलेख कहा गया है लेकिन अब यह उपलब्ध नहीं है। श्री बेंजाल ने जर्नल आफ रॉयल एशियाटिक सोसाइटी (1866) में इसका जिक्र करते हुए यह लिखा है कि इसकी भाषा विक्रम संवत् 1162 के कमौली दानपत्र से मिलती-जुलती है और संभवतः इसे भी गोविन्दचन्द्र ने प्रचलित करवाया होगा।

प्रारम्भ में केवल वे ही चार ताम्रपत्राभिलेख उपलब्ध थे जिनको महाराजपुत्र गोविन्दचन्द्र ने उत्कीर्ण करवाया था। इसके कारण विद्वानों में यह धारणा बलवती हुई कि संभवतः मदनपाल ने शासन ही नहीं किया था। और इस कारण यह अनुमान लगाया गया कि वह बीमार या अशक्त था। अतः शासन-सूत्र राजपुत्र गोविन्दचन्द्र को संभालना पड़ा तथा बसाही दानपत्र में उल्लिखित पुरोहित जागुक, महत्तक बालहन तथा प्रतिहार गौतम के समर्थन से दानपत्र निर्गत किए जाने लगे थे। और संभवतः शासन प्रबन्ध के लिए युवराज, रानी राल्हादेवी तथा पुरोहित प्रतिहार और महत्तक की एक समिति बनवाई गई थी। **लेकिन बडेरा का ताम्रपत्राभिलेख 1926 में प्राप्त हुआ तथा 1941 में प्रकाशित हुआ जिससे यह निश्चित माने जाने लगा कि परमभट्टारक, परमेश्वर, परमामाहेश्वर श्रीमान् मदनपालदेव ने वास्तव में शासन किया था।** लेकिन आश्चर्य की बात यह है कि किसी का ध्यान बंगाल एशियाटिक सोसाइटी के उस ताम्रपत्राभिलेख की ओर नहीं गया जिसमें मदनपाल को उन समस्त राजकीय उपाधियों के साथ प्रस्तुत किया गया है जिसका उल्लेख हम पहले कर आए हैं। इस प्रकार यह निश्चयपूर्वक कहा जा सकता है कि मदनपाल ने भी काफी लम्बे समय तक शासन किया होगा और अपने पिता के जीवनकाल में ही उसका राज्याभिषेक करा दिया गया होगा। उल्लेखनीय है कि चन्द्रदेव के काफी लम्बे समय तक जीवित रहा होने के कारण उसका पुत्र मदनपाल प्रौढावस्था में ही शासक बना होगा।

गहड़वाल वंश में मदनपाल ही वह पहला राजा है जिसने चांदी और तांबे के सिक्के चलवाए थे। उसके सिक्के वृषभ और अश्वारोही प्रकार के हैं जो उस समय उत्तर भारत में प्रचलन में थे। इनके पुरोभाग पर अश्वारोही का भद्दा चित्र है तथा उसके चारों ओर राजा का नाम 'मदनदेव' लिखा मिलता है। लेकिन किसी भी सिक्के पर पूरा नाम नहीं मिलता। कहीं मदन कहीं 'मद' और 'श्रीम'

मिलता है। पृष्ठभाग पर बैठे हुए वृषभ की रेखाकृति है जिस पर 'माधव श्री सामन्त' (अथवा 'माधव' 'श्रीसाम' अथवा 'माध') मिलता है। मदनपाल के चांदी के सिक्के अत्यधिक विरल हैं जिनमें प्रायः भारी मिलावट होती है। थामस ने इस राजा के एक सिक्के को चाँदी और तांबे का बताया है तथा कनिंघम ने एक-दूसरे सिक्के को विलोन का बताया है। इनका भारत भारतीय मान के अनुसार 32 रत्ती का होता है। लेकिन वास्तव में 1025 ग्रा० से लेकर 1.62 ग्रा० के भार वाले सिक्के मिले हैं जबकि 32 रत्ती लगभग 2 ग्रा० का होता है।

कुछ विद्वानों ने यह अनुमान लगाया है कि मदनपाल के शासनकाल में तुरुष्क आक्रमणकारियों ने आक्रमण करके कन्नौज पर विजय प्राप्त कर ली थी और मदनपाल को बंदी बना लिया था। गोविन्दचन्द्र ने मुक्तिधन देकर मदनपाल को मुक्त कराया था। इस मत की प्रबल समर्थक रोमा नियोगी हैं जिनके तर्कों का संक्षिप्त विवरण इस प्रकार है।

रोमा नियोगी के अनुसार, बसाही दानपत्र में यह उल्लिखित है कि चन्द्रदेव ने कान्यकुब्ज को अपनी राजधानी बना लिया था (कन्याकुब्जे करोद्राजा राजधानीमनिंदिताम्)। उनका यह अनुमान है कि यह दानपत्र मदनपाल के शासनकाल में विक्रम संवत् 1161 में लिखवाया गया था, तथा विचित्र बात यह है कि कर्मौली दानपत्र में यह श्लोक नहीं मिलता यद्यपि अन्य सभी श्लोक वैसे ही मिलते हैं। वास्तव में कोई भी गहड़वाल लेख कान्यकुब्ज को राजधानी नहीं बताता। इस प्रकार उन्होंने यह अनुमान लगाया है कि 25 दिसम्बर 1104 ई० (बसाही दानपत्र की तिथि) तथा 24 अक्टूबर 1105 ई० (कर्मौली दानपत्र की तिथि) के बीच में किसी समय गहड़वालों को राजधानी कान्यकुब्ज को छोड़ना पड़ा होगा तथा गोविन्दचन्द्र को 1105 ई० में नगर को पुनः प्राप्त करने के लिए युद्ध करना पड़ा। वे राहन दानपत्र में इसका कारण खोजती है जिसमें यह उल्लेख आता है कि असमान युद्ध के बार-बार होने के कारण हम्मीर को अपना वैर छोड़ना पड़ा (हम्मीरं न्यस्वैरं मुहुरसमरणक्रीडया यो विधते)। उनके अनुसार, हम्मीर अथवा अमीर (मुस्लिम सेनापति) जो विक्रम संवत् 1166 के पूर्व गोविन्दचन्द्र द्वारा पराजित किया गया था, गजनी का सुल्तान मसूद इब्न इब्राहिम (तृतीय, 1099 से 1115 ई०) अथवा उसका कोई अधिकारी रहा होगा। तबकात-ए-नासरी के अनुसार, इस सुल्तान के शासनकाल में हाजिब तुधातगीन ने गंगा पार करके हिन्दुस्तान के उन क्षेत्रों तक जेहाद छोड़ा जहां

सुल्तान महमूद के अतिरिक्त अन्य किसी की सेनाएं नहीं पहुँची थीं। समकालीन कवि सलमान ने अपने दीवान में इस घटना का विवरण इस प्रकार दिया है:—

इस्लाम की सहायता से मसूद ने एक सेना खड़ी की। जेहाद के लिए उसने हिन्दुस्तान पर धावा बोला। हिन्द के शासक खुदा के मारे हुए मल्ही को बन्दी बनाया, कन्नौज हिन्द की राजधानी थी जिसे काफिर अपना ध्रुवतारा मानते थे। यह सुमनियों का काबा था और काफिरों का किबला था। सारे हिन्द की धनराशि यहां जमा होती थी जैसे कि सभी नदियां समुद्र में मिलती हैं। मल्ही के पास सेना, धन, हाथी, हथियार क्या कुछ नहीं था।

रोमा नियोगी ने मल्ही अथवा मल्हीर को मदन का अपभ्रंश माना है। वे कुछ लोगों के इस सुझाव का विरोध करती हैं कि यह मल्ही विक्रम संवत् 1176 में जारी किए गए दानपत्र का मदन रहा होगा। उनके अनुसार, मल्ही को हिन्द का शासक कहा गया है तथा कान्यकुब्ज को हिन्द की राजधानी बताया गया है। इस कारण पराजित राजा स्वयं गहड़वाल शासक रहा होगा। इस कारण पराजित राजा स्वयं गहड़वाल शासक रहा होगा। इस प्रकार वे यह परिणाम निकालती हैं कि विक्रम संवत् 1161-62 में गजनी के सुल्तान मसूद तृतीय की सेना का नूतत्व करते हुए हाजिब तुघातगीन कान्यकुब्ज तक चढ़ आया और यदि कवि सलमान पर विश्वास किया जाए तो उसने गहड़वाल राजा मदनपाल को बन्दी बना लिया तथा प्रत्यर्पण राशि पाने के बाद छोड़ा।

यहां पर रोमा नियोगी के उपरोक्त सिद्धान्त में कई कमियां हैं जो हमारा ध्यान आकृष्ट करती हैं। बसाही के दानपत्राभिलेख में चन्द्रदेव के विषय में जो यह कहा गया है कि उसने कान्यकुब्ज को अपनी राजधानी बनाया वह किसी दूसरे संदर्भ में स्वीकार नहीं किया जाना चाहिए। वास्तव में समस्त गहड़वाल लेखों में चन्द्रदेव का वर्णन करते समय यह उल्लेख मिलता है कि उसने अपने बाहुविक्रम से कान्यकुब्ज का राज्य प्राप्त किया। बसाही दानपत्र लेख में इसी बात का उल्लेख ठीक उसी स्थान पर यह कहकर किया गया है कि उसने कान्यकुब्ज को अपनी राजधानी बनाया। यह एक सामान्य उल्लेख विभिन्न प्रकार की शब्द-रचना में नए श्लोक के रूप में बसाही दानपत्र में आता है। इसके आधार पर अनुमान

लगाना कि कमौली अभिलेख में राजधानी शब्द नहीं आता इसलिए कान्यकुब्ज राजधानी के रूप में गहड़वालों से छिन गया था, पंक्तियों के बीच में पढ़ने का प्रयास कहा जाएगा। वास्तव में कमौली दानपत्र लेख के बाद के किसी भी गहड़वाल अभिलेख में कान्यकुब्ज के राजधानी होने का उल्लेख नहीं आता, तो क्या इसका यह अर्थ निकाला जा सकता है कि बाद में फिर कभी कन्नौज गहड़वालों की राजधानी नहीं बन सका?

दूसरी बात मल्ही की पहचान मदनपाल से करने से सम्बन्धित है। किसी भी भाषा-शास्त्रीय दृष्टिकोण से मदन का अपभ्रंश मल्ही नहीं बनाया जा सकता। यदि मल्ही के समीप कोई नाम आता है तो वह चन्द्रदेव के पिता महीचन्द्र का नाम हो सकता है जिसका दूसरा रूप महीयल या महीतल आदि लेखों में प्राप्त होता है।

गोविन्दचन्द्र

यद्यपि गोविन्दचन्द्र ने अपने पिता के जीवनकाल में ही शासन-सूत्र संभाल लिया था तथा उसको भी एक युवराज के रूप में महत्वपूर्ण अधिकार प्राप्त थे लेकिन वह अपने पिता की भांति अपने पिता के जीवनकाल में राजपद पर अभिषिक्त नहीं हुआ था। उसका पितामह चन्द्रदेव लम्बी आयु तक जीवित रहा। इस कारण उसका पिता काफी प्रौढ़ावस्था में ही राजा बन पाया होगा और बहुत संभावना इस बात की कही जा सकती है कि वह भी अपने शासनकाल में यौवनोचित तेजस्विता खो चुका रहा हो जिसके कारण गोविन्दचन्द्र को कुछ अधिक ही अधिकार प्राप्त रहे हों। इसकी सूचना राजपुत्र के रूप में जारी किए गए गोविन्दचन्द्र के दानपत्रों से मिलती है। गोविन्दचन्द्र की माता का नाम राल्हादेवी था जिसका उल्लेख विक्रम संवत् 1179 के कमौली ताम्रपत्राभिलेख में मिलता है। मदनपाल की एक अन्य रानी पृथ्वीश्रीका के विषय में भी हमको विक्रम संवत् 1164 के बहुवरा दानपत्र से ज्ञात होता है कि जिसे 'टेरी एण्ड कम्पनी' का दानपत्र भी कहा जाता है। किन्तु यह मूल लेख अब उपलब्ध नहीं है। **गोविन्दचन्द्र गहड़वाल राजवंश का सबसे महान् शासक था।** उसने लगभग आधी शताब्दी तक उत्तर भारत की राजनीति को प्रभावित किया। एक युवराज के रूप में अपने पिता के शासन-काल में ही उसने जो सफलताएं प्राप्त कीं उसके कारण उसे अभिलेखों में "समस्तराजप्रक्रियोपेत" कहा गया है। उसका औपचारिक राज्याभिषेक 1109 ई० से 1114 ई० के बीच में किसी समय हुआ होगा क्योंकि युवराज के रूप में उसका अंतिम राहन

दानपत्र विक्रम संवत् 1166 (1109 ई०) में जारी किया गया था तथा महाराजाधिराज के रूप में पालि ताम्रपत्रालेख विक्रम संवत् 1171 (1114 ई०) में जारी किया गया था। अतः उसका राज्यभिषेक तथा उसके पिता मदनपाल की मृत्यु इन्हीं दो तिथियों के मध्य रखी जा सकती है। गोविन्दचन्द्र के द्वारा जारी किया गया अन्तिम गौली दानपत्र वि.स. 1211 (1154 ई०) का है जबकि उसके पुत्र विजयचन्द्र का पहला दानपत्र सि०सं० 1217 में (1160 ई०) में जारी किया गया था। इस प्रकार युवराज के रूप में उसका प्रथम दानपत्र वि०स० 1161 (1104 ई०) में जारी किया गया था। इस प्रकार गोविन्दचन्द्र को उत्तर भारत की राजनीति में कार्य करने का लगभग 56 वर्ष का कार्यकाल प्राप्त हुआ।

पुरातात्विक स्रोत

उसके शासनकाल के लगभग 45 अभिलेख प्राप्त हैं जो उसके युवराज काल में लिखवाए गए तीन अभिलेखों के अतिरिक्त हैं। इस कारण यह निश्चयपूर्वक कहा जा सकता है कि गोविन्दचन्द्र ने अपने राजवंश में सबसे अधिक दानपत्र लिखवाए। लेकिन इन दानपत्रों में एक उसकी रानी कुमारदेवी द्वारा पाषाण-खण्ड पर लिखवाई गई सारनाथ से प्राप्त प्रशस्ति भी शामिल है तथा तीन अभिलेख उसके राजकुमारों के द्वारा तथा एक किसी अन्य व्यक्ति द्वारा लिखवाया गया है। ...

साहित्यिक स्रोत

इन पुरातात्विक साक्ष्यों के अतिरिक्त गोविन्दचन्द्र के महासान्धिविग्रहिक लक्ष्मीधर द्वारा लिखित कृत्य-कल्पतरु ग्रन्थ भी उपलब्ध है जिसके विषय में लेखक का यह कथन है कि उसकी मंत्रणा ने राजा को यश प्राप्त करवाया (तत् सर्वं खलु यस्य मंत्रमहिमाश्चर्यं सह लक्ष्मीधरः) इसके अतिरिक्त लक्ष्मीधर यह भी कहता है कि उसने काशी के राजा के शत्रुओं से सफलतापूर्वक युद्ध किया था (नीताकाश्याधिपस्ययेन रिपुवस्ते ब्रह्मचर्यपरम्)। इस प्रकार गोविन्दचन्द्र का महासान्धिविग्रहिक लक्ष्मीधर केवल लेखक और एक विद्वान ही नहीं वरन् एक योद्धा तथा राजनीतिकुशल व्यक्ति भी था। अपनी पुस्तक के अन्त में 'व्यवहारकाण्ड' के अन्त में लक्ष्मीधर यह कहता है कि उसने कृत्यकल्पतरु की रचना गोविन्दचन्द्र के आदेश पर की थी (महाराजाधिराज गोविन्दचन्द्र देवादिष्टेन . . . श्री लक्ष्मीधर भट्टेनविरचितं . .

)। इस प्रकार यह ग्रंथ भी गोविन्दचन्द्र के शासनकाल के इतिहास का एक स्रोत है। एक अन्य ग्रन्थ नयचन्द्र द्वारा विरचित रम्भामंजरी नाटक है जिसमें गोविन्दचन्द्र के शासनकाल के कुछ उल्लेख मिलते हैं। यहां यह उल्लेखनीय है कि अभी हाल ही में अयोध्या से प्राप्त अभिलेख में नयचन्द्र नामक एक व्यक्ति को गोविन्दचन्द्र द्वारा साकेत मण्डल के अधिपति के रूप में नियुक्त किए जाने का उल्लेख मिलता है जो अल्हण का भतीजा बताया गया है। इस बात की सम्भावना की जा सकती है कि यह नयचन्द्र रम्भामंजरी नाटक का लेखक नयचन्द्र हो सकता है। इसके अतिरिक्त गोविन्दचन्द्र के शासनकाल के सम्बन्ध में कुछ उल्लेख अन्य समकालीन राजवंशों के अभिलेखों से भी प्राप्त होते हैं। मुस्लिम इतिहासकारों के कुछ उल्लेख भी प्रत्यक्ष अथवा अप्रत्यक्ष रूप से गोविन्दचन्द्र के शासनकाल पर प्रकाश डालते हैं। लेकिन अधिकांश मुस्लिम आक्रमणों में आक्रान्ताओं को मुँह की खानी पड़ी थी तथा मुस्लिम इतिहासकारों द्वारा मुस्लिम शासकों की पराजयों का उल्लेख न करने की प्रवृत्ति के कारण अनेक युद्धों का उन्होंने उल्लेख तक नहीं किया है जो गोविन्दचन्द्र और मुस्लिम आक्रान्ताओं के बीच लड़े गए थे।

मुस्लिम आक्रमण

गोविन्दचन्द्र ने युवराज के रूप में जब से शासन कार्य प्रारम्भ किया तभी से उसने अपनी प्रशासनिक प्रतिभा और सामरिक कुशलता का प्रदर्शन प्रारम्भ कर दिया था। यद्यपि उसने आसपास के राज्यों पर अपनी धाक जमा ली थी तथा अनेक राजवंशों को पराजित करके उनके राज्यक्षेत्र अपने शासन के अन्तर्गत शामिल कर लिए थे, फिर भी, उसकी सामरिक प्रतिभा का प्रदर्शन पश्चिम से होने वाले मुस्लिम आक्रमणों के प्रत्यावर्तन में दिखाई पड़ता है। कुछ इतिहासकारों ने यह दिखाने का प्रयास किया है कि गजनी के यामिनी सुल्तानों की सेना ने कान्यकुब्ज पर आक्रमण करके अस्थायी रूप से उस नगर को अपने अधिकार में कर लिया था और संभवतः गोविन्दचन्द्र के पिता मदनपाल को बन्दी बना लिया था। किन्तु पीछे हम यह देख आए हैं कि इस प्रकार की कल्पना में कोई सच्चाई नहीं है तथा मुसलमानों द्वारा कान्यकुब्ज पर आक्रमण, अधिकार तथा मदनपाल के बन्दी बनाए जाने के पीछे कोई तथ्यात्मक प्रमाण नहीं उपलब्ध हैं। इस कारण रोमा नियोगी का यह कहना कि यामिनी सुल्तानों द्वारा कान्यकुब्ज की पराजय से गहड़वालों को एक धक्का लगा था, उचित नहीं होगा।

गहड़वाल राजवंश के प्रथम शासक चन्द्रदेव के अभिलेखों में जो यह उल्लेख मिलता है कि उसने काशी, कान्यकुब्ज, अयोध्या तथा इन्द्रस्थानीयक आदि तीर्थों परिपालन (संरक्षण) किया था, यह दर्शाता है कि मुस्लिम आक्रमणकारियों के द्वारा इन तीर्थों की सुरक्षा को खतरा उत्पन्न हो गया था और ऐसे समय में चन्द्रदेव ने उत्तर भारत के बड़े भू-खण्ड पर आधिपत्य स्थापित करने का जो कार्य किया उसके पीछे इन तीर्थ क्षेत्रों की मुस्लिम आक्रान्ताओं से सुरक्षा ही मुख्य उद्देश्य था। यह कार्य उसके पुत्र मदनपाल तथा पौत्र गोविन्दचन्द्र के शासनकाल में सफलतापूर्वक किया जाता रहा। अयोध्या से प्राप्त पाषाण फलक अभिलेख से यह ज्ञात होता है कि गोविन्दचन्द्र के समय में पश्चिम से आने वाले भीति को प्रत्यावर्तित किया गया था। इस अभिलेख में उल्लिखित यह 'पाश्चात्य भीति' निश्चय ही पश्चिम से आने वाली मुस्लिम आक्रमण के भय की ओर संकेत करती है।

पश्चिम से होने वाले मुस्लिम आक्रमणकारियों का केन्द्र बिन्दु गजनी था जहां पर यामिनी सुल्तान शासन कर रहे थे। गोविन्दचन्द्र की शासनावधि में लगभग पाँच सुल्तानों ने गजनी पर शासन किया। यद्यपि ये सुल्तान आन्तरिक झगड़ों में व्यस्त रहे फिर भी, भारत भूमि पर लाहौर में केन्द्र स्थापित करके ये आन्तरिक भागों पर बार-बार आक्रमण करते रहे। इन आक्रमणों की प्रकृति मुख्य रूप से डाकुओं की भांति लूट-पाट के लिए आक्रमण करना और वापस चले जाने तक ही सीमित रही। वे आक्रान्त क्षेत्रों पर कभी शासन स्थापित नहीं कर सके। भारतीय राजवंश भी इसे खेल के रूप में लेते रहे। गोविन्दचन्द्र के यौवराज काल में लिखवाए गए 1109 ई० के राहन दानपत्राभिलेख में यह स्पष्ट रूप से कहा गया है कि 'मुहूरसमरणक्रीड़ा' में हार जाने के कारण अमीर को वैर त्याग देना पड़ा। (हम्मीर शब्द अरबी शब्द अमीर का भारतीय रूप है)। लेकिन इस उल्लेख में रणक्रीड़ा शब्द ध्यान देने योग्य है जिसके आधार पर यह अनुमान लगाया जा सकता है कि भारतीय इसे युद्ध का खेल ही मानते थे क्योंकि मुस्लिम आक्रान्ता अचानक प्रकट होते और जनता को लूटते-पाटते तथा गुलाम बनाने के लिए बन्दी करते और राजा की सेना से सामना होने पर थोड़ा-बहुत युद्ध करके भाग खड़े होते। लेकिन

इस उल्लेख में दो शब्द सबसे महत्वपूर्ण हैं वे हैं – 'मुहूर' और 'असम'। मुहूर का अर्थ होता है बार-बार तथा असम का अर्थ होता है असमान शक्ति। मुस्लिम आक्रान्ता लूट-पाट के इरादे से थोड़ी सी भी सेना एकत्र कर पाने के बाद इस प्रकार की लूटपाट के लिए निकल पड़ते थे और जमकर युद्धों में सामना नहीं करते थे। जहां कहीं पर उनका सफलता मिल जाती वहां उनके दरबारी इतिहासकार विजयघोष के साथ उनकी सफलता का उल्लेख करते तथा साथ ही वे इन तीन बातों का भी उल्लेख करना नहीं भूलते – 1. कितने हिन्दुओं को मारा और गुलाम बनाया, 2. कितने ऊँटों पर धन-दौलत लादकर वापस ले गए, तथा 3. कितने हिन्दू देव मंदिरों को ध्वस्त किया (तथा अवसर मिलने पर उनके ऊपर मस्जिदों का निर्माण कराया)। इस अभिलेख में हम्मीर द्वारा शत्रुता छोड़ देने का जो संकेत किया गया है वह यही बताता है कि गहड़वाल सेना द्वारा पराजित होने के बाद कुछ वर्षों तक मुस्लिम आक्रान्ता इस ओर पुनः आने का साहस नहीं कर सके।

गोविन्दचन्द्र के समकालीन जो पाँच यामिनी शासक हुए उनके नाम और शासनकाल इस प्रकार हैं—1. मसूद (तृतीय) इब्न इब्राहीम (ल01099—1115ई0), 2. शीरजाद(1115—16ई0), 3. अर्सलान शाह (1116—18ई0), 4. बहराम शाह (1118—52ई0), और 5. खुसरब शाह (1152—60ई0)। ये सुल्तान गद्दी के लिए परस्पर युद्धरत रहते थे। इनमें सबसे अधिक विनाशकारी संघर्ष अर्सलान शाह और बहराम शाह के बीच में हुआ जिसमें खुरासान के सुल्तान संजर ने मौके का लाभ उठाकर बहराम का साथ दिया और अर्सलान को भागकर भारतीय क्षेत्र में शरण लेनी पड़ी। बहराम सुल्तान संजर के संरक्षण में गजनी का सुल्तान बना। बाद में अर्सलान ने बहराम को पराजित कर दिया। किन्तु खुरासान के सुल्तान के द्वारा बहराम की सहायता किए जाने के बाद एक युद्ध में अर्सलान मारा गया। बहराम शाह ने 1118 से 1152 ई0 तक के अपने लम्बे शासनकाल में भारत पर कई आक्रमण किए ऐसा मुसलमान इतिहासकारों का कहना है। लेकिन रोमा नियोगी का यह कहना सर्वथा उचित है कि 'इन सुल्तानों द्वारा भारत पर किए जाने वाले आक्रमणों का कोई भी विस्तृत विवरण मुस्लिम इतिहासकारों ने नहीं दिया है।'

जबकि गोविन्दचन्द्र के महासान्धिविग्रहिक ने कृत्यकल्पतरु की राजप्रशस्ति में गोविन्दचन्द्र के बारे में यह लिखा है कि उसने असमान युद्ध में हम्मीर वीर को मार डाला (असम-समर-सम्पल-लम्पट शौर्यभाजाम्-अवधिरवधि-युद्धे येन हम्मीर वीर)। लक्ष्मीधर गोविन्दचन्द्र के महासान्धिविग्रहिक थे और इस कारण उन्होंने गोविन्दचन्द्र के विषय में यह जो सूचना दी है कि उन्होंने असम युद्ध में अमीर का वध कर दिया था, गलत नहीं हो सकता। लेकिन इस युद्ध में मारे गए अमीर का क्या नाम था और यह युद्ध किस समय हुआ था इसका निश्चय करना बहुत कठिन है, क्योंकि **मुस्लिम इतिहासकार अपनी पराजयों की कहानियों को प्रायः अनदेखी कर गए हैं**। राहन दानपत्र में भी, जैसा हम देख आए हैं, एक अमीर के द्वारा शत्रुता त्याग दिये जाने का उल्लेख है। ऐसा लगता है कि ये दोनों उल्लेख दो अलग-अलग समय में हुई घटनाओं से संबन्धित हैं। राहन दानपत्राभिलेख उस समय लिखवाया गया था जब गोविन्दचन्द्र एक युवराज अथवा महाराजपुत्र थे। लेकिन लक्ष्मीधर द्वारा किया गया उल्लेख गोविन्दचन्द्र के महाराजधिराज बन जाने के बाद की घटना कहा जा सकता है जिसमें आक्रमणकारी नेता मारा गया था। इस बात की संभावना तो नहीं लगती कि यह कोई यामिनी सुल्तान रहा होगा, लेकिन यह भारत में गजनी के सुल्तान का कोई प्रतिनिधि निश्चित रूप से रहा होगा। राहन दानपत्र और कृत्यकल्पतरु दोनों में ही एक बात समान रूप से देखने को मिलती है। एक में 'असम रण क्रीड़ा' और दूसरे में 'असम समर' का उल्लेख मिलता है और इन दोनों की शब्दों का एक ही अर्थ है कि इन युद्धों में दोनों सेनाओं के बल समान नहीं थे। ऐसा लगता है कि गोविन्दचन्द्र की विशाल सेना के सामने एक बार तो आक्रान्ता को भाग जाना पड़ा और दूसरी बार के युद्ध में वह मारा गया।

....

गोविन्दचन्द्र के सामन्त एवं समकालीन

कुमारदेवी के सारनाथ अभिलेख में यह उल्लेख है कि उसने वाराणसी की रक्षा के लिए कार्य किया। लक्ष्मीधर के कृत्यकल्पतरु में भी यह उल्लेख है कि वह शत्रुओं से काशी की रक्षा के लिए लड़ा। ये दोनों ही उल्लेख यह संकेत करते हैं कि काशी पर भी तुरुष्क आक्रमणकारियों का धावा हुआ था जिनसे काशी की रक्षा के लिए गोविन्दचन्द्र को लड़ना पड़ा। रोमा नियोगी का यह विचार है की

गोविन्दचन्द्र के शासनकाल में गहड़वाल राज्य का पश्चिमी सीमान्त काफी सुरक्षित रहा होगा क्योंकि दिल्ली में तोमर उसके अधीन राज्य कर रहे थे। बदायूँ में राष्ट्रकुट थे तथा कान्यकुब्ज में गाधिपुराधिति गोपाल के वंशज राज्य कर रहे थे। संभवतः गहड़वाल शासक की यह सुविचारित नीति रही हो कि पश्चिमी सीमान्त को इन शासकों के अधीन छोड़ दिया जाए जिससे वे तुरुष्कों से पहले निपट लें। लेकिन, भारतीय सामन्तवाद के अनुसार एक बड़े राजा के अधीन अनेक छोटे-बड़े सामन्त हुआ करते थे जो स्थानीय प्रशासन अपनी रूचि के अनुसार चलाते थे और उनके दैनन्दिन कार्यों में अधिराजा का कोई हस्तक्षेप नहीं होता था। ये सभी सामन्त अपनी-अपनी सेना के साथ अधिराज की सेना का निर्माण करते थे। आवश्यकता पड़ने पर एक साथ एक होते थे। इस कारण यह कहना उचित नहीं है कि पश्चिम में गोविन्दचन्द्र ने इन तीनों राजवंशों को जान-बूझकर इसलिए छोड़ दिया था कि वे तुरुष्क आक्रमणों का पहले सामना करेंगे। वास्तव में सम्पूर्ण गहड़वाल साम्राज्य क्षेत्र में सैकड़ों छोटे-मोटे राजवंश शासन करते रहे होंगे जिनमें से केवल कुछ के विषय में ही हमें अभिलेखों अथवा अन्य स्रोतों से सूचना मिल पाती है। इन सामन्तों के बावाजूद साम्राज्य की स्थायी सेना सीमान्तों पर नियुक्त रहती होगी। लेकिन इसके बावजूद तुरुष्क आक्रमणकारी किसी प्रकार काशी अथवा अयोध्या अथवा मथुरा तक आक्रमण करने में सफल हो जाते होंगे जिनको उल्लेख कभी-कभी भारतीय स्रोतों से हमें ज्ञात होता है।

गोविन्दचन्द्र का साम्राज्य पूर्व में पटना और मुंगेर तक विस्तृत था और इस दृष्टि से कभी-कभी उसका संघर्ष गौड़ के पाल राजाओं से भी हुआ था। पटना के निकट मोनेर नामक स्थान से प्राप्त वि०सं० 1183 (1124 ई०) लेख से यह ज्ञात होता है कि इस समय तक बिहार में कम-से-कम पटना का क्षेत्र उसके शासनान्तर्गत आ गया था। इसके अतिरिक्त उत्तर प्रदेश में स्थित लार से प्राप्त वि०सं० 1202 (1146 ई०) के एक अभिलेख से यह ज्ञात होता है कि इस वर्ष उसने मुग्दगिरी (मुंगेर, बिहार) से इस लेख का प्रकाशन किया था। यह उल्लेखनीय है कि गोविन्दचन्द्र के पिता मदनपाल के शासनकाल में यह क्षेत्र बंगाल के पाल राजा रामपाल के अधीन था। लेकिन किसी समय गोविन्दचन्द्र ने इस क्षेत्र पर अपना अधिकार कर लिया था। दक्षिण में उसने

त्रिपुरी के हैहय कल्चुरि राजा को हराकर उसका क्षेत्र अपने राज्य में मिला लिया था। कल्चुरि राजा यशःकर्ण को उसके पितामह चन्द्रदेव ने परास्त किया था। वि०सं० 1177 (1120 ई०) के बंगाल एशियाटिक सोसाइटी के दानपत्र से यह ज्ञात होता है कि गोविन्दचन्द्र ने कल्चुरि राजा यशःकर्ण के द्वारा अपने गुरु शिवाचार्य भट्टारक को दिए गए दान को वापस लेकर ठक्कुर वशिष्ठ नाम ब्राह्मण को दे दिया था। इस अभिलेख में पहली बार गोविन्दचन्द्र ने सुप्रसिद्ध कल्चुरि मौखरी, पुष्पभूति, परवर्ती गुप्त, प्रतिहार एवं गहड़वालों का युग उपाधि 'अश्वपति, गजपति, नरपति, राजत्रयाधिपति' को धारण कर लिया जिसका अर्थ यह माना जाता है कि उसने कल्चुरि राजवंश पर अपनी विजय को रेखांकित करने के लिए इस उपाधि को धारण किया था, जिसे उसके वंशज अन्त तक धारण करते रहे। इसके अतिरिक्त गोविन्दचन्द्र ने कल्चुरियों द्वारा प्रचलित लक्ष्मीप्रकार के सिक्कों को भी अपनाया जो उसकी कल्चुरियों पर विजय का एक प्रमाण माना जाता है।

गोविन्दचन्द्र ने दक्षिण दिशा में दशार्ण अथवा पूर्वी मालवा पर भी विजय प्राप्त की थी। इसका उल्लेख नयचन्द्र रचित रम्भामंजरी नाटक में हुआ है। इस नाटक के अनुसार जिस दिन गोविन्दचन्द्र ने दशार्ण पर विजय प्राप्त की उसी दिन उसके पौत्र जयचन्द्र का जन्म हुआ था और इसी कारण उसका नाम जयचन्द्र रखा गया। उस समय दशार्ण पर परमार वंश के शासक राज्य कर रहे थे तथा नरवर्मन और यशोवर्मन गोविन्दचन्द्र के समकालीन थे। लेकिन गोविन्दचन्द्र द्वारा मालवा विजय की पुष्टि किसी अन्य स्रोत से नहीं हो पाई है।

गोविन्दचन्द्र का चंदेल समकालीन मदनवर्मा (1129-93ई०) था और इसके शासनकाल में चंदेल शक्ति का विशेष विकास हुआ। मदनवर्मा के मऊ अभिलेख से ज्ञात होता है कि काशी के राजा सौहार्द्र के साथ अपना समय बिताते थे (काल सौहार्द्रयवृत्या गगमयति सततं त्रास्तः काशिराजः)।

दक्षिण भारत से भी गोविन्दचन्द्र के राजनियक संबन्ध रहे होंगे इसके आभिलेखिक प्रमाण गंगैकोण्डचोलपुरम् से प्राप्त होते हैं। कुलोत्तुगं प्रथम (1070-1120ई०) के इकतालीसवें राज्यवर्ष में उत्कीर्ण लेख के नीचे गहड़वाल राजवंश की वंशावली यशोविग्रह से चन्द्रदेव तक गहड़वाल शैली की लिपि में उत्कीर्ण है। यद्यपि यह लेख अचानक रुक आता है फिर भी कुलोत्तुगं चोल के उक्त अभिलेख के आधार पर यह कहा जा सकता है कि

इसे मदनपाल अथवा गोविन्दचन्द्र के शासनकाल में उत्कीर्ण किया गया होगा। दक्षिण भारत के बौद्ध भिक्षु श्रावस्ती (सहेत-महेत) में उपस्थित थे इसकी सूचना गोविन्दचन्द्र के वि०सं० 1176 के सहेत-महेत अभिलेख से प्राप्त होती है। इनमें एक भिक्षु चोल देश का था, दूसरा भिक्षु ओड्र देश (उड़ीसा) का था जिन्हें दान दिया गया था। इसके अतिरिक्त चालुक्य राजा सिद्धराज जयसिंह के एक राजदूत के काशी के राजा जयचन्द्र के दरबार में जाने का उल्लेख मेरुतुंग के प्रबन्ध चिन्तामणि में मिलता है। इसी प्रकार राजतरंगिणी से यह ज्ञात होता है कि गोविन्दचन्द्र के समकालीन कश्मीर के राजा जयसिंह से उसके अच्छे संबंध थे। रोमा नियोगी का यह कहना है कि 'यद्यपि गहड़वाल अभिलेखों में गोविन्दचन्द्र के समकालीन के समकालीन राजाओं के साथ राजनयिक संबंधों का कोई उल्लेख नहीं मिलता फिर भी समकालीन राजवंशों के अभिलेखों तथा अन्य साहित्यिक स्रोतों से प्रायः सभी महत्वपूर्ण पड़ोसी राजाओं के साथ मित्रता के सम्बन्धों के उल्लेख मिलते हैं। इस बात में कोई संदेह नहीं है कि उत्तर भारत में राजनीति के क्षेत्र में इस तीसरे गहड़वाल राजा को अत्यंत उच्च आदरणीय स्थान प्राप्त था।

गहड़वाल शासक गोविन्दचन्द्र को परम्परानुसार अनेक सामन्त भी प्राप्त हुए थे। इसके अतिरिक्त उसने कुछ और क्षेत्रों को जीतकर वहां के शासकों को अपना सामन्त बनने के लिए विवश किया। यद्यपि दिल्ली के तोमर गहड़वालों की अधीनता के विषय में अपने अभिलेखों में कोई संकेत नहीं देते फिर भी ऐसा लगता है कि वे गहड़वालों की छत्रछाया में लगभग स्वतंत्र रूप से शासन कर रहे थे। गोविन्दचन्द्र का समकालीन तोमर राजा संभवतः महीपाल देव था। इसके अतिरिक्त बदायूँ में शासन कर रहे राष्ट्रकूट राजवंश में गोविन्दचन्द्र के समकालीन शासक संभवतः के पुत्र और पौत्र रहें होंगे। रोमा नियोगी ने यह सम्भावना व्यक्त की है कि गाधिपुराधिपति गोपाल का राजवंश संभवतः बदायूँ के राष्ट्रकूट गोपाल के राजवंश से भिन्न रहा होगा। इस गाधिपुराधिपति गोपाल का वंशराज मदनपाल गोविन्दचन्द्र का समकालीन था जिसके मंत्री विद्याधर ने वि०सं० 1176 (1119 ई०) का सहेत-महेत दानपत्र जारी किया था।

विक्रम संवत् 1191 (1134ई०) के कमौली दानपत्र से एक अन्य सामन्त श्रृंगर वंशीय वत्सराज का अभिलेख मिलता है। इस अभिलेख में चन्द्रदेव से लेकर गोविन्दचन्द्र तक गहड़वाल वंशावली दी गई है। इसके बाद श्रृंगर वंश के राजाओं की वंशावली भी दी हुई है। इसमें दानकर्ता

वत्सराज को महाराजपुत्र कहा गया है तथा उसके पिता का नाम लोहणदेव बताया गया है। लोहणदेव के पिता का नाम अल्हण तथा उसके पिता का नाम श्रीकमलपाल बताया गया है। श्रीकमलपाल श्रृंगरोटा नामक स्थान से आए थे अतः इस वंश का नाम श्रृंगर वंश पड़ा।

इसके अतिरिक्त बारहवीं शताब्दी के नागरी लिपि में लिखे गए कसया (कुशीनगर, उ०प्र०) से प्राप्त एक खण्डित अभिलेख से भी एक अन्य कल्चुरि राजवंश का उल्लेख मिलता है जो गहड़वालों के सामान्त रहे होंगे। इसमें अन्तिम राजाओं, शिवराज प्रथम (भूदा का पति), लक्ष्मणराज तृतीय तथा भीमत में से कोई भी गोविन्दचन्द्र का समकालीन सामन्त रहा होगा।

कुछ गहड़वाल अभिलेखों में 'सरवार' शब्द आया है जो सरयूपार का प्रकृत रूप कहा जा सकता है। लार से प्राप्त (पेज 98-100) मोनेर अभिलेख के अतिरिक्त गोविन्दचन्द्र ने वि०सं० (1146 ई०) के मुग्दगिरि (मुंगेर) से एक अन्य अभिलेख जारी किया था। इस अभिलेख में सरयूपार गोविसालक के अन्तर्गत पानदल पतला में दुधेली ग्राम के दान का उल्लेख है। सरयूपार का उल्लेख गोविन्दचन्द्र के वि०सं० 1171 के पालि अभिलेख में भी हुआ है जिसमें पालि और उनवल ग्रामों के नाम आते हैं।

एक अन्य अभिलेख से इसी क्षेत्र से एक अन्य राजा कीर्तिपाल देव के विषय में जानकारी मिलती है। लखनऊ संग्रहालय में संग्रहीत वि०सं० 1167 (1111 ई०) के ताम्रपत्राभिलेख से ज्ञात होता है कि परमभट्टारक महाराजाधिराज परमेश्वर परमाहेश्वर श्री कीर्तिपालदेव ने एक दान दिया था जो परमभट्टारक महाराजाधिराज, परमेश्वर परमाहेश्वर श्री विक्रमपालदेव के पादानुध्यात थे तथा जिन्होंने उत्तर समुद्र अथवा सिन्धु का स्वामित्व अपने बाहुबल से प्राप्त किया था। यह लेख विक्रम संवत् 1167 के फाल्गुन मास के शुक्ल पक्ष द्वितीया, दिन शनिवार, को जारी किया गया था जो 11 फरवरी 1111 ई० में पड़ता है। जिन ग्रामों का दान किया गया उनको दरद गण्डकी देश में स्थित बताया गया है। यद्यपि इस क्षेत्र की पहचान नहीं हो पाई फिर भी कीलहार्न का यह सुझाव है कि यह क्षेत्र बिहार में बहने वाली गण्डकी नदी की घाटी में रहा होगा। रोमा नियोगी का यह विचार है कि यह क्षेत्र गोरखपुर जिले के पूर्वोत्तर में पड़ना चाहिए जो इस समय देवरिया जिले का उत्तरी भाग है। रोमा नियोगी ने स्मिथ द्वारा कलकत्ता के इण्डियन म्यूजियम में वर्णित 'कीर्ति' लेख वाले कुछ सिक्कों को कीर्तिपालदेव का सिक्का माना है। उन्होंने यह भी सुझाव दिया है कि दरद

गण्डकी देश घाघरा और बड़ी गण्डक के बीच का क्षेत्र रहा होगा और तिथि की दृष्टि से कीर्तिपाल मदनपाल अथवा गोविन्दचन्द्र का समकालीन रहा होगा। इन्होंने यह भी संभावना व्यक्त की है कि गोविन्दचन्द्र के पालि ताम्रपत्राभिलेख में जो 'नौराज्य गज' का उल्लेख मिलता है इससे यह अनुमान लगाया जा सकता है कि गोविन्दचन्द्र ने कीर्तिपाल के उत्तर समुद्र अथवा सौम्य सिन्धु राज्य को विक्रम संवत् 1167 (1111 ई०) तथा वि०सं० 1171 (1114 ई०) के बीच में युवराज अथवा राजा के रूप में जीत लिया था।

....यहां यह बात भी उल्लेखनीय है कि गोविन्दचन्द्र के वि०सं० 1182 के कमौली ताम्रपत्राभिलेख में भी एक अल्हण का नाम आता है जिसके पुत्र कीठण ने इस ताम्रपट्ट लेख की रचना की थी। इस ताम्रपत्र में अल्हण को 'श्रीवास्तव्य कुलोद्भूत कायस्थ' कहा गया है।

श्रीवास्तव्य—कुलोद्भूत—कायस्थोल्हण—सूनु ना।

लिखितस्ताम्र (म्र) पट्टोऽयं कीठणेन नृपाज्ञयेति ॥15॥

इस प्रकार अल्हण के दो पुत्रों का उल्लेख मिलता है और यह दोनों ही साहित्यकार थे। भतीजा नयचन्द्र जो साकेत मण्डल का अधिपति था और जिसने रम्भामन्जरी नाटक की रचना की थी। एक पुत्र कीठण या 'कृष्ण' था जिसे कृष्णचन्द्र भी इस आधार पर कहा जा सकता है कि उसके दो अन्य भाइयों के नाम के अन्त में चन्द्र शब्द आता है और कीठण को कृष्णचन्द्र का अपभ्रंश मान सकते हैं। इस कीठण को गोविन्दचन्द्र के शासन काल में प्रचारित कमौली दानपत्र की रचना का श्रेय प्राप्त है। अल्हण का दूसरा और छोटा (कनियान) पुत्र आयुषचन्द्र था जिसने अयोध्या की प्रशस्ति की रचना की थी और इस प्रशस्ति में यह भी संकेत मिला है कि वह इस समय स्वयं अयोध्या का राजा था। अयोध्या में प्रचलित एक परम्परा यह भी स्वीकार करती है कि इस क्षेत्र पर श्रीवास्तव वंश ने राज्य किया था।

.. रोमा नियोगी का यह मानना है कि गहड़वाल राज्य का अधिकांश भाग यथा, कान्यकुब्ज, बदायूँ, जौनपुर, चुनार, रोहतासगढ़, वाराणसी तथा संभवतः अयोध्या भी मुस्लिम राजनीतिक प्रभाव क्षेत्र से बाहर थे।

गोविन्दचन्द्र के सिक्के बहुत बड़ी मात्रा में लगभग सम्पूर्ण उत्तर भारत से प्राप्त हुए हैं। उसके केवल सोने के

सिक्कों की संख्या लगभग एक हजार बताई जाती है। चाँदी और तौबे के सिक्कों की संख्या अपेक्षाकृत कम है। उसके सिक्के बिहार और उत्तर प्रदेश से लेकर दिल्ली तक के क्षेत्र से मिले हैं। बहराइच जिले के नानपारा से 800 सोने के सिक्के मिले थे। इसके अतिरिक्त इलाहाबाद, बनारस, उन्नाव जिले में परमेदा, बिहार में चौसा और झबुआ तथा मुंगेर के पास सूरजगढ़, राँची, नालन्दा और राजगिरि से भी मिले हैं। दिल्ली के पास से भी गोविन्दचन्द्र के सिक्के प्राप्त हुए हैं। गोविन्दचन्द्र के सिक्के दो प्रकार के हैं, प्रथम प्रकार में लक्ष्मी की आकृति वाले सिक्के आते हैं और दूसरे प्रकार में अश्वारोही प्रकार के सिक्के आते हैं। इन पर 'श्रीमदगोविन्दचन्द्र देवः' लेख तीन पंक्तियों में मिलते हैं। लेकिन अधिकांश सिक्कों में देव शब्द नहीं मिलता। गोविन्दचन्द्र के सोने के सिक्के 3.88 ग्रा० के हैं। यद्यपि कुछ सिक्के 0.4 ग्राम के भी मिले हैं।

गोविन्दचन्द्र के परिवार के विषय में भी हमको अभिलेखों अथवा अन्य स्रोतों से जानकारी मिलती है। गोविन्दचन्द्र की माता का नाम राल्हा देवी था। गोविन्दचन्द्र की चार रानियों के नामों के उल्लेख मिलते हैं। इनमें कुमारदेवी के द्वारा लिखवाई गई एक प्रशस्ति सारनाथ से प्राप्त हुई है। कुमारदेवी तिठि के चिक्कोर राजवंश के राजा देवरक्षित की पुत्री थी। देवरक्षित गौड़ के पाल राजा का सामन्त था। कुमारदेवी ने सारनाथ में बौद्ध भिक्षुओं को दान दिया था। गोविन्दचन्द्र के कमौली दानपत्र लेख से उसकी एक अन्य पट्ट महादेवी नयनकेलि का नाम मिलता है। इसके अतिरिक्त बागरमऊ दानपत्रों से एक अन्य पट्ट महादेवी गोसल्लदेवी का नाम मिलता है। एक चौथी रानी बसन्तदेवी के नाम का उल्लेख नेपाल के दरबार पुस्तकालय में संग्रहित अष्टसाहस्त्रिका प्रज्ञापारमिता नामक पाण्डुलिपि से ज्ञात होता है।

गोविन्दचन्द्र के दो पुत्रों के नाम भी हमें अभिलेखों से प्राप्त होते हैं। वि०सं० 1190 (1140 ई०) के उनबरी दानपत्राभिलेख में युवराज आस्फोटचन्द्र का उल्लेख मिलता है। इसके अतिरिक्त दो अन्य अभिलेखों में महाराजपुत्र राज्यपाल देव का भी उल्लेख मिलता है। लेकिन गोविन्दचन्द्र के पश्चात् उसका पुत्र विजयचन्द्र शासक हुआ। इस कारण यह कहा जा सकता है कि आस्फोटचन्द्र और राज्यपाल देव की मृत्यु गोविन्दचन्द्र के जीवनकाल में ही हो गई थी।

विजयचन्द्र

प्रायः ऐसा समझा जाता है कि गोविन्दचन्द्र के बाद से ही गहड़वाल शक्ति का पतन प्रारम्भ हो जाता है। गोविन्दचन्द्र ने राजसत्ता का उपयोग काफी समय तक किया। **उसके शासनकाल का अन्तिम अभिलेख वि०सं० 9299 (1154 ई०) का है।** ऐसा लगता है कि इसके शीघ्र बाद ही गोविन्दचन्द्र का देहान्त हो गया और उसका पुत्र विजयचन्द्र शासनारूढ़ हुआ। गहड़वाल राजवंश में यह परम्परा रही है कि अपने पिता के जीवनकाल में ही युवराज भी दानपत्र जारी करते थे। चन्द्रदेव के जीवनकाल में ही मदनपाल का राज्याभिषेक कर दिया गया था, इसका उल्लेख हम कर आए हैं। मदनपाल के शासनकाल में गोविन्द ने महाराज के पुत्र के रूप में दानपत्र जारी किए। इसी प्रकार गोविन्दचन्द्र के शासनकाल में उसके दो पुत्रों ने शासनपत्र जारी किए। युवराज आस्फोटचन्द्र ने भदौनी का दानपत्राभिलेख वि०सं० 1190 में जारी किया था। उसके बाद महाराजपुत्र राज्यपालदेव ने उनवल दानपत्राभिलेख वि०सं० 1201 में जारी किया था। ऐसा लगता है कि युवराज आस्फोटचन्द्रदेव का देहान्त वि०सं० 1190 के बाद किसी समय हो गया। सम्भवतः महाराजपुत्र राज्यपालदेव भी अपने पिता के जीवनकाल में ही दिवंगत हो गया था। गहड़वाल राजवंश में सम्भवतः केवल विजयचन्द्र ही एक मात्र ऐसा शासक है जिसको अपने पिता के जीवनकाल में दानपत्राभिलेख जारी करने का अवसर नहीं प्राप्त हो सका था।

विजयचन्द्र के शासनकाल के कुल छः दानपत्राभिलेख प्राप्त होते हैं। उसका पहला दानपत्र वि०सं० 1216 (1161 ई०) में जारी किया गया था। इसके अतिरिक्त उसने वि०सं० 1221 (1165 ई०) तथा वि०सं० 1223 (1166 ई०) में भी स्वतंत्र रूप से दानपत्र जारी किए थे। वि०सं० 1224 में विजयचन्द्र के शासनकाल में महाराजपुत्र जयचन्द्र ने हरिपुरा का दानपत्र जारी किया था। इसके बाद वि०सं० 1225 (1170 ई०) में 'यौवराज्याभिषिक्त महाराजपुत्र श्रीजयचन्द्रदेव' ने नागली दानपत्र जारी किया। इन पाँच दानपत्रों के अतिरिक्त विजयचन्द्र के शासनकाल में विक्रम संवत् 1225 (1169 ई०) में जौनपुर से किसी 'भट्टारक भविभूषण' ने एक स्तम्भ अभिलेख दो पंक्तियों में लिखवाया था।

डॉ० रोमा नियोगी ने जिस समय गहड़वाल राजवंश का इतिहास नामक पुस्तक का प्रणयन किया था तब तक वि०सं० 1217 के कण्डिनी

दानपत्र का प्रकाशन नहीं हो सका था और 1221 तथा 1223 के दानपत्र भी उस समय तक प्रकाश में नहीं आ सके थे जिसके कारण उन्होंने यह अनुमान लगाया था कि 1154 ई० में गोविन्दचन्द्र के अन्तिम दानपत्र के पश्चात् 1168 ई० तक विजयचन्द्र के शासनकाल का कोई अन्य दानपत्र लेख नहीं मिलता। यह तेरह वर्षों का अन्तराल इस राजवंश के लिए असाधारण सा लगता है। जबकि इसके पहले तक अनेक दानपत्र जारी किए जा चुके थे। इसके लिए उन्होंने आन्तरिक कलह को जिम्मेदार माना था तथा यह भी बताया था कि शायद युवराज आस्फोटचन्द्र और महाराजपुत्र राज्यपाल देव के साथ उत्तराधिकार का संघर्ष हो सकता है। इसके अतिरिक्त एक दूसरी संभावना मुसलमानी आक्रमणों के कारण दिल्ली का हाथ से निकल जाना भी हो सकता है।

अभिलेखों में विजयचन्द्र को परम्परागत रूप से प्रशंसित किया गया है। इसके साथ ही यह भी कहा गया है कि संसार को दलित करने वाले हम्मीर के नारियों की आँखों से निकलने वाली जलधारा से उसने पृथ्वीलोक के ताप को धो डाला था "भुवन – दलन – हेला – हर्म्य – हमवीर – नारी – नयन – जलद – धौत – भूलोकतापः"। यहां पर उल्लिखित हम्मीर का तात्पर्य विजयचन्द्र के दो समकालीन यामिनी सुल्तानों से हो सकता है— 1. खुसरू शाह, जिसने 1150–60 ई० के बीच शासन किया और 2. खुसरू मालिक, जिसने 1160–86 के बीच शासन किया था। इसमें पहले यामिनी सुल्तान की संभावना अधिक की जा सकती है क्योंकि उसका शासनकाल अफगानिस्तान के धुज कबीले के लोगों के आक्रमण के कारण विचलित रहा और उसे भागकर भारत में लाहौर में अपना केन्द्र बनाना पड़ा। अमीर और विजयचन्द्र के बीच यह संघर्ष 1161 ई० के पूर्व हुआ होगा। क्योंकि उसके बाद के सभी अभिलेखों में विजयचन्द्र के लिए इसका उल्लेख मिलता है। यह भी संभव है कि विजयचन्द्र ने तुरुष्कों पर यह विजय अपने पिता के शासनकाल में प्राप्त की हो।

पृथ्वीराजरासों में चन्दवरदायी ने विजयचन्द्र द्वारा की गई कई विजयों का उल्लेख किया है जिसके विषय में इतिहासकारों को संदेह है। इसके अनुसार, विजयचन्द्र ने कटक (उड़ीसा) के सोमवंशी राजा मुकुन्ददेव को पराजित किया था तथा उसे इस बात के लिए बाध्य किया था कि वह अपनी पुत्री का विवाह उसके पुत्र जयचन्द्र से कर दे।

जयचन्द्र की इसी पत्नी से संयोगिता अथवा संयुक्ता का जन्म हुआ था जिसके बाद में पृथ्वीराज चौहान से विवाह हुआ। लेकिन इतिहासकारों का यह विश्वास है कि दक्षिण कोशल के सोमवंशी राजाओं को गंगो ने गोविन्दचन्द्र के शासनकाल के प्रारम्भ में ही परास्त करके उनका राज्य हड़प लिया था तथा मुकुन्ददेव नाम के किसी राजा का नाम उड़ीसा के इतिहास में नहीं मिलता। इसके उत्तर में यह कहा जा सकता है कि मुकुन्ददेव सोमवंशी राजाओं का कोई अल्पज्ञात उत्तराधिकारी रहा होगा क्योंकि यदि उसके अस्तित्व से ही इंकार कर दिया जाएगा तो पृथ्वीराज और संयोगिता की कथा का आधार ही समाप्त हो जाएगा जो पृथ्वीराजरासों का मुख्य विषय है। रासों में ही यह भी कहा गया है कि विजयचन्द्र ने दिल्ली के तोमर राजा अनंगपाल को हराया था। इसके अतिरिक्त पट्टनपुर के भोलाभीम को भी उसने हराया था। इस भोलाभीम की पहचान अनहिलपाटक के चालुक्य नरेश भीमदेव द्वितीय से की जा सकती है जिसके शासन का प्रारम्भ 1173 ई० से होता है। इसके पूर्व उसके पिता चालुक्य कुमारपाल ने 1114 ई० से 1173 ई० तक शासन किया था। इस प्रकार इतिहासकारों का यह मानना है कि भीमदेव द्वितीय के शासनारूढ़ होने के तीन वर्ष पूर्व ही विजयचन्द्र का शासनकाल समाप्त हो गया था। लेकिन इस सम्बन्ध में यह कहा जा सकता है कि भीमदेव द्वितीय से विजयचन्द्र का संघर्ष उस समय हुआ हो सकता है जब भीमदेव युवराज था। उसका पिता चालुक्य कुमारपाल लगभग 59 वर्षों तक शासन करता रहा और बहुत संभव है कि उसके शासनकाल के अन्तिम दिनों में उसका पुत्र ही शासन कार्य देखता रहा हो।

रोमा नियोगी ने यह भी संभावना व्यक्त की है कि बंगाल के सेन राजाओं ने भी गहड़वाल प्रदेश पर विजय प्राप्त की थी क्योंकि लक्ष्मणसेन के माघाई नगर अभिलेख से यह ज्ञात होता है कि जब वह कुमार था तभी उसने गौड़ पर अधिकार कर लिया, युद्ध में काशीराज को जीतकर (येन—आसौ—काशीराज समर—भुवविजिता) तथा कलिंग की नारियों के साथ क्रीड़ा की।

इसके अतिरिक्त विश्वरूपसेन तथा सूर्यसेन के अभिलेखों से यह ज्ञात होता है कि या तो लक्ष्मणसेन ने अथवा विश्वरूपसेन ने प्रयाग और काशीपुरी पर विजय प्राप्त करके विजय स्तम्भ खड़े किए थे (क्षेत्र

विश्वेश्वरस्य.....त्रिवेण्या.....धनोच्चैरयज्ञ-यूपैः सह समर जय-स्तम्भ-मालान्य धायि)। लेकिन ऐसा लगता है कि ये उक्तियां परम्परागत प्रशंसात्मक बातें ही थीं क्योंकि विजयचन्द्र के शासनकाल में उसकी राजधानी वाराणसी तथा राज्य के हृदयस्थल में स्थित प्रयाग पर गौड़ सेनाएं विजय प्राप्त कर सकी हों, यह संभव नहीं लगता। यह अवश्य कहा जा सकता है कि तीर्थयात्री के रूप में इन राजाओं ने वाराणसी और प्रयाग में यज्ञ करके यज्ञ-यूप खड़े किए हों।

रोमा नियोगी ने प्रबन्ध चिन्तामणि की एक घटना का उल्लेख किया है तथा उसको गहड़वाल क्षेत्र पर सेन और तुरुष्क आक्रमणों के साथ जोड़ा है। इस घटना के अनुसार चौलुक्य कुमारपाल के शासनकाल (1114-73 ई0) में वाराणसी के एक कवि विश्वेश्वर पट्टन गए तथा उन्होंने जैनाचार्य हेमचन्द्र द्वारा बुलाई गई एक साहित्यिक संगोष्ठी में भाग लिया। बाद में चौलुक्य राजा कुमार पाल ने उनसे अपने राज्य में ही ठहर जाने का अनुरोध किया। किन्तु विश्वेश्वर ने विनम्रतापूर्वक उत्तर देते हुए यह कहा कि उनका मन प्रभास तीर्थ जाने को व्याकुल है क्योंकि 'कर्ण केवल नाममात्र को कहानियों में शेष रह गए है। वाराणसी नगर में लोग नहीं रह गए हैं तथा हरि के क्षेत्र में हम्मीर के घोड़े प्रसन्नतापूर्वक हिनहिना रहे हैं।' यहां पर उपरोक्त उद्धरण में कहीं भी सेन राजा के आक्रमण का संकेत नहीं मिलता। चौलुक्य कुमारपाल का शासनकाल 1114 ई0 में प्रारम्भ हुआ था और यही वह वर्ष है जब गोविन्दचन्द्र ने गहड़वाल नरेश के रूप में अपना प्रथम अभिलेख जारी किया था। इस कारण विश्वेश्वर के द्वारा ऊपर दिया गया वर्णन गोविन्दचन्द्र के शासनकाल पर भी लागू किया जा सकता है। बनारस के साथ-साथ 'हरि के क्षेत्र' में हम्मीर के घोड़ों की हिनहिनाहट का अर्थ अयोध्या पर मुस्लिम आक्रमण से सम्बन्धित किया जा सकता है। हाल ही में अयोध्या से प्राप्त पाषाण फलक अभिलेख की चर्चा हम कर आए हैं तथा ऐसा लगता है कि कवि विश्वेश्वर का यह उल्लेख अयोध्या के उस अभिलेख में वर्णित घटना से सम्बन्धित है जो कि गोविन्दचन्द्र के शासनकाल में हुई होगी।

इसी संदर्भ में वि0सं0 1223 (5 सितम्बर 1166 ई0) को बिहार के शाहाबाद जिले के सुनहर ग्राम से प्राप्त एक जाली ताम्रपत्राभिलेख का उल्लेख किया जाना चाहिए। वास्तव में यह दानपत्र महाराजा विजयचन्द्र ने विधिपूर्वक दान करने के बाद लिखवाया था तथा इसका लेखक

महाअक्षपटलिक ठक्कुर श्री श्रीपति हैं जिन्होंने गोविन्दचन्द्र के शासनकाल में कई अभिलेखों को लिखा था। इस अभिलेख के अनुसार, स्वर्णहल ग्राम के ब्राह्मणों को भूमि गई थी। यह स्वर्णहल अथवा सोनहल ग्राम वर्तमान में सुनहर ग्राम कहा जाता है। इसका महत्व इस दृष्टि से है कि प्रताप धवल के ताराचण्डी शिलालेख में इसको 'कुताम्र पत्र' कहा गया है जिसको गाधिनगर के राजा के एक दास (अधिकारी), जिसका नाम देउ था, जो स्वर्णहल के ब्राह्मणों ने घूस (उत्कोच) देकर लिखवा लिया था। प्रताप धवल ने 16 अप्रैल 1169 ई० को यह शासनपत्र जारी किया कि इस ग्राम के ब्राह्मणों को सुई की नोक बराबर भूमि भी न दी जाए तथा यह आदेश महानायक प्रताप धवल के वंश के पुत्र-पौत्रों को भी बता दिया जाए कि इन लम्पट ब्राह्मणों के उपर तनिक भी विश्वास नहीं किया जाना चाहिए। ताराचण्डी के इस शिलालेख से कई रोचक बातें प्रकाश में आती हैं। पहली बात तो यह है कि महानायक प्रताप धवल अपने को सामन्त कहता है। इसके अतिरिक्त स्वयं को जापिलाधिपति महानायक श्रीप्रतापधवल भी बताता है। इस प्रकार यह कहा जा सकता है कि प्रताप धवल विजयचन्द्र का एक सामन्त रहा होगा। लेकिन इसके बावजूद उसके प्रदेश में कान्यकुब्ज के राजा विजयचन्द्र ने एक ग्राम की कुछ भूमि दान में दी जिसके विषय में प्रताप धवल ने यह आदेश जारी किया कि यह दानपत्र देउ नामक राजकर्मचारी को घूस देकर लिखवाया गया था और उन ब्राह्मणों को जिन्हें भूमि दान में मिली थी उससे बेदखल कर दिया गया। यहां पर सामन्त और अधिराज के अधिकारों के संबंध में रोचक तथ्य प्राप्त होते हैं और यह ज्ञात होता है यदि अधर्मपूर्वक उत्कोच या घूस देकर कोई दान अधिराज से करवा लिया जाए तो अधीनस्थ सामन्त राजा उसको मानने से इन्कार भी कर सकता था। विजयचन्द्र का सुनहर दानपत्र लेख इसी श्रेणी में आता है।

विजय चन्द्र का अन्तिम दानपत्र माघ सुदी 15, वि० सं० 1225 में जारी किया गया था तथा उसके पुत्र जयचन्द्र का प्रथम दानपत्र आषाढ़ सुदी 6, 1226 को जारी किया गया था। इस प्रकार यह अनुमान लगाया जा सकता है कि माघ 1225 के बाद तथा अषाढ़ 1226 के पूर्व किसी समय विजयचन्द्र का देहान्त हुआ।

जयचन्द्र

जयचन्द्र का प्रथम दानपत्राभिलेख 21 जून 1170 ई० को जारी किया गया

था और उसके बाद उसने लगभग 24 वर्षों तक शासन किया। ऐसी मान्यता है कि मुइज्जुद्दीन मुहम्मद गोरी के साथ 1194 ई० में चन्दवर के युद्ध में वह मारा गया था। इस बीच में उसके शासनकाल के लगभग 24 अभिलेख प्रकाश में आए हैं। इनमें कुछ अभिलेख कुछ सामान्य नागरिकों द्वारा भी जारी किए गए हैं। अपने पितामह और पिता की भांति जयचन्द्र के समय में भी गहड़वाल राज्य अपनी शक्ति की चरम सीमा पर था। उसका समकालीन चन्देल राजा परमार्दि था तथा पश्चिम में चौहान राजा पृथ्वीराज भी उसका समकालीन था। चौहानों और चन्देलों में परस्पर कई युद्ध हुए जिनमें जयचन्द्र की सहानुभूति चन्देलों के साथ रही। जयचन्द्र के शासनकाल में ही पृथ्वीराज और जयचन्द्र की पुत्री संयोगिता की घटना की जानकारी साहित्यिक स्रोतों से मिलती है। लेकिन इसके सम्बन्ध में कोई आभिलेखिक प्रमाण नहीं मिलता। जयचन्द्र के शासनकाल में भी उसका राज्य क्षेत्र प्रायः वही बना रहा जो उसके पिता के शासनकाल में था।

भारतीय साहित्यिक स्रोत जयचन्द्र को अपने समय का सबसे बड़ा राजा सिद्ध करते हैं तथा मुस्लिम इतिहासकारों के कथन भी इसी बात की पुष्टि करते हैं कि 'वह भारत का सबसे बड़ा राजा था तथा सबसे बड़े क्षेत्र का स्वामी था।' उसके पास बहुत बड़ी सेना थी। **जयचन्द्र गहड़वाल राजवंश में एकमात्र ऐसा राजा है जो भारतीय साहित्य में जाना जाता है।** उसके शासनकाल की कोई बड़ी महत्वपूर्ण घटना अभिलेखों से नहीं ज्ञात होती लेकिन भारतीय साहित्य इस बात की सूचना देते हैं कि उसका मुसलमानों से कई बार संघर्ष हुआ था।

विद्यापति के ग्रन्थ पुरुषपरीक्षा तथा जयचन्द्र के रम्भामञ्जरी नाटक एवं पृथ्वीराजरासों से यह ज्ञात होता है कि मुइज्जुद्दीन (शिहाबुद्दीन) गोरी से जयचन्द्र के कई बार संघर्ष हुए तथा जयचन्द्र ने उसे परास्त करके भागने पर विवश कर दिया। दूसरी ओर सभी मुस्लिम इतिहासकार गयासुद्दीन के भाई मुइज्जुद्दीन मुहम्मद गोरी के साथ पृथ्वीराम के केवल दो युद्धों तथा जयचन्द्र के केवल एक युद्ध का उल्लेख करते हैं। गयासुद्दीन मुहम्मद गोरी 1163 ई० में गोर का सुल्तान हुआ और उसने अपने भाई शिहाबुद्दीन मुहम्मद गोरी को गजनी

का राज्यपाल नियुक्त किया जिसने भारत पर अनेक आक्रमण किए, लेकिन बार-बार परास्त होना पड़ा। मुहम्मद के प्रारम्भिक अभियान डेरा इस्माईल खान के पश्चिम में स्थित गोमल दर्रे से होते थे क्योंकि यह मार्ग छोटा और अधिक सुरक्षित था। परिणामस्वरूप मुल्तान और उछ उसके अधीन हो गए। बाद में सिन्ध भी धराशायी हुआ लेकिन जब उसने मरुभूमि पार करके गुजरात पर आक्रमण करने का प्रयास किया तो उसे मुँह की खानी पड़ी। 1178 ई० में मुहम्मद गोरी मरुभूमि पार करके आबू तक पहुँच गया था लेकिन इसमें उसकी सेना नष्ट हो गई और बची खुची-सेना को चालुक्य राजा मुलराज द्वितीय ने नष्ट कर दिया। मुहम्मद गोरी अपने थोड़े से सिपाहियों के साथ कठिनाईपूर्वक जान बचा सका। उसके बाद उसने दूसरा रास्ता अपनाया। उसने 1178 ई० में पेशावर और 1185 में स्यालकोट ले लिया। अगले वर्ष लाहौर पर भी उसका कब्जा हो गया। इसके बाद वह चौहान राजा पृथ्वीराज तृतीय पर चढ़ दौड़ा तथा उससे कई बार पराजित हुआ। अंत में 1192 ई० में तराईन के युद्ध में पृथ्वीराज पराजित हुआ और मारा गया। उसके एक सेनापति कुतुबुद्दीन ऐबक ने 1192 में हॉसी को जीत लिया तथा मेरठ और बरान (बुलन्दशहर) इन दो स्थानों से उसने पूर्व में अपने आक्रमणों का संचालन किया। फिर बाद में उसने चौहान राजा को दिल्ली से भगाकर 1193 में अपनी राजधानी बना लिया। छोटे-मोटे आक्रमणों में उसने कोल (अलीगढ़) तक अपना प्रभाव फैला लिया।

चन्दवर का युद्ध

....

उपरोक्त कारणों से यदि रासो, पुरुषपरीक्षा और रंभा-मंजरी नाटक आदि यह विवरण देते हैं कि गोरी के सुल्तान को कई बार पराजय का मुख देखना पड़ा तो इसमें सत्य का कुछ अंश अवश्य ही है। लेकिन मुसलमान इतिहासकार गहड़वाल सेना के साथ एक छोटी झड़प तथा चन्दवर के मैदान में एक बड़े युद्ध का विवरण मात्र देते हैं। हसन निजामी के ताजउलमाथीर के अनुसार दिल्ली, अजमेर और कोल को पराजित करने के बाद सुल्तान ने अपना ध्यान गहड़वालों की ओर लगाया। कुतुबुद्दीन के

नेतृत्व में 50,000 की सेना के साथ उसने दीन (धर्म) के दुश्मनों की सेना का सामना किया और उसे हराया। ऐसा कहा जाता है कि यह झड़प गहड़वाल सेना के सीमान्त प्रदेश की सुरक्षा में लगी टुकड़ी के साथ हुई होगी न कि उसकी मुख्य सेना से। कामिलउत्तवारीख में भी इब्न अथीर ने कुतुबुद्दीन के इस चढ़ाई का उल्लेख किया है जिसमें उसने अनेक को मार डाला था तथा बन्दियों और लूट के साथ घर वापिस आ गया था। जब जयचन्द्र को इसकी सूचना दी गई तो उसने अपनी सेना को एकत्र करके मुसलमानों के क्षेत्र में प्रवेश किया। गहड़वालों और मुस्लिम सेना के बीच चन्दवर के मैदान में युद्ध हुआ। इसमें जयचन्द्र स्वयं हाथी पर चढ़कर युद्ध का संचालन कर रहा था। फिरिश्ता के अनुसार कुतुबुद्दीन द्वारा चलाए गए एक तीर से जयचन्द्र मारा गया। इसके बाद भयंकर मारकाट हुई और तीन सौ हाथी जिन्दा पकड़ लिए गए। अस्नी के किले को लूट लिया गया, जहाँ पर गहड़वाल राजाओं ने अपने सोने-चौंदा तथा रत्नों के भण्डार जमा कर रखे थे। बनारस, जो हिन्द देश का केन्द्र माना जाता था, भी लूट लिया गया और वहाँ पर लगभग एक हजार मन्दिर गिरा दिए गए और उनकी नींव के उपर मस्जिदें उठा दी गईं। मुस्लिम इतिहासकारों ने यह सूचना दी है कि हिन्द के राजा और सामन्त अमीर के प्रति अपनी अधीनता जताने के लिए आगे आए। देश का प्रबन्ध एक विश्वस्त व्यक्ति को सौंपा गया जो लोगों को न्याय दे सके और मूर्तिपूजकों को दबा सके। लेकिन मुस्लिम इतिहासकारों ने इस व्यक्ति का नाम नहीं बताया है। बाद में कुतुबुद्दीन दिल्ली का राज्यपाल नियुक्त किया गया और दिल्ली में उसने अपनी राजधानी बना ली।

गहड़वाल राजवंश के इतिहास को लिखने वाले प्रायः सभी इतिहासकारों का यह मत है कि चन्दवर के इस युद्ध के बाद गहड़वाल साम्राज्य ध्वस्त हो गया और मुस्लिम आक्रमणकारियों के मार्ग की सबसे बड़ी बाधा दूर हो गयी। लेकिन इस प्रकार के किसी अभिमत को सही नहीं माना जा सकता क्योंकि चन्दवर के युद्ध के पांच-छः साल बाद भी जयचन्द्र का पुत्र हरिश्चन्द्र पूरी राजकीय उपाधियों के साथ शासन कर रहा था। जौनपुर के मछलीशहर तहसील में घिसवा परगना के कोटवा नामक ग्राम से एक ताम्रपत्राभिलेख

प्राप्त हुआ है जिस पर रविवार पौष सुदी 15 वि० सं० 1253 (6 जनवरी 1197 ई०) की तिथि पड़ी हुई है। इसके अनुसार 'परम भट्टारक महाराजाधिराज परमेश्वर, परममाहेश्वर अश्वपति गजपति नरपति राजत्रयाधिपति विविध विधा विचार वाचस्पति श्री हरिश्चन्द्र देव' द्वारा पमहयि ग्राम दान दिये जाने का उल्लेख है। इस पमहयि ग्राम की पहचान अभिलेख के प्राप्ति स्थल के समीप स्थित पोहा नामक ग्राम से की गई है। इस कारण यह स्वीकार करने में कठिनाई नहीं होनी चाहिये कि चन्दवर युद्ध के पांच-छः वर्ष बाद भी जयचन्द्र का पुत्र हरिश्चन्द्र अपने वंश की सम्पूर्ण राजकीय उपाधियों के साथ शासन कर रहा था।

यहां पर उल्लेखनीय है कि चन्दवर के युद्ध के समय हरिश्चन्द्र की आयु लगभग 19 वर्ष रही होगी क्योंकि हरिश्चन्द्र का जन्म 1175 ई० में हुआ था। जयचन्द्र के बड़ेसर दानपत्राभिलेख में, जो रविवार भाद्र बदी 8 वि० सं० 1232 (10 अगस्त, 1175) में लिखवाया गया था, हरिश्चन्द्र के जातकर्म का उल्लेख है तथा जयचन्द्र के वि० सं० 1232 के आश्विन सुदी 14, दिन सोमवार (29 सितम्बर, 1175) के चन्दवर अभिलेख में महाराज पुत्र हरिश्चन्द्र देव के जातोत्सव का उल्लेख है। इस प्रकार मछलीशहर के दानपत्र को लिखवाने के समय हरिश्चन्द्र की आयु 22-23 वर्ष रही होगी। कुछ इतिहासकारों का यह विचार है कि इस युवक राजा ने मुस्लिम आक्रमणों को कैसे झेला होगा इस पर विचार करना कठिन काम है। उन्होंने यह सुझाया है कि सम्भवतः मुइज्जुद्दीन मुहम्मद गोरी की राजनीतिक दूरदर्शिता के कारण हरिश्चन्द्र को एक सामन्त राजा के रूप में शासन करने की अनुमति दे दी गई थी। आर० एस० त्रिपाठी का यह विचार है कि इस संघर्षपूर्ण काल में बालक राजा द्वारा अपनी स्वतन्त्रता की एक छोटी सीमा को भी बचाए रख पाना अविश्वसनीय लगता है। लेकिन हरिश्चन्द्र के द्वारा सभी उपाधियों को धारण करते हुए मछलीशहर के दानपत्र को जारी करना यह प्रदर्शित करता है कि चन्दवर के युद्ध के तुरन्त बाद गहड़वाल साम्राज्य ध्वस्त नहीं हो गया था, यद्यपि उसकी प्रतिष्ठा को धक्का लगा था। गहड़वाल साम्राज्य के अनेक सामन्तों के लेख भी इस बात की पुष्टि करते हैं कि वे इस समय भी गहड़वाल आधिपत्य को ही स्वीकार करते थे न कि मुस्लिम आधिपत्य को। उदाहरण के लिए, राणक विजयकर्ण का एक अभिलेख मिर्जापुर जिले के

बेलखरा ग्राम से प्राप्त हुआ है जो वि० सं० 1253 के वैशाख सुदी 11 (29 अप्रैल, 1197 ई०) को जारी किया गया था। इसमें राणक श्रीविजयकर्ण के राज में एक व्यक्ति द्वारा एक स्तम्भ की स्थापना का उल्लेख है। इसमें हरिश्चन्द्र का नाम नहीं है। फिर भी, 'कान्यकुब्ज विजयराज्य' का उल्लेख किया गया है (परमभट्टारक-इत्यादि राजावली)।
 .अश्वपति-गजनति-नरपति-राजत्रियाधिपति-विविध-विधा विचार-वाचस्पति
 - श्रीमत्-कान्यकुब्ज विजयराज्य।

इसी प्रकार मध्य प्रदेश में नागोद जिले में उद्दल देवी द्वारा लिखवाया गया एक खण्डित अभिलेख प्राप्त हुआ है जिस पर 1237 ई० की तिथि पड़ी हुई है। इस अभिलेख को महासामन्त राज बरहदेव की पुत्री उद्ददेवी, जो कान्यकुब्ज में पैदा हुई थी तथा जो श्री महमन्ददेव की पट्टराज्ञी थी, ने लिखवाया था। इसमें विन्ध्येश्वर शिव के मंदिर के निर्माण का उल्लेख है। महमन्ददेव गहड़वाल राजवंश के श्री आडक्कमल्लम का सामन्त था (श्रीमद् गहड़वाल-कुल-विकसन-सहस्रांशु-श्री आ (डक्क) मल्ल-सामान्त-शरण-आगत-वज्र-पंजर-श्रीमन्-महमन्ददेव-पट्टराज्ञा-श्रीउद्दलदेव्य)। ऐसा लगता है कि गोविन्दचन्द्रदेव ने जिस समय विन्ध्य क्षेत्र में कल्चुरि राजा को हराया था उसी समय गहड़वाल वंश के किसी राजकुमार को वहां का शासक नियुक्त किया था जिसका वंशज आडक्कमल था। यद्यपि इस अभिलेख में कान्यकुब्ज के गहड़वाल राजवंश का उल्लेख नहीं है फिर भी यह उल्लेखनीय है कि उस क्षेत्र में मुस्लिम आक्रमणों का कोई प्रभाव हुआ नहीं लगता। इसके अतिरिक्त रोहतासगढ़ (बिहार) से विक्रम संवत् 1297 (1223 ई०) का एक अभिलेख खैरवाल राजवंश के प्रताप धवल द्वितीय का प्राप्त हुआ है जिसमें उसने यवनों को खेल-खेल में हराने का उल्लेख किया है। (जवन-दलन-मानसलैः)। धवल राजवंश भी गहड़वाल के अधीन था।

अतः गहड़वाल राजवंश का साम्राज्य चन्दवर के युद्ध के बाद एकदम धराशायी हो गया, इतिहासकारों की यह अवधारणा सही नहीं लगती। मुल्जिम इतिहासकारों के विवरणों को देखने से यद्यपि यह जरूर सूचित होता है कि 1193 ई० के चन्दवर के युद्ध में बनारस को जीत लिया गया था और उसके एक हजार मन्दिर धराशायी कर दिए गये थे। लेकिन ऐसा लगता है कि बनारस की यह लूट केवल अस्थायी ही सिद्ध हुई और गहड़वालों ने उस पर पुनः कब्जा कर लिया था। तबकात-ए-नासरी के

अनुसार इल्तुतमिश की प्रारम्भिक विजयों में बनारस को भी शामिल किया गया है। इस प्रकार यदि यह मानें कि हरिश्चन्द्र ने 1193 के युद्ध के बाद पुनः अपनी राजधानी काशी पर कब्जा कर लिया था तो अनुचित नहीं होगा। मुस्लिम इतिहासकारों द्वारा सम्पूर्ण गहड़वाल साम्राज्य पर अधिकार कर लेने वाली बात कितनी खोखली है यह उनके उल्लेखों के विश्लेषण से भी सिद्ध किया जा सका है। 1193 के चन्दावर के युद्ध के बाद कन्नौज जीता नहीं जा सका था, केवल फिरिश्ता ही उस वर्ष के युद्ध के बाद यह कहते हुए कि सुल्तान ने बंगाल की सीमा तक-क्षेत्र को अपने अधिकार में कर लिया था, कन्नौज को विजित किए गए नगरों में शामिल किया गया है। लेकिन फिरिश्ता का विवरण बाद का होने के कारण विश्वसनीय नहीं माना जाता। तबकात-ए-नासरी भी यह उल्लेख नहीं करता कि मुस्लिम सेनाएं कन्नौज में पहुँची या नहीं। लेकिन वह यह अवश्य बताता है कि कान्यकुब्ज इल्तुतमिश के द्वारा विजय किया गया तथा इस अवसर पर नए सिक्के चलवाए गए। इसके अतिरिक्त ताजउलमाथीर तथा कामिलउत्तवारीख जैसे समकालीन इतिहासों में भी 1193 ई० में मुस्लिम सेना द्वारा विजित नगरों में कन्नौज का उल्लेख नहीं मिलता। तबकात-ए-नासरी में कन्नौज के साथ-साथ बदायूँ और अयोध्या को भी इल्तुतमिश के द्वारा जीते जाने का उल्लेख मिलता है। इस प्रकार पश्चिमी उत्तर प्रदेश में बदायूँ, मध्य उत्तर प्रदेश में कन्नौज तथा पूर्वी उत्तर प्रदेश में काशी और अयोध्या में इल्तुतमिश द्वारा विजय किए जाने के उल्लेखों के कारण यह मानना पड़ेगा कि इल्तुतमिश के शासनकाल तक ये क्षेत्र गहड़वाल शासकों की सत्ता स्वीकार करते रहे। यद्यपि एक-आध सीनों पर कहीं-कहीं मुस्लिम सेनापतियों को जागीर दिए जाने के उल्लेख मिलते हैं। उदाहरण के लिए मुहम्मद इब्न बख्तियार को 1196 ई० में गंगा कर्मनाशा के बीच में भगवान और भिउली की जागीरें दिए जाने का उल्लेख मिलता है। लेकिन इस प्रकार जागीरों को बनाए रख पाना बड़ा कठिन काम होता रहा होगा क्योंकि चारों ओर हिन्दू राजा और सामन्त शासन कर रहे थे जो मुस्लिम सत्ता को चुनौती देते रहते थे। धीरे-धीरे दिल्ली के सुल्तानों की सत्ता अन्तर्वेदी के आन्तरिक क्षेत्रों में भी स्वीकार की जाने लगी होगी लेकिन गहड़वाल राजवंश के अंतिम (?) शासक हरिश्चन्द्र ने कब तक शासन किया और उसके बाद इस राजवंश का क्या हुआ इसके विषय में किसी भी स्रोत से कोई जानकारी नहीं मिलती।” (Pages 81-105)

3870. The Sultanate and Mughal period is said to commence not in the entire part of India but initially at Sindh and thereafter gradually it increase to other parts. As such, therefore, it may not be said that with the advent of Sultanate period the territory of Oudh was ruled by Muslims. On this aspect also in **Ayodhya Ka Itihas Evam Puratatva (supra)** at Chapter-8, pages 109-113 some details have been given and the same may be referred as under:

“इस्लाम की स्थापना के बाद ही आठवीं शताब्दी के प्रारम्भ में अरबों ने भारतभूमि पर सबसे पहले सिन्ध पर आक्रमण किया लेकिन वहां उन्हें कोई बहुत बड़ी सफलता प्राप्त नहीं हो सकी थी। वहां पर केवल एकाध क्षेत्रों पर ही उनका राज्य कायम हो सका जहाँ वे लगभग अज्ञात रूप से तीन शताब्दियों तक अपना अस्तित्व बनाए रख सके। इस बीच में इस्लाम ने यूरोप से लेकर चीन तक के विशाल भू-भाग को जीत लिया था किन्तु भारत में सिन्धु के आगे वे अपना विस्तार नहीं कर सके थे। सिन्धु नदी की घाटी में भी इस बीच में उनका अस्तित्व डॉवाडोल ही रहा। शक्तिशाली अब्बासी खलीफा जिस भारतभूमि को नहीं जीत सके उन्हें अफगानिस्तान में स्थापित होने वाले छोटे-मोटे तुरुष्क राजवंशों ने शताब्दियों तक बारम्बार किए जाने वाले प्रयासों के बाद प्राप्त किया। नवीं शताब्दी में अलममून के एक सेनापति ताहिर को खुरासान का प्रशासक नियुक्त किया गया तथा बगदाद के पूर्व का पूरा क्षेत्र उसके शासन में दे दिया गया। शीघ्र ही ताहिर और उसके वंशजों ने स्वतन्त्रता प्राप्त कर ली और भारत की सीमाओं तक अपना विस्तार किया। नवीं शताब्दी के चौथे चरण में अयूब इब्न नयत अलसफर के नेतृत्व में एक नए राजवंश का उदय हुआ जिसने ताहिर के वंशजों के स्थान पर अपने को स्थापित किया तथा काबुल, जाबुल और सिन्ध तक के प्रदेशों को जीता। दसवीं शताब्दी के अन्तिम दशक में शक्तिशाली सामानी साम्राज्य को दो तुरुष्क राजवंशों ने आपस में बांट लिया। सामानी साम्राज्य के दक्षिण का भाग यामीनी राजवंश के लोगों ने प्राप्त किया, जिन्हें आधुनिक इतिहास के लेखक गजनवी कहते हैं।

सलतनत काल

यामीनी राजवंश के लोग अपने को फारस के सम्राटों का वंशज बताते हैं। इसी वंश में सुबुक्तीगीन नामक व्यक्ति का जनम हुआ था जिसने गजनी में यामीनी राजवंश की नींव डाली थी। लेकिन प्रारम्भ में जब वह केवल बारह वर्ष का एक बालक था, पड़ोस के एक कबीले द्वारा बन्दी बना लिया गया। भाग्य के फेर से वह कई बार बेचे जाने के बाद खुरासान के सामानी शासक के एक अधिकारी अलप्तगीन के द्वारा खरीद लिया गया। 977 ई० में सुबुक्तीगीन ने अपने शासन की स्थापना की और शीघ्र ही उसने बस्त, दावर, कुसदार, तुखारिस्तान तथा घूर को अपने राज्य में मिला लिया। उसके बाद भारत में उसने शाही राजवंश के साथ युद्ध किया तथा उसके कुछ क्षेत्रों को अपने राज्य में मिलाया। **सुबुक्तीगीन की मृत्यु 997 ई० में 58 वर्ष की आयु में बल्ख के सीमान्त पर हुई। उसके बाद उसका पुत्र महमूद गजनी के सिंहासन पर 998 ई० में बैठा।** उस समय उसकी आयु मात्र 27 वर्ष की थी। 1000 ई० में उसने भारत पर पहला आक्रमण किया। उसके बाद उसने प्रायः प्रत्येक वर्ष भारत पर आक्रमण किए। भारतीय इतिहास में वह महमूद गजनवी के नाम से प्रसिद्ध है। उसके आक्रमणों की प्रकृति मुख्य रूप से लूटने तथा पराजित राजाओं से धन वसूलने की थी।

मुस्लिम इतिहासकारों ने महमूद गजनवी के आक्रमणों के जो विवरण दिए हैं वे अतिरंजित मालूम होते हैं और उनमें केवल उसकी सफलताओं के विवरण ही मिलते हैं। इन विवरणों को किन्हीं अन्य स्रोतों से समर्थित नहीं किया जा सकता लेकिन प्रायः इन्हें सही मान लिया जाता है। आगे जो विवरण दिया जा रहा है वह पूरी तरह मुस्लिम इतिहासकारों के विवरणों के आधार पर ही है। गंगा-यमुना की घाटी में उसका आक्रमण 1018 ई० में हुआ था। उसने 2 दिसम्बर, 1018 को यमुना नदी को पार किया तथा रास्ते में कुछ पहाड़ी किलों को जीतते हुए बरन, वर्तमान बुलन्दशहर, पहुँचा। उस समय वहाँ का राजा हरदत्त था जिसने महमूद का मुकाबला किया लेकिन परास्त हुआ। उसे सुल्तान को दस लाख दिरहम और तीस हाथी देकर संधि करनी पड़ी। उसके बाद महमूद ने महाबन में यादव राजा कुलचन्द्र को परास्त किया। **तत्पश्चात् मथुरा उसके कोष का भाजन बना। मथुरा नगर इस समय पत्थर के प्राकार से घिरा हुआ था। जिसमें अनेक विशाल मन्दिर थे। इसमें सबसे बड़ा मन्दिर नगर के केन्द्र में था। संभवतः यह कृष्ण-जन्मभूमि का**

मन्दिर था। इसकी विशालता से महमूद अत्यधिक प्रभावित हुआ। उसका अनुमान था कि यह मन्दिर कम-से-कम दस करोड़ लाल दीनारों से बनवाया गया होगा तथा अत्यधिक कुशल शिल्पियों ने भी इसको बनाने में कम-से-कम दो सौ वर्ष का समय लगाया होगा। इन मन्दिरों की अनेक मूर्तियों में पांच मूर्तियाँ शुद्ध सोने की बनाई गई थीं जिनकी आँखों में एक लाख दीनार के रत्न जड़े थे। इन सभी मूर्तियों में 68,300 मिष्कल भार का सोना था। चॉदी की मूर्तियों की संख्या 200 थी। यह नगर दिल्ली के राजा के अधीन था लेकिन, बिना किसी संघर्ष के महमूद ने मथुरा पर अधिकार कर लिया तथा सोने और चॉदी की सभी मूर्तियों को अधिकार में लेने के बाद उसने सभी मन्दिरों को जलाकर राख कर देने का आदेश कर दिया। इन मूर्तियों को जान-बूझकर टुकड़े-टुकड़े कर दिया गया। नगर में बीस दिनों तक लूटमार होती रही तथा अधिकांश भवन जलाकर राख कर दिए गए।

मथुरा को लूटने के बाद महमूद गजनवी ने कन्नौज की ओर प्रयाण किया। यद्यपि मार्ग में उसे प्रतिरोध का सामना करना पड़ा, फिर भी वह कन्नौज पहुँच गया। यह नगर सात दुर्गों से युक्त था जिसमें दस हजार मन्दिर थे। महमूद के आगमन की सूचना पाकर प्रतिहार वंश का राजा राज्यपाल गंगा के दूसरी ओर बारी नामक स्थान में चला गया। इस प्रकार कन्नौज को महमूद ने पूरी तरह लूटा। कन्नौज के अभियान में महमूद को दो करोड़ दिरहम, तिरपन हजार बन्दी तथा तीन सौ पचास हाथी हाथ लगे।

महमूद कन्नौज से आगे नहीं बढ़ा और इस प्रकार अयोध्या उसके आक्रमण से बच गई। लेकिन महमूद के मुख्य आक्रमण के अतिरिक्त उसकी सेना के कुछ सेनापतियों के आक्रमणों को अयोध्या को अवश्य झेलना पड़ा होगा। महमूद ने 1025 ई० के जनवरी महीने के मध्य में सोमनाथ पर आक्रमण किया और उसे लूटा। सोमनाथ के मन्दिर के शिवलिंग को उसने तोड़कर खण्डित कर दिया तथा दो करोड़ दिरहम का धन भी लूटा। मन्दिर को भी ध्वस्त कर दिया गया तथा शिवलिंग के टुकड़ों को गजनी ले जाया गया जहाँ पर उन टुकड़ों को जामी मस्जिद में द्वार की सीढ़ियों में लगा दिया गया। इस जामी मस्जिद का निर्माण 1019 ई० में कन्नौज को लूटने

के बाद कराया गया था। सोमनाथ के इस युद्ध में सैय्यद सालार मसूद भी शामिल था। उस समय उसकी आयु 12 वर्ष की थी।

अब्दुर्रहमान चिश्ती के अनुसार मसूद महमूद गजनवी की बहन मौला का पुत्र था। इसके पिता का नाम सुल्तान सालार साहू था जो अपने समय का प्रसिद्ध ईरानी योद्धा था। सोमनाथ पर आक्रमण के समय मसूद भी महमूद गजनवी के साथ था और उस समय उसकी आयु केवल 12 वर्ष थी। सोमनाथ की लूट के पाँच वर्षों के बाद मसूद ने इस्लाम के नाम पर एक सेना एकत्र की और अपने पिता सालार शह की सेना के साथ हिन्दुस्तान को फतह करने के इरादे से सिन्धु नदी को पार किया। मसूद ने पहले मुल्तान के शाही राजा अनंगपाल को पराजित किया। इसके बाद उसने दिल्ली के राजा महिपाल के विरुद्ध मोर्चा लिया। दिल्ली के बाद मसूद ने मेरठ पर चढ़ाई की। मेरठ और कन्नौज के राजाओं ने उसके साथ युद्ध करना ठीक न समझकर मित्रता कर ली। . . अयोध्या के मियां रजब सालार सैफुद्दीन ने बहराइच, अमीर हसन अरब ने महुना तथा मलिक फजल ने बनारस जीत लिया। सुलतानसलादीन और मीर बख्तियार दक्षिण की ओर कन्नूर तक गये। लेकिन वहां मीर बख्तियार हिन्दू सेना द्वारा मार डाला गया। सालार मसूद ने रजब मास की 14वीं तारीख अर्थात् रविवार 14 जून, 1033 ई० के दिन बहराइच में बालार्क (बाल सूर्य) के मन्दिर पर आक्रमण कर दिया। मसूद का वध राजा सुहेल देव के द्वारा हुआ। इस युद्ध में बहुत से लोगों की जानें गईं लेकिन 22 वर्षीय सालार मसूद की मृत्यु के बाद यह आक्रमण बिखर गया। चिश्ती ने सेनाओं की संख्या बहुत बढ़ा-चढ़ाकर लिखी है। उसके अनुसार, हिन्दू सेना में बीस लाख घुड़सवार और तीस लाख पैदल थे तथा दोनों ओर से लगभग पौन करोड़ सैनिक लड़े थे। लेकिन ये संख्याएं अत्यधिक अतिरंजित हैं। अब्दुर्रहमान चिश्ती ने मीरात-ए-मसूदी के अन्त में लिखा है कि -

सालार मसूद की मृत्यु के बाद अजमेर में मुजफ्फर खान भी मारा गया। उसके उत्तराधिकारियों को हिन्दुओं ने मार भगाया। जो मूर्तियां तोड़ी गई थीं, वे पुनः स्थापित हो गईं।

फैजाबाद गजेटियर में भी इसका विवरण दिया गया है। स्मिथ ने अर्ली हिस्ट्री आव इण्डिया में लिखा है कि -

वर्षा के बाद मसूद ने अपनी सेना को अजुधन (अयोध्या) के विरुद्ध संचालित किया। यद्यपि उन दिनों वह स्थान व उसके आस पास धनी आबादी थी फिर भी बिना संघर्ष के उसे जीत लिया गया। मसूद अजुधन के मौसम से काफी प्रसन्न था और चूंकि यहां पर शिकार अच्छे मिलते थे इसलिए वह अगली वर्षा तक यहां रुक गया और उसके बाद दिल्ली गया।

सालार मसूद के आक्रमण का काफी प्रतिरोध हुआ और उसकी सेना के लोगों को जगह-जगह मार खानी पड़ी। लखनऊ फैजाबाद के पुराने मार्ग पर मसूद की तथाकथित कब्रों से इसकी सत्यता का ज्ञान होता है। महमूद की सेना का एक अन्य सेनानायक अहमद नियाल्तगीन भी था जिसे महमूद गजनवी ने पंजाब सूबे का अधिकारी बनाया था। ऐसा कहा जाता है कि उसने 1034 ई० में बनारस को लूटा था। हन्स बेकर का कहना है कि या तो उसने अथवा उसकी सेना के किसी अन्य नायक ने इस अवसर पर अयोध्या पर आक्रमण किया हो सकता है। लेकिन हन्स बेकर के इस कथन को हम केवल उनकी शुभ कल्पना मात्र कह सकते हैं क्योंकि **इसका कोई भी प्रमाण नहीं मिलता कि नियाल्तगीन की सेना के किसी सेनापति ने अयोध्या पर आक्रमण किया था।** इसके अतिरिक्त लगभग एक ही वर्ष पूर्व सालार मसूद अयोध्या के निकट बहराइच में मारा गया था। वैसे, अहमद नियाल्तगीन के इस आक्रमण को भी हम मुस्लिम इतिहासकारों की 'गप' ही मानते हैं क्योंकि तवारीख-ए-सुबुक्तगीन में बैहाकी ने जिस तरह से इस घटना का वर्णन किया है वह बड़ा संदिग्ध सा लगता है और ऐसा ऐलता है कि नियाल्तगीन की सेना लाहौर से निकलकर अचानक बनारस पहुँच गई और दोपहर तक लूटपाट करके नमाज के समय तक वापस लौट गई। बैहाकी का विवरण इस प्रकार है—

उसने (नियाल्तगीने) अपने योद्धाओं और सेना के साथ 1033 ई० में लाहौर से निकलकर ठाकुरों से जबरदस्ती खूब रकम वसूली। बाद में वह गंगा पार करके उसके बाएं किनारे से नीचे की ओर चल पड़ा। यकायक वह बनारस नाम के शहर में, जो गंग नाम के राजा के राज्य में था, आ पहुँचा। इसके पहले कोई भी मुस्लिम सेना वहां तक नहीं पहुँची थी। नगर दो फरसंग मुरब्बे में था और उसमें काफी पानी था। सेना

वहां सवेरे से दोपहर की नमाज तक ठहरी क्योंकि ज्यादा ठहरने में खतरा था। बजाजों तथा गंधियों और जौहरियों की बाजारें लूट ली गई, लेकिन इससे कुछ अधिक करना नामुमकिन था। सेना के सिपाही भी इसलिए अधीर हो गए क्योंकि वे अपने साथ लूट का सोना, चॉदी, अतर और जवाहरात लेकर सही सलामती लौट जाना चाहते थे।

इस प्रकार नियाल्तगीन द्वारा बनारस की लूट की घटना बिल्कुल विश्वसनीय नहीं लगती।

महमूद गजनवी के अन्तर्वेदी (दोआबा) में इन आक्रमणों के बाद यहां पर एक शक्तिशाली साम्राज्य की स्थापना हुई। गहड़वाल वंश के चन्द्रदेव अथवा चन्द्रादित्य देव ने जिस साम्राज्य की नींव रखी उसने लगभग एक शताब्दी तक अन्तर्वेदी की सुरक्षा की। चन्द्रदेव और उसके उत्तराधिकारियों के अभिलेखों से यह ज्ञात होता है कि गहड़वाल वंश के सभी राजाओं के तुरुष्क आक्रमणकारियों का सामना करके उन्हें बार-बार प्रत्यावर्तित करना पड़ा। कुमारदेवी के सारनाथ अभिलेख से यह ज्ञात होता है कि दुष्ट तुरुष्क-बीर से वारणसी की रक्षा के लिए भगवान विष्णु को गोविन्दचन्द्र के रूप में अवतार लेना पड़ा जिसे लिए शिव ने प्रार्थना की थी। गोविन्दचन्द्र के राहन ताम्रपत्र से यह ज्ञात होता है कि गोविन्दचन्द्र ने असम युद्ध में हम्मीर को शत्रुता त्यागने के लिए बाध्य कर दिया था। बदायूँ के लखनपाल के एक अभिलेख से भी यह ज्ञात होता है कि उसके पूर्वज मदनपाल ने हम्मीर के दवेनदी (गंगा) की घाटी में आक्रमण को असंभव बना दिया था। गोविन्दचन्द्र के पुत्र विजयचन्द्र को भी हम्मीर की गतिविधियों को सफलतापूर्वक रोकने का श्रेय दिया गया है। दिल्ली-शिवालिक स्तम्भ लेख में विशालदेव को म्लेच्छों का नाश करने का श्रेय दिया गया है। इस प्रकार अन्तर्वेदी में मुस्लिम आक्रमणकारी लगातार प्रयास करते रहे और यहां के राजवंशों ने उनका प्रतिरोध भी समय-समय पर किया। इसका उल्लेख न केवल मुस्लिम इतिहासकार करते हैं बल्कि भारतीय राजाओं के अभिलेखों से भी इनकी सूचना मिलती है। इसके अतिरिक्त अयोध्या से अभी हाल ही में प्राप्त किए गए पाषण फलक अभिलेख से भी यह ज्ञात होता है कि गोविन्द चन्द्र के शासनकाल में किसी प्रकार का आक्रमण अयोध्या में हुआ था। 1193 ई० में चन्द्रवर के युद्ध में जयचन्द्र के पराजित हो जाने के बाद मुसलमान सेनाओं ने वाराणसी को नष्ट किया था इसकी तो सूचना मिलती

है, किन्तु अयोध्या में भी उनका आक्रमण हुआ था इसकी कोई सूचना नहीं मिलती। कुछ इतिहासकार यह मानते हैं कि मुहम्मद गौरी के एक अधिकारी मखदूमशाह जुरान गोरी ने अयोध्या पर आक्रमण करके आदिनाथ के जैन मंदिर को तोड़ा था। लेकिन उसने अयोध्या के किसी अन्य हिन्दू मंदिर को भी नष्ट किया था इसकी निश्चित सूचना नहीं मिलती। गहड़वाल सम्राट के युद्ध में पराजित हो जाने के बाद मुस्लिम सेनाएं सारे गहड़वाल साम्राज्य पर अपना प्रशासन स्थापित कर सकी होंगी इस पर भी विश्वास करना कठिन है क्योंकि अनेक जगहों पर स्थानीय रूप से मुस्लिम सेनाओं का प्रतिरोध जारी रहा और कहीं कहीं पर बहुत शक्तिशाली प्रतिरोध किया गया, इसका उल्लेख हम पीछे कर आए हैं। 1226 ई. में इल्तुतमिश के पुत्र मलिक नासिरुद्दीन महमूद को अवध का प्रशासक नियुक्त किया गया और संभवतः उस समय हिन्दू प्रतिरोध को एक धक्का लगा। तबकात-ए-नासरी में यह उल्लेख किया गया है कि अयोध्या में बरतूह नामक एक व्यक्ति ने बीस हजार मुसलमानों को मौत के घाट उतार दिया था। लेकिन नसीरुद्दीन महमूद ने अवध के इन काफिरों को उखाड़ फेंका।

अवधवासी लाला सीताराम ने अपने अयोध्या का इतिहास में लिखा है कि चन्द्रवर के युद्ध में जयचन्द्र के पराजित होने के बाद शहाबुद्दीन गोरी ने 1194 में अवध पर आक्रमण किया और मखदूमशाह जुरान गोरी अयोध्या में मारा गया और वहीं उसकी समाधि बनी। परन्तु बख्तियार खिलजी ने सबसे पहले अवध में राज्य प्रबन्ध किया और उसे सेना का एक केन्द्र बनाया। इसमें उसको इतनी सफलता मिली कि आसाम तक का क्षेत्र उसने अपने अधीन कर लिया। उसने अपनी शक्ति इतनी बढ़ा ली थी कि कुतुबुद्दीन की मृत्यु के बाद जब इल्तुतमिश गद्दी पर बैठा तो उसको दास समझकर उसकी आधीनता स्वीकार करने से इन्कार कर दिया। उसके पुत्र गियासुद्दीन ने बंगाल में स्वतन्त्र राज्य स्थापित कर लिया किन्तु कुछ ही दिनों में अयोध्या उसकी अधीनता से छिन गई और बहराइच और मानिकपुर के बीच का प्रदेश दिल्ली की अधीन कर दिया गया। इससे हिन्दुओं में बड़ी प्रतिक्रिया हुई और संघर्ष में बहुत से मुसलमान मारे गए। हिन्दुओं का दमन करने के लिए शाहजादा नसीरुद्दीन को दिल्ली से भेजा गया। 1236 और 1242 ई० में क्रमशः नसीरुद्दीन महमूद और कमरुद्दीन केरान अवध के प्रशासक रहे।

1155 ई० में सुल्तान नसीरुद्दीन की मां मलक-ए-जहाँ ने कुतलुग

खान से विवाह कर लिया था। इस कारण कुतलुग खान को अवध का हाकिम बना दिया गया तथा 16 फरवरी 1255 को उसे अवध जाने का आदेश दिया गया। इस बीच में उलुघ खान दिल्ली दरबार में शक्तिशाली हो गया था तथा उसने बादशाह से यह हुक्म निकलवा दिया कि मलिक ताजुद्दीन माह पेशानी को बहराइच का हाकिम बनाया जाता है। इस पर कुतलुग खान ने मलिक ताजुद्दीन को बन्दी बना लिया लेकिन वह भाग निकला और बहराइच पहुंच गया। इधर दिल्ली दरबार ने पुनः कुतलुग खान को अवध से बहराइच स्थानान्तरित कर दिया लेकिन उसने इस आदेश को नहीं माना। बाद में 1256 ई० में दिल्ली से सेना आने पर वह गायब हो गया। उसके स्थान पर अर्सलान खान संजर को अवध का हाकिम बनाया गया किन्तु 1259 ई० में उसने भी विद्रोह कर दिया तथा निकाल दिया गया।

इसके बाद मलिक एतिगीन मुई-दराज (लम्बें बालों वाला), जिसे अमीन खान भी कहा जाता था, को अवध का हाकिम बनाया गया। बलबन ने लखनौती के तुघील के विद्रोह को दबाने के लिए एक बड़ी सेना के साथ अमीन खान को भेजा, लेकिन वह हार गया। इस पर बलबन की आज्ञा से अमीन खान का सिर काटकर अवध (अयोध्या) के द्वार पर टांग दिया गया। इसके थोड़े ही दिन बाद फरहत खान को अवध का हाकिम नियुक्त किया गया। उसने शराब के नशे में एक नीच को मार डाला। उसकी विधवा ने बलबन से फरियाद की। बलबन ने फरहत खान को 500 कोड़े लगवाए और उसे उस विधवा को सौंप दिया।

सल्तनत काल में अवध को ही हिन्दुस्तान समझा जाता था। बलबन दिल्ली से अवध के मार्ग को निष्कण्टक बनाने के लिए प्रयत्नशील था। वह दो बाद दिल्ली छोड़कर कम्पिल और पटियाली में पांच-छह महीने ठहरा जिसमें लुटेरों और डाकुओं से दिल्ली से अवध का मार्ग साफ हो जाए। इसके लिए कई प्रयास भी किए गए। बंगाल में तुघील के विद्रोह का दमन करने के लिए जाते समय वह अवध में ठहरा था तथा वहां पर सेना में काम आने वाले विभिन्न प्रकार के व्यक्तियों, यथा-ए जुड़सवार, पैदल, पायक, धनुर्धर, कहार, कैवानी, तीरन्दाज, गुलाम, नौकर, व्यापारी, दुकानदार, आदि को दो लाख की संख्या में एकत्रित कराया। लखनौती विजय के बाद बलबन ने बुगरा खान को वहां पर नियुक्त किया। राजधानी लौटने पर उत्सव मनाया गया तथा तुघील के समर्थकों को मौत

के घाट उतारने का आदेश दिया। यद्यपि काजी ने कुछ को बचा लिया किन्तु इतिहासकार बर्नी लिखता है कि तुघील के समर्थकों में से एक अयोध्या के शेख फरीद के गंज-ए-शाकर के जमातखाना में आत्मिक शान्ति पाने की इच्छा रखता था।

बलबन के बाद बुगरा खान का बेटा कैकुबाद दिल्ली का सुल्तान बना। उधर लखनौती में बुगरा खान स्वतंत्र हो गया था। बाप-बेटे दोनों की सेनाएं आमने-सामने थीं। एक घाघरा के इस किनारे पर डेरा डाले था तो दूसरा घाघरा के उस पार। काफी संदेशों के आदान-प्रदान के बाद पिता-पुत्र एक स्थान पर मिले तो कैकुबाद ने अपने पिता बुगरा खान के चरणों पर गिरकर उसे आंसुओं से भिगो दिया। बाद में दोनों अपने-अपने राज्यों में लौट गए।

फरहत खान के निकाले जाने के बाद खानजहाँ अवध का हक़िम बनाया गया। उसी के काल में अमीर खुसरों दो वर्ष तक अयोध्या में रहा और यहां की बोली में फारसी-हिन्दी कोश खालिकबारी की रचना की।

जब खिलजी वंश की सल्तनत दिल्ली में कायम हुई तो इस वंश के संस्थापक जलालुद्दीन का भतीजा अलाउद्दीन अवध का शासक बनाया गया। अलाउद्दीन इलाहाबाद के निकट कड़ा में रहता था जहां उसने धोखे से अपने चाचा का सिर कटवाकर धड़ को गंगा की रेती में फिंकवा दिया और खुद सुल्तान बन बैठा।

चौदहवीं शताब्दी में खिलजी वंश के बाद तुगलक वंश अस्तित्व में आया। तारीख-ए-फिरोज शाही में लिखा है कि मुहम्मद बिन तुगलक ने गंगा के तट पर एक नगर बसाना चाहा था जिसका नाम उसने स्वर्गद्वारी रखा था। सुल्तान फिरोज तुगलक दो बार अयोध्या आया था। पहली बार 1324 ई० में और दूसरी बार 1348 ई० में। उसके समय में मलिक सिगनि और आयानुल मुल्क अयोध्या के शासक रहे।

मुहम्मद तुगलक का पूर्व नाम जूना खान था और यह कहा जाता है कि उसी के नाम पर जौनपुर बसाया गया था। बाद में जौनपुर में शर्की वंश का राज्य हुआ और अयोध्या उनके शासन के अन्तर्गत आ गई।”

3871. We may mention that the description of Salar Masud about his alleged attack on Ayodhya is incorrect and has been

admitted by Sri T.P. Verma in his cross-examination before this Court also. We have already discussed this aspect while considering the issues relating to period of construction of the building. Rest of the historical events particularly the rulers and their periods substantially could not be shown incorrect by the learned counsels.

3872. What actually appears from the above books is that the twilight zone when Hindu rulers came to be dominated by Muslim rulers has been considered by some of the historians as the commencement of the medieval period which some has termed as early medieval and some as Sultanate period. With the advent of Mughal Rulers the term has been called medieval and that has been treated to be the end of the Sultanate period. It is in this context we find ASI has taken a mid way and termed 6th period as Medieval Sultanate, 7th as Medieval and have divided the same centurywise, i.e., 11th and 12th century as Medieval Sultanate, 13th to 16th century to be more precise upto 1526 AD to be medieval and thereafter Mughal. In fact for more clarity this division has been made. None of the alleged expert witness has shown the said classification or periodization of ASI wholly unknown to historians or perverse or something which could not have been said or conceived by a person well conversant in such matters.

3873. It brings us to the concept of periodization of Indian history-particularly for Northern India as Ancient, Medieval and Modern. By and large, in the present day usage, the Ancient Period ends in the 7th century A.D., after the rule of Emperor Harsh. Then starts the Early Medieval Period. It lasts till the end of the 12th century. It is followed by the Medieval Period which

starts in the 13th century. In fact, the 11th and 12th centuries form the 'transitional stage', the stage between the Ancient and Medieval i.e. early Medieval period. Earlier, in the history books written in the first part of the 20th century, there was no concept of "Early Medieval", the "Ancient" ended in the 11th century and "Medieval" started in the 12th century. Thus there is absolutely no need of making sarcastic remarks against the Archaeological Survey of India, as the historians themselves have not been unanimous on this issue during the last one hundred years. Earlier, even "Hindu", "Muslim" and "British" were the designations of the three-fold division of Indian history.

3874. Many scholars have pointed out inadequacy of use of the term "Medieval" in Indian history since this is imposing the European concept on Indian history, the characteristic features of say British Mediaevalism which was never present otherwise in India. It is more systematic and precious to use centuries, like 11th, 12th, 16th, 20th in the present context instead of Ancient, Medieval and Modern. For this kind of division there are several Radiocarbon Dates from the site, the list of which is given in the Report. Periodization won't be a cut off feature like on-off electric current by a switch. It is the flow and merger of previous culture and power structure of the immediately following period. Any specific data is only suggestive of some event of significance which throws light both on the past and the next.

3875. **Professor R.S. Sharma** mentioned in his book "**Perspective in Social and Economic History of Early India**" on page 228-229 that an important problem in the general

history of India is that of transition from the ancient to medieval, and certain dates such as AD 647, 711, 750, 916, 997 and 1206 have been suggested as landmarks in political history. But since politics was the preoccupation of a small section of society in early times, it has to be shown whether any of the above mentioned dates or whether any other date or point of time is equally significant in the history of land system, crafts and commerce polity, society, language, art, religion, etc. There has taken place a lot of discussion whether Harsavardhana's death in AD 647 marks the end of one and the beginning of another era in Indian history. The statement of Vincent Smith that the death of Harsavardhana set in the process of decline of Indian history has been ably refuted by a number of scholars, and especially by H.C. Ray. But for those who wish to investigate patterns of social and economic life, the real point to look for is not the presages of decline and prosperity but the nature of change in the existing way of life. If the change is of a fundamental nature, it should be regarded as heralding the advent of new period. If it is a minor change it would not necessitate any new characterization of the period, even the question to the process of change involved in it. We have to carefully consider how far the decline of the existing system of life shows symptoms of the rise of a new pattern of life. None of these points have been taken into account either by V. Smith when he says that the death of Harsavardhana in AD 647 brings a period of decline or by those who try to refute his theory.

3876. On the grounds of dynastic and political history H.C. Ray suggests that AD 916 should be accepted as the line of demarcation between the two periods in the history of northern

India. In his opinion: “these may be called the ancient and the medieval periods; but it would be perhaps more reasonable to call them simply the Hindu period and the period of the Turks and Afghans. A similar approach has been adopted by some other scholars. In the fifth volume of the **"History and culture of the Indian People"**, it is said at one place that ancient India came to an end in AD 997, (the period subsequent whereto Mahmood Gazni invaded on the northern front) and again at another, that in Indian history the medieval factor was introduced in the thirteenth century. Both views are based on the assumption that the Muslim conquest ushered in mediaevalism in India. Does it mean that without the Muslim conquest there would have been no mediaevalism in India? Does it imply that the countries of Europe which escaped this conquest had no mediaeval period in their history? In Europe it is difficult to think of mediaevalism without feudalism, the origins and nature of which have to be examined in the case of India.”

3877. In **"The History and Culture of the Indian People"**, Bhavan's Book University published by Bhartiya Vidya Bhavan Mumbai (first edition 1957), 5th Edition 2001, Vol. V, "The Struggle for Empire" in the foreword written by Dr. K.M. Munshi it is said that for over 2000 years, i.e., from before the days of King Janmejaya Parikshita, referred to in the Brahmanas, the culture of the dominant classes, developing in almost unbroken continuity, had brought large sections of the people within its fold. It was, however, disturbed on occasions, for instance by the raids of Alexandar; by the influx of the Bactrian Greeks, the Kushanas and the Sakas; by the invasion of the Hunas; by the Arab incursions in Sindh. But these inroads

were only temporary episodes; the vitality of the culture and social organisation found it easy to absorb most of the alien elements which were left behind in the country after they were closed. It was based on the faith that Bharatvarsha, in its ideal aspect often referred to as Aryavarta, was the sacred land of Dharma, 'the high road to Heaven and to Salvation'; where 'men were nobler than the Gods themselves; where all knowledge, thought and worship were routed in the Vedas, revealed by the Gods themselves; where the Dharmasastras prescribes the fundamental canons of personal life and social relations; where Chaturvarnya, the divinely-ordained four-fold order of society, embraced all social groups; where, whatever the dialect of the people, Sanskrit, the language of the Gods, was the supreme medium of high expression. 'The Dharmasastras' and by that is meant not only the Smritis beginning with the Manu-smriti, but the Mahabharata and Ramayana have played a very big role in the life of the country. Manu-smriti as the Dharmasastra of divine origin, has had an all-pervading influence from the time historical memory could reach back to moulding the mind and the life of men, not only in India but in the India beyond the seas, in Burma, Siam, Annam, Combodia, Jawa and Bali. With the Mahabharata and the Ramayana, it has provided a background of continuity to the social and moral life; modified customary laws of tribes and communities in different stages of civilization; and built up the Collective Unconscious of our people that subconscious source of integrative vitality which keeps a people together, leads them to feel and react as one in the face of certain circumstances, and provides the urge to collective action of a recurring character. Century after century,

the system, first formulated by the Manu-smriti, was accepted throughout the country, never by force of arms, less by royal fiats than the sanction implied in the belief that 'God gave it and the ancestors obeyed it'. It was found so acceptable because it had a revealing basis of reality: of a frank recognition of the temperamental inequalities of man; of the predominance of hereditary influences over environments; of the need for a synthetic framework for widely differing social groups in a vast country where culture have been staggered from not only region to region, but often from one group of villages to another. But then the year AD 1000 was fateful year for Bharatversha. The crucial age in Indian history began in AD 998 when the Turkish conqueror Mahmood captured Ghazni and thereafter invaded India for umpteen times. Generally it is believed that Mahmood invaded Indian territory for 17 times and his last visit was in AD 1027. He drove India on enormous wealth and destroyed much of its man power by repeated expeditions. This extortion of economic resources and man power told upon the future political destiny of India. Particularly the destruction of Shahi Kingdoms which barred the gates of India against foreign invaders dealt with a severe blow to its future independence. The inclusion of Punjab and Afganistan in the kingdom of Ghazni made Islamic conquest of India a comparatively easy process. The northern part of India, however, soon recovered. In Bihar area, i.e., Magadh, Tirabhukti and Mithila, sometimes around AD 1097 Nanyadev of Karnataka dynasty established his supremacy while Kannauj was taken by Gaharwala dynasty in the later part of the 11th century. After 1034 AD till 1068 AD we find no information about any military campaign by muslims

against Hindustan. The cause might be the forceful dominant military power of Parmar Bhoj and Kalchuri Karn who led expeditions even into the heart of muslim territory of Punjab. Bhoj died about 1055 AD and Karn died about 1072 AD whereafter the military expeditions recommenced. Prince Mahmood, the Governor of Punjab plundered Kannauj and Kalanjar and invaded Ujjain between 1086 to 1090 AD. 42 inscriptions of Govindacharya's reign bearing dates extended from AD 1114 to 1154 proving that his kingdom extended atleast up to Banaras, Fatehpur and Kanpur districts on the south Kannauj, on the west Gonda and Gorakhpur, on the north Dinapur and Patna (Bihar) on the east. The last king in succession who live peacefully for about 2 decades was Jaichand but was defeated in the end of 12th century by Muizz-ud-din Muhammad Ghuri who came after conquering Delhi and Ajmer by defeating Prithviraj Chahmanas. Ghuri captured the fort of Asni in Fatehpur district where the treasure of the king of Banaras was deposited and then plundered Banaras city also. In 1197 it appears that Harishchandra son of Jai Chandra retained his power over Kannauj, Jaunpur and Mirzapur district resting his patron kingdom from the commands of muslims. He was, however, killed by Malik Nasiruddin Muhammad Shah the eldest son of Iltutmish in AD 1226 and the Kannauj was finally conquered by Iltutmish. It may be added at this stage that Muhammad Ghuri after his death was succeeded by Kutubuddin Aibak in 1206 AD who established the Turkish Sultanate in India at Lahore later transferred to Delhi. It is in this context that the Sultanate period is considered to have commenced in the first half of 13th century.

3878. Nothing is brought to our notice which may suggest anything otherwise in the historical background referred to above. We therefore find no reason whatsoever in the above background to hold periodization determined by ASI as mistaken.

3879. Moreover, we have no doubt in our mind that ASI, as a premier institution of this country, is responsible for the preservation, maintenance and discovery of ancient monuments and sites, as well as archaeological survey and excavation. They are experts of expert. No archaeologist in this country can undertake an archaeological expedition at a historical site of importance without permission or licence from ASI. The status enjoined to ASI which we have already referred, empowers it to control all these activities. The finds and researches as well as the determination and conclusion of any archaeologist or other expert in this field is not normally recognised unless it has been scrutinized by ASI and after approval it is also published in the regular journals of ASI. An individual at some point of time may be said to have acted with some kind of bias, legal or factual as the case may be, but to brandish the entire body or a large number of its officials who belong to different religions including Muslims also, that they have worked with preconceived notions is not only an irresponsible attitude to show some kind of pre-determined plan and scheme to atleast create a clout on a remarkable and excellent work ASI it has, otherwise performed. The result of a work, if it is not chewable to one or more, will not make the quality of work impure or suspicious. The self contradictory statement, inconsistant with other experts made against ASI of same party i.e. Muslim, extra

interest, and also the fact that they are virtually hired experts reduces trustworthiness of these experts despite their otherwise competence. The allegations, need much more material to substantiate. In the matter of stratigraphy/ periodization made by ASI, in the absence of anything to show that what they have said is improbable, ex facie fake or incorrect or that no person having adequate knowledge in the subject may have formed such opinion, we have no reason to disbelieve or discard it and instead accept version of interested and partisan expert witnesses who at times have made contradictory statements as we have already noticed to some extent above. **We, therefore, find no force in the objection with respect to the stratification/periodization made by ASI.**

Pillar Bases

3880. The next and the biggest objection is with respect to the pillar bases. We thus proceed to consider the same. A serious allegations of framing of certain structures in particular, i.e. certain pillar bases have been levelled by submitting objections dated 21.05.2003 and 07.06.2003 which we have already discussed in detail. Normally, it would have been suffice to mention at this stage that had there been any truth, the same could not have gone unnoticed by such a large number of persons present at the site particularly when two members of Higher Judicial Services were also present there as 'Observers' having been appointed by this Court. We have already noticed that two expert archaeologist, i.e., PW 16 and 24 who have given very long statements before this Court thrice and twice respectively, both of them visited the site in June 2003 and Dr. Mandal also visited again in Sept. 2003. Both of them admitted

that in June 2003 they had no idea or information that any structure was manipulated by the members of Archaeological Team of ASI. However considering the seriousness and also the fact that in the Court, the stand is slightly different, we would go in further detail of these allegations.

3881. The ASI in Chapter IV commencing from page 48 has considered various structures it found during the course of excavation. For the time being we leave other structures and proceed with the pillar bases in respect whereto the reference is on page 55 and onwards. It says:

"From the excavation it could be inferred that there were seventeen rows of pillar bases from north to south, each row having five pillar bases. Due to area restriction and natural barriers, the pillar bases in the central part occupied by the make-shift structure on the raised platform could not be located. Out of excavated fifty pillar bases only twelve were completely exposed, thirty five were partially exposed and three could be traced in sections only. A few pillar bases were noticed during earlier excavation after which a controversy took place about their association with different layers and their load bearing capacity. The present excavation has set aside the controversy by exposing the original the form of the bases having calcrete and stone blocks arranged and set in a proper manner over a brick foundation and their arrangements in rows including their association with the top floor of the structure existing prior to the disputed structure.

The seventeen rows of pillar bases were constructed

along the north-south running brick wall (wall 16) on the west. The distance of the first pillar base in each row from the wall ranges from 3.60 to 3.86m. Seventeen rows of pillar bases could be categorised in three different groups on the basis of north-south distance which varies in different groups whereas east-west distance from centre to centre of each pillar base vary from 2.90 to 3.30m. Six rows of the pillar bases on north and south were at the equidistance which ranges from 3 to 3.30m. Central five rows consisting twenty five pillar bases show different equations-two rows on either sides of the central row were placed approximately at the distance of 5.25m. whereas the other two rows on either side of these three rows were at the distance of 4.20 - 4.25 m. From this it could be easily concluded that the central part of the pillared structure was important and special treatment was given to it in architectural planning.

In the southern area only one decorated sand stone was found over a pillar base while in the northern area many of the pillar bases were found topped by a plain sand stone block set over the brick bat foundation having calcrete blocks over them (Pl. 36). Top parts of stone encasings had a projection in the middle. In the northern area at a few places where the stone blocks were not found sand stone slabs were found over the calcrete blocks of the brick bat foundation of the pillar bases. The decorated octagonal sand stone block on pillar base³² having floral motif on four corners in trench F7 in the southern area is the unique example at the site (Pl. 39) which definitely

belongs to the twelfth century A.D. as it is similar to those found in the Dharmachakrajina Vihara of Kumaradevi at Sarnath (Pl. 40) which belongs to the early twelfth century A.D. Seeing its cut or broken surface on one side its use as the base of a neighbouring pilaster (Pl. 41) attached with wall 16 in trench E6 cannot be ruled out."

3882. Thereafter the details of pillar bases have been tabulated showing a total number of 50 pillar bases in different trenches the relevant extract whereof is as under:

<i>Pillar Base number given by ASI</i>	<i>Trench No.</i>	<i>Pillar Base given by ASI</i>	<i>Trench no.</i>
1.	ZH3-ZH2 baulk	2.	ZF2
3.	ZG2	4.	ZG2
5.	ZH2	6.	ZH2-ZJ2 baulk
7.	ZF1	8.	ZG1
9.	ZH1	10.	ZF1
11.	ZG1	12.	ZG1
13.	ZH1	14.	ZH1-H1 baulk
15.	F1	16.	F1-G1
17.	G1	18.	H1
19.	H1	20.	F2-G2 baulk
21.	G2	22.	F2
23.	F2-G2 baulk	24.	G2
25.	F3	26.	G5
27.	H5	28.	F6
29.	F6	30.	G6
31.	F6-F7 baulk	32.	F6-F7
33.	G6-G7 baulk	34.	E7-F7 baulk
35.	F7	36.	G7
37.	F8	38.	F8
39.	G8	40.	F8-F9 baulk

41.	<i>F8-F9 baulk</i>	42.	<i>G8-G9 baulk</i>
43.	<i>E9-F9 baulk</i>	44.	<i>F9</i>
45.	<i>G9</i>	46.	<i>G9-H9 baulk</i>
47.	<i>E10-F10 baulk</i>	48.	<i>F10</i>
49.	<i>G10-H10 baulk</i>	50.	<i>H10</i>

3883. The learned experts who have appeared before this Court rendering their opinion on behalf of muslim parties have sought to challenge this part of the report making serious allegations that most of the pillar bases have been created, actually they did not exist. This attack is led on front by PW 29, 32 and DW 6/1-2. These very Experts (Archaeologists) who have deposed their statements on behalf of muslim parties complaining about the manner in which the ASI have functioned in the above excavation have also said simultaneously something otherwise.

3884. **PW 29, Jaya Menon** on pages 177-178 and 179-180 has said:

“Excavation was conducted by a team of members of the A.S.I. It was supervised by two Judicial Officers throughout the excavation. Besides these observers, parties, their counsels nominees and experts were also present during excavation. Day to day register was maintained during excavation on day to day basis by ASI but so far as site note book is concerned I don't know about it. Day to day register was signed by parties or their nominees and Advocates regularly on day to day basis. Antiquity register was not maintained by ASI on day to day basis. During my stay at the excavation site I did not sign on the daily register. Since it was not compulsory to sign this register therefore I did not sign this register, day to day

register mentioned the antiquities found in various trenches on daily basisDuring my stay at Ayodhya I verified by inspection of day to day register, the antiquities recorded on day to day basis in the daily register but did not sign the register.” (Page 177-178)

“During excavation photography of trenches along with artefacts was being regularly done. There was three dimensional recording during excavation. Videography was regularly done but I do not know that videography of each and every trench was being done or not. I have not seen the C.D. Of video recording prepared by the ASI.I have seen the site note books prepared by the A.S.I. And submitted in the court. Site note books were prepared by the A.S.I. trenchwise on the basis of regular excavation at excavation site. It is correct that excavation conducted by the A.S.I. Was grid system of excavation. Vertical and horizontal excavation were some by A.S.I. At the site.It is correct that for the compliance of the order of the court horizontal excavation was necessary on the spot. Vertical excavation by itself was not sufficient because both types of excavation were necessary. Both types of excavation had been conducted by the A.S.I. at the spot. A.S.I. has given it's report along with some plans and sections.” (Page 179-180)

3885. Similarly PW 30, Dr. R.C. Thakran has said:

“सामान्य तौर पर भारतीय पुरातत्व विभाग के उत्खनन की टीम के सदस्य जिनको उत्खनन के कार्य का सुपरविज़न का भार सौंपा गया था, वे नोट्स तो लेते थे, परन्तु उस तरह के नोट्स नहीं लिये जाते थे, जिस तरह के नोट्स की ऐसी परिस्थितियों में आवश्यकता होती है। नोट्स लेने से मेरा तात्पर्य खुदाई के दौरान जो

भी अवशेष प्राप्त होते हैं, चाहे वे कितने ही तुच्छ नज़र आते हों, सभी की उचित प्रकार से रिकार्डिंग होनी चाहिए और इस रिकार्डिंग का लेखा-जोखा टेंच नोट बुक में होना ही चाहिए, ताकि जब भी कभी इसको कन्सल्ट करने की आवश्यकता पड़े, तो किया जा सके। मुझे इस बात की जानकारी है कि ए०एस०आई० द्वारा एक डेली रजिस्टर मेन्टेन किया जाता था, जिसमें शाम के वक्त दिन-भर के उत्खनन के दौरान उत्खनन कर्ताओं के अनुसार जो उल्लेखनीय अवशेष होते थे, उनकी रिकार्डिंग की जाती थी। मैंने ए०एस०आई० द्वारा मौके पर "साइट नोट बुक" मेन्टेन करते नहीं देखा था। यद्यपि आमतौर पर "साइट नोट बुक" उत्खनन के दौरान प्रयोग की जाती है।" (पेज 54)

"Generally, members of the excavation team of Indian Archaeology Department who were assigned the job of supervising the excavation work, used to take notes but such type of notes were not taken down as are required in such circumstances. By the words 'taking notes' I mean that proper recording should be done of all the remains which are discovered in course of the excavation, howsoever trivial they seem to be, and accounts of this recording should only be maintained in the note book in regard to the trench so that it may be consulted whenever such need be there. I have the information that ASI maintained a daily register recording in the evening all remains discovered in course of day-long excavation and which the excavators take to be worth recording. I did not see ASI taking site notebooks, though such notebooks are generally used in course of excavation." (E.T.C.)

“उत्खनन के दौरान जब मैं उत्खनन स्थल पर मौजूद रहा था, तब मैंने यह देखा था कि उत्खनन से प्राप्त जो पुरावशेष उत्खनित किए जाते थे, उनकी रिकार्डिंग तो होती थी, परन्तु सभी प्रकार के पुरावशेषों की समुचित रिकार्डिंग नहीं होती थी।” (पेज 75)

“In course of the excavation, when I was present at the excavation site, I saw that the antiquities obtained from the excavation were certainly recorded but a proper recording of all sorts of antiquities was not done.” (E.T.C.)

प्रश्न— अयोध्या में उत्खनन के दौरान जो पुरावशेष प्राप्त हुए थे, क्या उनकी इंडेक्सिंग (नम्बरिंग) की गई थी?

उत्तर— हाँ, मुझे इस बात की जानकारी है कि उत्खनन के दौरान जो पुरावशेष उपलब्ध होते थे और जिनको उत्खननकर्ता महत्वपूर्ण मानते थे, उन पुरावशेषों की उत्खनन के दौरान मार्किंग की जाती थी।

प्रश्न— उपरोक्त पुरावशेष जिनकी मार्किंग होना आपने अभी बताया है, क्या यह मार्किंग विवादित स्थल पर स्थित मेक शिफ्ट स्ट्रक्चर के पूरब स्थित एक बड़े चबूतरे पर होती थी?

उत्तर— हाँ, मुझे यह जानकारी है कि उक्त स्थल पर दिन भर की खुदाई के दौरान जो पुरावशेष (उत्खननकर्ताओं की दृष्टि से तथाकथित महत्वपूर्ण अवशेष) मिलते थे, उनकी मार्किंग और लिस्टिंग वहाँ न करके किसी अन्य जगह पर की जाती थी और उसके पश्चात् इस तरह से लिस्टिंग की गई पुरावशेषों की जानकारी उत्खननकार्य को प्रतिदिन समाप्त करने से पहले उपस्थित पर्यवेक्षकों या अन्य उपस्थित व्यक्तियों को दी जाती थी।” (पेज 76)

“Question:- Was the indexing done of the antiquities discovered from the Ayodhya excavation ?

Answer:- Yes, I have the information that the antiquities which were discovered in course of the excavation and which were considered to be important by the excavators, were marked in course of the excavation.

Question:- You have just told about the marking of the afore-said antiquities. Was this marking done at a big chabutra located east of a make-shift structure at the disputed site ?

Answer:- Yes, I have the information that the marking and

listing of the antiquities which were discovered as a result of the day long digging at the said place (and which were called important from excavators' point of view), used to be done at any place other than there. After that, information regarding the antiquities thus listed, used to be given to supervisors or the other present persons before the end of each day's excavation work.” (E.T.C.)

“यह सही है कि अयोध्या की खुदाई में अदालत के आदेशों के अनुसार सभी पक्षकार एवं उनके नामिनी की उपस्थिति में ही कोई मजदूर या ए०एस०आई० टीम का कोई सदस्य उत्खनन क्षेत्र में जा सकता था। खुदाई के समय अदालत द्वारा नियुक्त पर्यवेक्षक उपस्थित रहते थे।
 . .मैंने एक समय में तीन, चार टेंचेज से भी ज्यादा टेंचेज में खुदाई होते देखा था। मैंने आठ –दस, बारह टेंचेज में एक साथ खुदाई होते देखा था। खुदाई के समय मेरे साथ मुस्लिम पक्ष के एक, दो, तीन एक्सपर्ट – नामिनी रहते थे।” (पेज 118)

"It is true that in the Ayodhya excavation, under the orders of the court, any labourer or any member of the ASI team could go to the excavation site only in the presence of all the parties or their nominees. Court-appointed supervisors used to be present at the time of excavation. I had at a time seen the digging going on in even more than three to four trenches. I had seen the digging going together in 8-10 or 12 trenches. At the time of excavation, I used to be accompanied with one or two or three experts or nominees from the Muslim side.”
 (E.T.C.)

“खुदाई के समय पक्षकारों में मो० हाशिम तथा हाजी महबूब खुदाई स्थल पर रहते थे, इनके अतिरिक्त वहाँ के जो स्थानीय वकील रहते थे, उनके नाम मुझे याद नहीं हैं ऐसा नहीं था कि दो वीडियो कैमरा,

दो स्टिल फोटोग्राफर तथा दो ड्राफ्टमैन खुदाई वाले हर टेंच पर रहते थे। खुदाई के वक्त शाम के समय डेली रजिस्टर में जितने आर्टिफैक्ट्स मिलते थे, उनका इन्द्राज इन आर्टिफैक्ट्स की प्राप्ति की टेंच, उसकी गहराई तथा आर्टिफैक्ट्स के विवरण के साथ किया जाता था। रजिस्टर में इन्द्राज न्यायालय द्वारा नियुक्त दो पर्यवेक्षकों की उपस्थिति में होता था। रजिस्टर में इस इन्द्राज के बाद पर्यवेक्षकों तथा एक्सपर्ट के हस्ताक्षर होते थे। मैंने भी उक्त डेली रजिस्टर पर हस्ताक्षर किए थे।” (पेज 119)

*“Among the parties Mohammad Hashim and Haji Mahmood used to be present on the excavation site at the time of excavation. Besides them, local counsels used to be there. I do not remember their names. It was not that two video cameras, two still photographers and two draftsmen used to be present at every trench of digging. All the artefacts discovered in course of the excavation, used to be entered in the daily register in the evening with the name and depth of trench from where these artefacts were discovered and with descriptions of artefacts. **Entries in the register use to be done in presence of two court-appointed supervisors. After the recording of entries in the register, they used to be signed by supervisors and experts. I had also signed the said daily register.**”*
(E.T.C.)

3886. On the question of "Pillar Bases" Para 5 (5.1 to 5.16) contains the allegations and alleged irregularities, as under:

5. THE MYTH OF SO CALLED "PILLAR BASES":-

5.1 That the so called pillar bases are one or more calcrete stones resting upon brickbats, just heaped up, though A.S.I. claims that mud-mortar was also sometimes

used. In many of them the calcrete stones are not found at all. As one can see from the descriptive table on pages 56-67 of the Report not a single one of these supposed "pillar bases" has been found in association with any pillar or even a fragment of it; and it has not been claimed that there are any marks or indentations or hollows on any of the calcrete stones to show that any pillar had rested on them. The A.S.I. Report nowhere attempts to answer the questions (1) why brickbats and not bricks were used at the base, and (2) how mud-bounded brickbats could have possibly withstood the weight of roof-supporting pillars without themselves falling apart. It also offers not a single example of any medieval temple where pillars stood on such brick-bat bases.

*5.2. That the Report's claim of these so called "pillar bases" being in alignment and their being so shown in infancy drawings (Figures 23, 23A and 23B), is not borne out by the actual measurements and distances; and there is indeed much doubt whether the plan provided by A.S.I. is drawn accurately at all, since there are **enormous discrepancies between Fig. 3A (the main plan) and the Table in Chapter IV on the one hand, and the Report's Appendix IV, on the other.***

5.3. That even those "pillar bases" that lie in the first north-south "row" on the west, lie at different distances from thick western wall: the distances varying between 3.60 and 3.86 m. The east-west distance between any two features (center to center) can vary from 2.9 to 3.3 m (difference of 40 cm) (p. 55) whereas in the north-south

direction there is greater variation between each feature and its neighbor: 3-3.3 m in the north and in the south, and about 5.25 m in the central area. The use of the term "rows", therefore, is incorrect.

5.4. That the entire manner, in which the A.S.I. has identified or created the so called "pillar-bases" is a matter of serious concern. Complaints were regularly made to the Observers appointed by the High Court that the A.S.I. was ignoring calcrete-topped brickbat heaps where these were not found in appropriate positions and selected only such brickbat heaps as were not too far-off from its imaginary grids, and there creating the so called "bases" by clearing the rest of the floor of brick-bats. In this respect reference may be made to the complaints dated 21.5.2003, 7.6.2003, 28.6.2003, 26.7.2003 and 2.8.2003 etc.

*5.5. That the most astonishing thing, that the A.S.I. so casually brushes aside, relates to the varying levels at which the so called "pillar-bases" stand. Even if we go by the A.S.I.'s own descriptive table (pages 56-67), as many as **seven** of these so called 50 "bases" are definitely **above Floor 2, and one is in level with it. At least six rest on floor 3, and one rests partly on Floor 3 and 4.** Since at least Floors 1 to 3 are even recognised by the A.S.I. to be floors of the Mosque, how can so many pillars be said to have been erected after the Mosque had been built, in order to sustain a so called earlier temple structure! Moreover, as many as nine so called "pillar bases" **are shown as cutting through Floor No. 3.** So, are we to presume that when the Mosque floor was laid out, the so called "pillar bases"*

were not floored over? It is thus clear that the said structures are simply not "pillar bases" at all, but some kind of loosely-bonded brickbat deposits, which continued to be laid right from the time of Floor 4 to Floor 1.

5.6. That the comparative stratigraphy of these 50 alleged bases also requires comment. The tabulation on p.p. 56 to 67 gives us the following data:-

2 bases (nos. 16, 26) were cut through Floor 4.

25 of them (from the Z- trenches in the north to the G10 and H10 trenches in the south) rested on Floor 4.

6 of them on Floor 3 (nos. 19, 21, 23, 24, 30, 37).

1 (no. 28) actually is said to rest "at the junction of Floor 3 and 4".

2 of them cut through Floor 3 (nos. 12, 15).

7 of them project above Floor 2 (nos. 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 8 and 14).

We thus see that these 50 features belong to different floors and therefore could not all have been functional at the same time. They lack coherence as architectural features. It is irresponsible, therefore, to repeatedly refer to "rows" of these features, as has been done in the report.

Some of these features appear to incorporate all sorts of material: pieces of brick, small stones and brick pieces, long stone slabs, and D-shaped large stones, etc. This also leads to the inference that all these structures could not belong to any one period.

5.7. That even the table on pages 56-67 of the A.S.I.'s Report may not correctly represent the layers of the pillar

bases, since its information on floors does not match that of the Report's Appendix IV, which in several trenches does not attest to Floor No. 4 at all, which the said "pillar-bases", in many cases, are supposed to have been sealed by, or to have cut through or stand on!

5.8. *That most of these so called pillar bases of the northern side comprise of square sandstone slabs, perhaps resting on calcrete blocks (only one has been excavated that reveals the calcrete block). The inner dimensions of these pillar bases range from 48.5x43, 50x50, 47x46, 48x56, 49.5x49 and 51x51 cm. These dimensions are completely different from those of the pillars that have actually been recovered. The dimensions of the latter range from 21x21 to 24x24 cm. Thus, the pillars that could be said to have stood on the said northern pillar bases would certainly not be the black stone pillars, used in the mosque, or any other pillars of the same or similar type.*

5.9. *That the A.S.I.'s assumption is that the floor, with which are associated these so called pillar bases in the north, is the same as Floor 2 in the south. However, it cannot be definitely said that the floors in E2, F2 or G2 can be easily correlated with E1, F1 or G1 or with ZF1 or ZG1.*

5.10. *That the A.S.I.'s own information on the said pillar bases is highly confusing and marked with discrepancies. For example, in the tabulation of so called pillar bases in Chapter IV, 50 'pillar bases' have been described and have been illustrated in Fig. 3A. The number and the location of these 'pillar bases', however, do not tally with information*

given in Appendix IV as illustrated in the following Table:-

Discrepancies on numbers of 'pillar bases'

<i>Trench</i>	<i>Number of 'pillar bases in Appendix IV</i>	<i>Number of 'pillar bases' in Fig. 3A and Tabulation in Chapter IV</i>
<i>E1</i>	<i>Brick wall/pillar base?-1</i>	-
<i>E2</i>	<i>Brick wall/pillar base?-1</i>	-
<i>ZF1</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>2</i>
<i>F1</i>	<i>'pillar bases'- unspecified</i>	<i>1</i>
<i>F2</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>1</i>
<i>F3</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>1</i>
<i>F4</i>	<i>1</i>	-
<i>F6</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>2</i>
<i>F7</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>4</i>
<i>F8</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>4</i>
<i>F9</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>2</i>
<i>F10</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>2</i>
<i>ZG2</i>	<i>'pillar bases'- unspecified</i>	<i>1</i>
<i>ZG1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>G1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>2</i>
<i>G2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>
<i>G5</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>1</i>
<i>G6</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>1</i>
<i>G7</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>2</i>
<i>G8</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>1</i>
<i>G9</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>G10</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>1</i>
<i>ZH2</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>2</i>

ZH1	2	1
H1	2	2
H5	2	1
H10	2	1
J2	1	-
L1	2	-
L2	2	-
L3	2	-
L7	2	-

5.11. *That, two 'pillar bases' are mentioned in H5, H10, G10 and ZH1 whereas only one in these trenches have been illustrated and described in the text. 'Pillar bases' in the L series of trenches and J2 have not been indicated in the Tabulation as illustrated above.*

5.12. *That on p. 55, distances between 'pillar bases' have been given, that in the east-west direction, center-to Centre distance was 2.90-3.30 m. However, the distance between 'pillar bases' 37 and 38 is 3.80 m. Similarly, these are not always in alignment as is the case with 'pillar base' 30 in Trench G6. 'Pillar bases' 37 and 38 in Trench F8 are also not in alignment with each other.*

5.13. *That the dubious nature of the 'pillar bases' is illustrated by the figures attached with the complaints. The collection of calcrete and brickbats at a lower level than the above has been ignored by the A.S.I. even though it resembles their so called 'pillar bases'. At times, walls were cut to make 'pillar bases' as in Trench F6. The confusion between walls and 'pillar bases' is apparent in Trenches E1 and E2. The same is the case with 'pillar base' 27 in Trench*

H5. This is nothing but the southern part of Wall 18B.

5.14. That more serious problem has been created by giving Figs. 23A and 23B, showing the 'pillar bases' hypothetically. An incorrect impression is being created, by showing some 'pillar bases' where no structure was exposed at all and where no excavation was also done.

5.15. That there is an additional problem with the "pillar base" interpretation. Load carrying pillar bases require to rest on hard and resistant surfaces, on floor slabs or rammed floors of say 30 to 40 cm height, or else to be set into or enclosed in pits that are packed tight with filled material. The various sections in the report indicate that this is not the case (see, e.g., Figures 8,9,10 where the features appear to have only been set without packing into the ground, and interrupt the continuity of Floor 2, which is only a few centimeters thick, and lies over a stratum not said to be homogeneous earth filling, or of rammed earth. Thus the very use of the words "rows" and "bases" is incorrect and misleading. These features could in some cases represent a pile of unused bricks, broken or entire. In other cases, they may have been used to fill hollows or to raise the level of the mound. In yet other cases they could have been used to shore up a heavy wall or else to function as an apron for a building.

5.16. That the A.S.I. should have surely looked about for other explanations of these heaps of brickbats, before jumping to its so called "pillar base" theory. There was another clear and elegant explanation. When the surkhi-lime mortar bonded Floor No. 4 was being laid out over

the mound, sometime during the Sultanate period, its builders much have had to level the mound properly. The hollows and depressions then had to be filled by brickbats topped by calcrete stones (the latter often joined with lime mortar) to fill them and enable the floor to be laid. When in time Floor 4 went out of repair, its holes had similarly to be filled up in order to lay out Floor 3. And so again when Floor 3 decayed, similar deposits of brickbats had to be made to fill the holes in order to lay out Floor 2 (or, indeed, just to have a level surface). This explains why the so called "pillar bases" appear to "cut through" both Floors 3 and 4, at some places, while at others they "cut through" Floor 3 or Floor 4 only. They are mere deposits to fill up holes in the floors. Since such repairs were at times needed at various spots all over the floors, these brickbat deposits are widely dispersed. Had not the A.S.I. been so struck by the necessity of finding pillars and "pillar bases" to please its masters, which had to be in some alignment, it could have found scattered over the ground not just fifty but perhaps over a hundred or more such deposits of brickbats.

3887. As we have already noticed, these objections were prepared by PWs-29 and 32 as they themselves have admitted in the affidavit filed by them supporting their stand taken in the objections. There are some difference in their statement. **PW-29 (Jaya Menon)** in her affidavit in para 13 says as under:

A. That the ASI's own information on so called pillar bases is highly confusing and marked with discrepancies. For example, in the tabulation of so called pillar bases in Chapter IV of the Final Report, 50 so called 'pillar bases'

have been described and have been illustrated in Fig. 3A. the number and the location of said 'pillar bases', however, do not tally with the information given in Appendix IV. The details have been provided in the Objections filed by the Sunni Central Board of Waqfs, UP dated October 8th 2003.

B. That Appendix IV in the Final Report mentions so called pillar bases in trenches L1, L2, L3 and L7 (page 17 of Appendix IV). Yet, Site Note Book No. 30 makes no mention of pillar bases in L1 (pages 76-85), L3 (pages 67-75) and L7 (pages 54-66). Nor are there any pillar bases mentioned in Site Note Book No. 24 for Trench L2, or Site Note Books No. 22 and 38 on the cutting of baulks between various trenches in the L series.

C. That a study of the Site Note Books brings out discrepancies from the information provided in the Final Report. site Note Books Nos. 37 and 21 for Trench G7 make no mention of recovering any pillar bases. however, the listing of so called pillar bases in the Final Report from pages 56-67 has records of so called pillar bases in Trench G7 (pillar base No. 26; pages 64-65) and in the G6/G7 baulk (pillar base No. 33; page 64). Appendix IV of the Final Report on page 10 mentions so called two disturbed pillar bases for Trench G7. It needs to be emphasized that the Site Note Books are the result of hte trench supervisor's observations and impressions. Interpretations may also form a part of Site Note Books. But, here, we find that trench supervisors make no mention of anything remotely like a pillar base but these suddenly appear in the Final Report.

D. That the so called pillar bases are not in alignment with each other as should be expected in a pillared hall. At the same time, anything that has been found out of line with their imagined alignment has been discarded as evidence. A complaint was also filed which noted that structure was exposed in the eastern part of J2/J3 baulk after excavating a platform. Since it did not fall in line with the ASI's pillar base in Trench J1 it was not considered as base. But in physical appearance, made of calcrete and brickbats, this structure resembles many of the ASI's so called pillar bases. It is clear that this structure indicates nothing but the manner in which the platform was constructed. This shows the bias with which the ASI was working and their selective use of evidence.

E. That it is clear that at times, walls were cut to make so called 'pillar bases' as in Trench F6 and thus there is in Appendix IV, a confusion between walls and so called 'pillar bases' in Trenches E1 and E2. The same is the case with the so called 'pillar base' in Trench H5. This is nothing but the southern part of Wall 18B.

F. That a more serious problem is showing the so called 'pillar bases' hypothetically in Figs. 23A and 23B. An incorrect impression is being created, by showing some so called 'pillar bases' where they do not exist.

G. That the ASI's assumption that the floor, with which are associated these pillar bases in the north, is the same as Floor 2 in the south, is baseless as there has been no concordance of trenches in the north and south.

H. That according to the Report (page 54), Structure 4

(the 'massive structure') "has survived through its nearly 50 metre long wall (wall 16) in the west and fifty exposed so called pillar bases to its east attached with Floor 2 or the floor of the last phase of Structure 4." However, several sections provided by the ASI (Figs. 6, 10, 16, Plates 21, 46) clearly show that the floor to which they were supposed to be attached sealed these so called 'pillar bases'. In Fig. 6, the 'pillar bases' has cut through Floor 3 (the floor associated with sub-period VIIB) and should have been attached to Floor 2. However, the section in Fig. 6 clearly shows Floor 2 intact over alleged 'pillar base' 31 which means the supposed sandstone block with orthostats and pillar could not have projected over Floor 2. This was the case also with so called 'pillar bases' in Trenches F2, G2 and G5.

I. That these so called "pillar bases" are too flimsy to have supported any load-bearing pillars. Made largely of brickbats, these are completely lacking in uniformity that would be expected if these were in reality pillar bases. Diameters vary from 1.10 m to 1.90 m. Brickbats are not placed in courses as should be the case, but are random, in many cases in a tilted position. The height of brickbats varies from 5-55 cm within a single base. Brickbats do not lie only under the stone but also over the stone as in Trenches F7 and F10. Brickbats make the entire structure unstable and would get broken if a weight was placed over them. If these really were rounded bases, originally they would have been constructed of wedge-shaped bricks instead of which we find brickbats of jagged shape.

J. That if these really were pillar bases, they should have had casings within which the pillar would have fitted. In contrast, we see real pillar bases at the Early Historic site of Sanghol. One notices that these are rectangular, made of large bricks neatly placed with a depression in the centre to set the pillar. These are all of uniform size, constructed uniformly and are accurately aligned, unlike in the case of Ayodhya. Three Photographs of these pillar bases of Sanghol were filed as Annexures Nos. 2, 3, and 4 alongwith the Additional objection of Sunni Waqf Board dated 3-2-2004.

K. That the northern area is the only area of the site where pillar bases have been found. These appear to have been part of a separate much later period structure. In an area of about 10 x 10 metre, these were embedded in Floor 1 and hence were contemporary with Floor 1. These pillar bases comprise of square sandstone slabs, of which only one has been excavated with a calcrete block. The inner dimensions of these pillar bases range from 48.5 x 43, 50 x 50, 47 x 46, 48 x 56, 49.5 x 49 and 51 x 51 cm. These dimensions are completely different from those of the black stone pillars that have actually been recovered with dimensions ranging from 21 x 21 to 24 x 24 cm. Thus, the pillars that would have stood on the said northern side pillar bases were certainly not the black stone pillars. These northern side pillar bases are the ones numbered 1-8, 13 and 14, by the ASI.

L. That barring pillar bases 1 to 8, 13 and 14, the ASI has created so called 'pillar bases' in the rest of the site.

Their creation has been actually observed during excavation and complained about. The deponent has personally witnessed the creation of so called "pillar bases" in Trenches ZF1, F3, F6, G5 and F2/G2.

M. (i) That observations were made of the creation of so called pillar bases in Trench ZF1 from 29th April to 30th April 2003. Floor 1 was exposed at 40 cm bsl, Floor 2 at 57 cm bsl and Floor 3 at 80 cm bsl, all floors being lime-surkhi floors. Floor 1 was reached on April 29th 2003 and was cut through on 30th April 2003, exposing a complete brickbat layer. But during excavation, when a stone was observed as protruding out of the brickbats, the brickbats in the area near the stone were left in a squarish shape while the rest of the brickbats were removed and thrown away. On April 30th 2003 when Floor 2 was cut through, the same kind of brickbat layer was exposed beneath it. This brickbat layer can be easily observed by studying the south-facing section in Trench ZF1. A complaint was lodged about the creation of this so called "pillar base".

(ii) That the creation of a so called pillar base was observed in Trench G5 from 24th - 30th of May 2003. Under the Babri Masjid floor various alignments of brickbats were excavated. By the 28th of May 2003, brickbats in the north-western area were concentrated on because there were traces of mortar on these. The mortar was probably remnants from Floor 1. By the 30th of May 2003, brickbats were left in a somewhat circular shape because a few small stone chips with traces of mortar on them were found. This whole contraption was made into a so called pillar base by

selective digging and partial removal of brickbats. It appears that any co-occurrence of stone, even in the form of chips, and brickbats was made into a so called pillar base, as long as it is 3.30 m to 3.50 m away from the next. Any stones along with brickbats found out of this alignment was not made into a pillar base. A complaint was lodged during excavation about the creation of this "pillar base" also.

(iii) That the same situation of creation of so called pillar bases can be seen in Trench F3. The relevant excavation took place from July 8th to 12th July 2003. In this trench, part of the wall of the northern dome of the Babri Masjid is still standing. A sandstone slab was recovered in the north-western corner of the trench at 2.30 m bsl. On excavation, brickbats were found lying all over the trench and Floor 2 was partially seen below the brickbats at 3.08 m below surface level (bsl). On the 9th of July 2003, brickbats were selectively removed, leaving those only around the sandstone slab. Further excavation down to Floor 3 at 3.35 m bsl revealed a similar layer of brickbats under it. Finally the so called pillar base was created by heaps of brickbats that had been left in place around a sandstone slab while removing all the other brickbats in the rest of the trench. A complaint was lodged during excavation about the creation of this "pillar base".

(iv) That the construction of a so called pillar base was observed in Trenches F2/G2 from the 23rd to the 26th of July 2003. The loose deposit under the Babri Masjid floor was removed leaving brickbats in the north-eastern part of the

trench in a semi-circular shape. By the 24th of July, the entire area was cleared leaving brickbats in the eastern area and a small patch in the south-western part. What is important is that the eastern and western parts of the trench were excavated carefully with knife and brush unlike the rest of the trench that was excavated with a pick. This was because it was in the eastern and western portions that so called pillar bases had to be created, keeping their distance from those constructed in Trench G1. It must also be pointed out that in the clearing work, a collection brickbats and sandstone in the north-western part of the excavated area was removed because it did not fall in an expected alignment of so called pillar bases. This 'structure' had been objected to earlier in a complaint filed on 21st May 2003. By the 26th of July, brickbats in the south-western part were recovered along with sandstone chips. Digging under Floor 1 revealed brickbats in the entire area, but the south-eastern and south-western areas were excavated separately. It was very obvious that these were going to be made into so called pillar bases, even though brickbats had been found in the entire area. By 11.40 am, the area was cleared but further digging revealed the same kind of deposit of brickbats, mud, and brick nodules. By afternoon, the so called "pillar base" in the south-eastern area was created by removing brickbats from its edges to give it a neat shape. Glazed ware sherds were found at this level. The so called "pillar base" in the south-western part of the trench was cleared of brickbats to make it equal in size to its counterpart and a piece of

broken floor sticking to it was removed. Very obviously, these so called pillar bases were created by selectively removing brickbats that lie under each floor. A complaint was lodged during excavation about the creation of this so called "pillar base".

N. That it was observed that, during excavation, brickbats were selectively removed so as to leave brickbat heaps around stone piece and blocks. (There were preconceived ideas about where so called "pillar bases" were to be carved out of brickbats. If no sandstone or calcrete blocks or slabs were noted, heaps of brickbats were left at intervals of 3.00-3.30 m.) A clear attempt was made to neaten the edges of so called "pillar bases" by removing brickbats to give rounded/squarish shapes. It appears that at the end of the excavation, when some so called 'pillar bases' were found obviously out of alignment, they were dismantled as in the case of the structure in the north-west of Trench G2.

O. That the sections of a trench provide us direct evidence of the brickbats layers that lay under individual floors. (It is also obvious that brickbats have been removed from the sections of many trenches: south-facing section of G8/G9 baulk, north, south, and east-facing sections of F1, north- and south facing sections of G1, north-facing section of H1, and east-facing section H1/H2 baulk, south- and west-facing sections of ZF1, east-facing section of G2 and east-facing section of F9.) In archaeology, whenever sections are made during excavation, protruding artefacts like antiquities or bricks, stone and brickbats are never

scraped level with the section but are allowed to protrude. This provides a correct picture of the section and its cultural material. In the case of Ayodhya, the above-mentioned trenches show gaping holes from where brickbats have been removed.

P. That the so called "pillar bases" were only part of a floor construction technique. Each lime-surkhi floor was underlain with several layers of brickbats interspersed with stone blocks and slabs and other material as fillers. The intervening spaces were filled with brickbats, mud and brick nodules. Stones have also been used at the site as fillers (as seen from the Plates 4, 21, 30, 50 in the Final Report), levelling mechanisms and for raising walls and platforms and so forth.

Q. That it seems that originally the aim was to create the so called pillar bases all over the excavated area. 8 so called 'pillar bases' were carved out in the L series of trenches as can be seen by Appendix IV (page 17) of the Final Report. As pointed out, there is no mention of these in the individual Site Note Books of the L series of trenches. These were probably not included in the final tabulation or in Fig. 3B showing so called 'pillar bases' as they did not fit in which the ASI' plan of a so called temple with a large brick pavement in front. This brick pavement to the east was considered as the entrance of the massive structure and hence pillar bases would not have fitted into this plan further to the east."

3888. PW 32 (Dr. Supriya Verma) in her affidavit dated 27th March, 2006 has said:

A. That the northern area is the only area of the site where pillar bases have been found. In an area of about 10 x 10 m, these were embedded in Floor 1 and hence were contemporary with Floor 1. These pillar bases comprise of square sandstone slabs, of which only one has been excavated with a calcrete block. The inner dimensions of these pillar bases range from 48.5 x 43, 50 x 50, 47 x 46, 48 x 56, 49.5 x 49 and 51 x 51 cm. These dimensions are completely different from those of the black stone pillars that have actually been recovered with dimensions ranging from 21 x 21 to 24 x 24 cm. There is a pillar lying in the gully to the north of the mound that may have fitted on top of these pillar bases. Thus, the pillars that would have stood on the northern side pillar bases were certainly not the black stone pillars. These northern pillar bases are the ones numbered 1-8, 13 and 14, by the ASI.

B. That barring pillar bases 1-8, 13 and 14, the ASI has created 'pillar bases' in the rest of the site. Their creation has been actually observed during excavation was even and complained about. The deponent has personally witnessed the creation of "pillar bases" in Trenches G2, G5 and F3. Observations were made on the creation of "pillar bases" in Trench G2 from May 16-20, 2003, in Trench G5 from May 27-30, 2003, and in Trench F3 from July 8-12, 2003 and complaints were filed on May 21, 2003, June 28, 2003 and July 26, 2003 respectively. These complaints/objections were prepared by the deponent and Dr. Jaya Menon and were filed under the signatures of Muslim parties and their counsels.

C. *That a close observation of the excavation and recording was done of Trench G2 from May 16 to May 20, 2003. It was found that brickbats randomly scattered over the entire excavated area were selectively removed so as to create a visual impression that the brickbats were confined to only a portion of the excavated area. An examination of the section will reveal the fact that brickbats lay in the layer below Floor 1. When Floor 2 was dug through, once again a whole layer of brickbats was exposed.*

D.. *That the so called "pillar bases" were only part of a floor construction technique. Each lime-surkhi floor was underlain with several layers of brickbats interspersed with stone block blocks and slabs and other material as fillers. The intervening spaces were filled with brickbats, mud and brick nodules. Stones have also been used at the site as fillers (as seen from the Plates 4, 21, 30, 50 in the Final Report), levelling mechanisms and for raising walls and platforms and so forth.*

E. *That during excavation, brickbats were selectively removed so as to leave brickbat heaps around stone pieces and blocks. If no sandstone or calcrete blocks or slabs were noted, heaps of brickbats were left at intervals of 3.00-3.30 m. It appears that at the end of the excavation, when some so called "pillar bases" were found obviously out of alignment, they were dismantled as in the case of the structure in the northwest part of Trench G2.*

F. *That the sections of a trench provide us direct evidence of the brickbat layers that lay under individual floors. It is also obvious that brickbats have been removed*

from the sections of many trenches: south-facing section of G8/G9 baulk, north-, south-, and east-facing sections of F1, north- and south-facing sections of G1, north-facing section of H1, and east-facing section of H1/H2 baulk, south- and west-facing sections of ZF1, east-facing section G2 and east-facing section of F9. (In archaeology, whenever sections are made during excavation, protruding artefacts like antiquities or bricks, stone and brickbats are never scraped level with the section but are allowed to protrude. This provides a correct picture of the section and its cultural material.) In the case of Ayodhya, the above-mentioned trenches show gaping holes from where brickbats have been removed.

G. That the ASI's own information on the so called "pillar bases" is highly confusing and marked with discrepancies. For example, in the tabulation of "pillar bases" in Chapter IV of the Final Report, 50 "pillar bases" have been described and have been illustrated in Fig. 3A. The number and the location of "pillar bases", however, do not tally with the information given in Appendix IV. The details have been provided in the Objections filed by the Sunni Central Board of Waqfs, UP on October 8th 2003.

H. That Appendix IV in the Final Report mentions so called "pillar bases" in trenches L1, L2, L3 and L7 (p. 17 of Appendix IV). Yet, Site Note Book No. 30 makes no mention of pillar bases in L1 (pp. 76-85), L3 (pp. 67-75) and L7 (pp. 54-66). Nor are there any "pillar bases" mentioned in Site Note Book No. 24 for Trench L2, or Site Note Books No. 22 and 38 on the cutting of baulks between various

trenches in the L series.

I. That it seems that originally the aim was to create "pillar bases" all over the excavated area. Eight so called "pillar bases" were carved out in the L series of trenches as can be seen by Appendix IV. (p. 17) of the Final Report. As pointed out, there is no mention of these in the individual Site Note Books of the L series of trenches. These were probably not included in the final tabulation or in Fig. 3B showing "pillar bases" as they did not fit in with in the ASI's plan of a temple with a large brick pavement in front. This brick pavement to the east was considered as the entrance of the massive structure and hence so called "pillar bases" would not have fitted into this plan further to the east.

J. That a study of the Site Note Books brings out discrepancies from the information provided in the Final Report. Site Note Books Nos.37 and 21 for Trench G7 make no mention of recovering any so called "pillar bases". However, the listing of "pillar bases" in the Final Report from pp. 56-67 has records of "pillar bases" in Trench G7 (pillar base No. 36; pp. 64-65) and in the G6/G7 baulk ("pillar base" No.33; p. 64). Appendix IV of the Final Reprt on p. 10 mentions two disturbed "pillar bases" for Trench G7. It needs to be emphasized that the Site Note Books are the result of the trench supervisor's observations and impressions. Interpretations may also form a part of Site Note Books. But, here, we find that trench supervisors make no mention of anything remotely like a "pillar base" but these suddenly appear in the Final Report.

K. That the so called "pillar bases" are not even in alignment with each other as should be expected in a pillared hall. At the same time, anything that has been found out of line with their imagined alignment has been discarded as evidence. A complaint filed on 24th July, 2003 noted that a structure was exposed in the eastern part of J2/J3 baulk after excavating a platform. Since it did not fall in line with the ASI's so called "pillar base" in Trench J1 it was not considered as a base. But in physical appearance, made of calcrete and brickbats, this structure resembles many of the ASI's so called "pillar base". It is clear that this structure indicates nothing but the manner in which the platform was constructed. This shows the bias with which the ASI was working and their selective use of evidence.

L. That it is clear that at times, walls were cut to make so called "pillar base" as in Trench F6 and thus there is in Appendix IV, a confusion between walls and "pillar bases" in Trenches E1 and E2. The same is the case with the "pillar base" in Trench H5. This is nothing but the southern part of Wall 18B.

M. That a more serious problem is that of showing the so called "pillar bases" hypothetically in Figs. 23A and 23B. An incorrect impression is being created, by showing some 'pillar bases' where they do not exist.

N. That the ASI's assumption that the floor with which are associated these so called "pillar bases" in the north is the same as Floor 2 in the south is baseless as there has been no concordance of trenches in the north and south.

O. That according to the Report (p. 54), Structure 4 (the

'massive structure') "has survived through its nearly 50 m long wall (Wall 16) in the west and fifty exposed pillar bases to its east attached with Floor 2 or the floor of the last phase of Structure 4." However, several sections provided by the ASI (Figs. 6, 10, 16, Plates 21, 46) clearly show that the floor to which they were supposed to be attached sealed these "pillar bases". In Fig. 6, the "pillar base" has cut through Floor 3 (the floor associated with sub-period VIIB) and should have been attached to Floor 2. However, the section in Fig. 6 clearly shows Floor 2 intact over "pillar base" 31 which means the supposed sandstone block with orthostates and pillar could not have projected over Floor 2. This was the case also with "pillar bases" in Trenches F2, G2 and G5.

P. That these so called "pillar bases" are too flimsy to have supported any load-bearing pillars. Made largely of brickbats, these are completely lacking in uniformity that would be expected if these were in reality pillar bases. Diameters vary from 1.10 m to 1.90 m. Brickbats are not placed in courses as should be the case, but are random, in many cases in a tilted position. The height of brickbats varies from 5-55 cm within a single base. Brickbats do not lie only under the stone but also over the stone as in Trenches F7 and F10. Brickbats make the entire structure unstable and would get broken if a weight was placed over them. If these really were rounded bases, originally they would have been constructed of wedge-shaped bricks instead of which we find brickbats of jagged shape.

Q. That if these really were pillar bases, they should

have had casings within which the pillar would have fitted. In contrast, we see real pillar bases at the Early Historic site of Sanghol. One notices that these are rectangular, made of large bricks neatly placed with a depression in the centre to set the pillar. These are all of uniform size, constructed uniformly and are accurately aligned, unlike in the case of Ayodhya. The deponent had visited the said site of Sanghol. District Ludhiana (Panjab) alongwith Dr. Jaya Menon and Dr. Suchi Dayal in 2004 and Dr. Jaya Menon and the deponent had taken the photographs of the said Sanghol site (3 of which have already been filed as ANNEXURES Nos. 2, 3 and 4 to the Additional objection dated 3-2-2004 filed by the Sunni Waqf Board against the A.S.I. Report.)

3889. After very careful consideration of the above as also the arguments advanced before us including ASI report, it appears to us that the report of ASI was sought to be criticized by the plaintiffs (Suit-4) as if ASI was supposed to satisfy them about its finding and not the Court. Several fanciful objections have been made just to multiply and add the list of the objections.

3890. Under the heading "The Myth of so called pillar bases", paras 5.12, 5.16, in a general way, all the pillar bases are sought to be discredited though a number of pillar bases, we have already demonstrated, are admitted by the experts of the muslim parties. Complaints in respect to some of the pillar bases, which were made on 21st May, 2003 and 7th June, 2003 have already been discussed above and that itself is sufficient to discard the objections of the plaintiffs (Suit-4) on this aspect.

However, we propose to throw some more light on the subject of pillar bases.

3891. In the cross examination, the Expert (Archaeologist) plaintiffs (Suit-4) have also said something about pillar bases.

PW-16 (Surajbhan) said:

“इन तथाकथित पिलर बेसेज पर मंदिरों के कोई चिन्ह अथवा सिम्बल नहीं है।” (पेज 149)

“There are no signs or symbols of temples on these so-called pillar bases.” (E.T.C.)

“बनभोर वाले स्टोन के पिलर बेसज बाबरी मस्जिद के उत्तरी भाग में उत्खनित किये गये पिलरबेसेज से कुछ भिन्न थे। लेकिन जो ईंटों के पिलर बेसेज बताये गये हैं उन सबका वास्तव में पिलर बेस होना संदिग्ध है। उन पिलर बेसेज के साथ क्रॉससेक्शन नहीं दिया गया है, जिससे यह टेस्ट किया जा सके कि वह छोटा ढांचा वास्तव में पूर्णरूप से एक पिलर बेस ही सिमेट्रीकल कम्बैक बनाया गया था अथवा यह इररेगुलर है और क्रॉससेक्शन के बगैर यह जानना सम्भव नहीं है कि यह खुदाई में एक्सकेवेटर ने ग़लती से या जानबूझकर ऐसा रूप तो नहीं दे दिया है।” (पेज 150)

“ Pillar bases of the Banbhor stone were slightly different from the pillar bases excavated in the northern part of the Babri mosque but it is doubtful that what have been reported to be brick-built pillar bases are all actual pillar bases. These pillar bases have not been provided with cross section enabling it to ascertain whether that small structure was actually built completely as a symmetrical come-back(?) of a pillar base or whether it is an irregular structure. Without the cross section, it is not possible to know that the excavator has not by mistake or deliberately given it such a shape in the excavation.”(E.T.C.)

“मुख्य परीक्षा के शपथ-पत्र के प्रस्तर – 2 की दूसरी पंक्ति में “सर्व दि लिमिटेड परपज़ आफ़ डिगिंग” लिखा है, इससे मेरा तात्पर्य यह है कि जी०पी०आर० सर्वे ने जो एनामलीज हिन्ट की थी, उनमें से कुछ पर उत्खनन में वाल्स, पिलर्स और फ्लोर्स तो मिले थे,” (पेज 153)

“By the words 'serve the limited purpose of digging' which I have written in the second line, I mean to say that at some places in respect of which anomalies were hinted at in the G.P.R. survey, walls pillars and floors were discovered in the excavation" (E.T.C.)

“मुख्य परीक्षा के शपथ पत्र के पृष्ठ 6 लगायत 8 प्रस्तर 11 के पृष्ठ 7 पर दिये गये अंश “दि सो काल्ड पिलर बेसेज हैव नो सिम्बालिक फीचरस आन देम” से साक्षी का तात्पर्य क्या है? साक्षी ने बताया कि इससे मेरा तात्पर्य मंदिरों की तरह पिलर्स के वाहक स्टोन्स में कोई चित्रकारी, कोई डिज़ाईन, किसी यक्ष आदि की आकृतियों से है।

प्रश्न—किसी भवन के निर्माण करते समय क्या उसके आधारशिला (फाउन्डेशन स्टोन में) चित्रित पत्थर डाले जाते हैं?

उत्तर— रिपोर्ट के अनुसार यह तथाकथित पिलर बेसेज प्रायः फ़र्श के ऊपर मौजूद बताये गये हैं और नींव खोद कर रखे नहीं बताये गये हैं, न ही इनके साथ के कोई अन्य फ़र्श समकालीन दिखाये गये, इसलिए यही समझा जायेगा कि इन पिलर बेसेज के ऊपर वाला ढांचा यदि मंदिर था तो इनका फ़र्श वाल नं० 16 व 17 वाला फ़र्श ही था और इन पर भी कोई सिम्बल अथवा कोई डिज़ाईन उत्कीर्ण मिलनी चाहिए थी, वरना कथित विशाल मंदिर के भवन में यह कुरूपता को ही जोड़ेंगे।” (पेज 226)

*“ On being asked what the witness meant to say by the words 'the so called pillar basis have no symbolic features on them', which words find mention on point -7 of para-11 given on pages 6 to 8 of the affidavit in the Examination-in-Chief, the witness stated – **By the said words I meant to denote any drawing, any design and***

any figure like that of Yaksha engraved in the stones sustaining the weight of the pillars looking like those of temples.

Question:- Are engraved stones used as foundation stones while constructing any building ?

Answer:- As per the report these so called pillar bases were often said to be present on the floor and they have not been laid after digging up the base, nor was any other floor shown to be contemporaneous to them. Hence it will be taken to me only that if the structure above these pillar basis was a temple then the floor of wall no.16 or 17 was certainly their floor and there ought to have been an engraving in shape of symbol or design on them also, or else they will be giving an ugly shape to the building of the alleged large temple” (E.T.C.)

“इस संरचना को देखने से ऐसा नहीं लग रहा है कि किसी फ़र्श को बनाकर उसके ऊपर कोई पिलर बेस बनाया गया हो और न ही इस तथाकथित पिलर बेस के साथ यहाँ कोई ऊपर के पिलर के टुकड़े ही दिखाई दे रहे हैं, जो इसे प्रमाणित करते कि यह वास्तव में पिलर बेस था।” (पेज 229)

“From the site of this structure, any pillar bases do not seem to have been erected after building a floor, nor even pieces of any upward pillars are seen along with this so-called pillar-base, which fact would have been capable of demonstrating that it was really a pillar base.” (E.T.C.)

“इन पिलर बेसेज में से कुछ को मैंने विवादित स्थल पर देखा था। विवादित स्थल के उत्तर तरफ़ जो वास्तविक पिलर बेसेज दिखाई दे रहे थे, उनमें चूना-सुर्खी मार्टर के तौर पर इस्तेमाल हुई मालूम देती थी।”

(पेज 230)

“I saw some of these pillar bases at the disputed site. Lime and brick powder appeared to have been used as a mortar in the actual pillar bases seen on the north of the disputed site.” (E.T.C.)

“उत्तर— चूंकि मैं अनेक तथाकथित पिलर बेसेज को सही नहीं मानता, इसलिए पिलर बेसेज का काल बताना तो सम्भव नहीं है। यदि कोई वास्तविक पिलर बेसेज मुझे चित्र में दिखाएं जाएं और उसके साथ फ्लोर लेविल्स और उसके साथ क्रॉस सेक्शन निर्दिष्ट हो, तो यह बताना सम्भव होगा। फिर भी यदि तथाकथित पिलर बेसेज के काल की ही जानकारी लेनी है, तो मैं फ्लोर तथा क्रॉस सेक्शन के साथ उसके सम्बन्धों की जांच करके बता दूँगा।

प्रश्न—बिना पिलर बेसेज के अध्ययन के ही आपने इनके संदर्भ में “तथाकथित” शब्द का प्रयोग किया है, इसके बारे में आप क्या कहेंगे?

उत्तर— यह कहना सही नहीं होगा। क्योंकि तथाकथित पिलर बेसेज कई फ़र्शों के साथ दिखाए गए हैं, जैसा कि आइसोमेट्रिक व्यू वाले चित्र में भी साफ़ दीख पड़ रहा है, इसलिए इनके आधार पर बाबरी मस्जिद के पूर्व के भवन का आंकलन नहीं किया जा सकता और यही बजह है कि मैंने बाबरी मस्जिद की पश्चिमी दीवार के नीचे जो पश्चिमी दीवार देखी थी और उनके साथ फ़र्श जो मैंने देखे थे, उनके अतिरिक्त मुझे कोई और प्रामाणिक आधार नहीं दिखाई दिया, जो स्ट्रक्चरल फ़ेसेज अथवा कालों को निर्धारित करने में मदद कर सकता।” (पेज 230–231)

“Answer:- Since I do not take many of the so-called pillar bases to be real ones, hence it is not possible for me to date such pillar bases. If any actual pillar base is shown in a picture and floor levels and cross section are also specified along with it, it will be possible for me to determine its antiquity. However, if the antiquity of the so called pillar bases is to be ascertain, I will tell about it after examining their floors and their relations to the cross section.

Question:- Even without having any study of these pillar bases, you have used the word 'so-called' in reference to

them. What would you like to say in this regard?

Answer:- It will not be correct to say so, because the so called pillar bases have been shown with several floors, as are seen even in the picture having an isometric view. Hence, on the basis of this the building situated on the east of the Babri masjid cannot be assessed. This is the reason why I did not, except for the western wall and its accompanying floor, which I had seen below the western wall of the Babri masjid, see any other reliable basis, which could have been helpful in determining structural phases and their timings.” (E.T.C.)

“ए0एस0आई0 रिपोर्ट वाल्यूम-2 के प्लेट संख्या- 46 देखने पर प्रश्न किए जाने पर बताया कि गोल आकार के पिलर जैसी आकृति का यह स्पष्ट चित्र है। इसे पिलर बेस में इसलिए नहीं कह सकता, क्योंकि इसके साथ किसी पिलर का एसोसिएशन अथवा उसके टुकड़ों की एसोसिएशन नहीं दिखाई देता अर्थात् पिलर बेस हम उसे कहते हैं, जो किसी स्तम्भ का आधार हो।” (पेज 231-232)

*“When plate no.46 of the ASI report volume-2 was shown to the witness, on being questioned he stated – **This picture clearly shows a figure like cylinder-shaped pillar.** I cannot style it a pillar base because its association with any pillar or its pieces is not visible. I mean to say that what we term as a pillar base is a base supporting a pillar.”(E.T.C.)*

3892. PW-29 (Jaya Menon) about pillar bases has said:

"A.S.I. has also mentioned about pillarbases in its report. The total number of pillarbases mentioned in the A.S.I. report is 50 in relation to particular phase of structure. . Some of the pillarbases have been reported by the A.S.I. in the sections also. I don't know the exact

number of pillarbases mentioned in the sections." (Page 181)

*"I think **one pillar base was found in the section in the northern part of the disputed site. . . .** That 8 pillar bases are projected over floor no 2. So far as floor no. 3 is concerned I can not make out the exact no. of so called pillar bases. **Approximately they are 6 in number.** It does not appear on the perusal of figure 23 that some of the so called pillar bases from 3 have penetrated down to floor 4." (Page 204-205)*

*"The plate no. 46 and 47 in Vol. II of ASI reports have been shown to the witness who stated that they are not pillar bases. The plate no. 48 shows some structure but the same is not pillar base. **I do not know what it is.** This is wrong to suggest that plate no. 48 shows a pillar base and this is also wrong to say that I am not making the correct statement . Plate no. 45 also does not show nay pillar bases. The pillar bases shown by ASI in plate nos. 42 and 43 are not pillar bases. These are the part of the floors. In reference to plate no. 43, the witness stated that the pillars base have been created by removing the brick bats around it and the photograph shows the alleged pillar base after removal of brick-bats. In Plates no. 46 and 47, the lower floor is visible. Besides decorative stones, decorative bricks were also recovered. Plates No. 95 and 96 are decorative bricks." (Page 230-231)*

"Pillar base means base of the pillar. . . . Since I am not an engineer, therefore, I am unable to reply that if I am required to build a pillar base a foundation will be

required or not. ” (Page 248)

3893. PW-30 (R.C.Thakran) about pillar bases has said:

“जब तक मैं खुदाई स्थल पर रहा, ऐसा नहीं है कि ए 0एस0 आई0 वालों ने पिलर बेस बनाए हों, बाद में अगर उन्होंने कुछ किया हो, तो मुझे इस बात का ज्ञान नहीं है। यदि सभी ट्रेंचेज में लगातार वीडियोग्राफी हो रही हो, तो पिलर बेस बनाना सम्भव नहीं है,.... ” (पेज 118)

“As long as I was present at the excavation site, it was not that the ASI men might have erected pillar bases. I do not have any knowledge if they may have done so later on. If all the trenches are being constantly video-graphed, it is not possible to erect pillar bases. .” (E.T.C.)

“अयोध्या की खुदाई में तथाकथित सभी पिलर बेसेज पर स्टोन स्लेब नहीं हैं। ज्यादातर कथित पिलर बेस पर स्टोन नहीं हैं, जिन पर स्टोन मिल रहे हैं, वे कैल्शियम और कार्बोनेट से बने स्ओन्स मिले हैं, जो कमजोर होते हैं। ऐसे पत्थरों को कैल्क्रीट स्टोन कहते हैं। . . . प्लेट नं० 46 में पिलर बेस आधे फ़्लोर पर है। इसे, जैसा देखने में लग रहा है, पेडस्टल स्टोन नहीं कहेंगे, लेकिन अगर इसकी खुदाई में पूरा बेस हो, तो पेडेस्टल स्टोन कहा जा सकता है, यानि अगर और खुदाई करने पर नीचे स्ओन्स की पूरी एक पर्त मिले तो उसे पेडेस्टल स्टोन कहेंगे। मैंने ए0एस0आई0 रिपोर्ट के विरुद्ध प्रस्तुत की गई आपत्तियों को पढ़ा है, . . मैं यह नहीं कह सकता कि मैंने सभी आपत्तियों पढ़ी हैं मुझे यह भी नहीं मालूम कि कुल कितनी आपत्तियाँ रिपोर्ट के विरुद्ध फाईल की गई थीं। मुझे नहीं मालूम है कि उपरोक्त दोनों आपत्तियों में इस बात की आपत्ति की गई थी कि पिलर बेसेज को जहाँ तक खोदा गया था, उस पिलर बेस को डिस्मेंटल न किया जाए। जब तक मैं खुदाई स्थल पर रहा मुझे याद नहीं है कि पिलर बेस के सम्बन्ध में ऐसी कोई आपत्ति दी गई या नहीं।” (पेज 117)

“As revealed from the Ayodhya excavation, stone slabs are not there at all the so called pillar-bases. Stones are not there at most of the so called pillar-bases. The

*stones which have been discovered, are made of calcium and carbonate and they are very weak. Such stones are called calcrete stones. . . . In plate no. 46, the pillar base stretches up to half of the floor. Keeping in view what it looks like, we would not call it pedestal stone but if on being excavated it is found to have full base, it can be called pedestal stone. That is to say, we would call it pedestal stone if we discover a full layer of stones below on further excavation being carried out. . . . I have gone through the objections raised against the ASI report. . . . I also do not know how many objections were filed in all against the report. . . . I do not know that in the aforesaid two objections it was objected to the pillar bases not being dismantled up to the extent to which they were dug up. . . . **I do not remember whether or not any such objection was filed in regard to the pillar bases as long as I was present on the excavation site.**” (E.T.C.)*

3894. PW 32 about pillar bases has said:

*“Except the pillar bases in the north all the pillar bases at different levels have been created, some of whom I saw personally with my own eyes and complaints were filed in the case of trenches G2, G5 and F3. **These complaints were filed by Dr. Jaya Menon and me.** These complaints were handed over to muslim parties and their counsels.”(Page 79)*

“...except pillar bases in the north, as I have stated already, the remaining have been created by the ASI.”(Page 80)

“I do not agree with the report of the ASI that there is

any pillar base in trench G-8. By saying that ASI people created pillar bases, I mean that while excavating, they removed brick bats selectively from some portion leaving the other portion to give shape of a pillar base and it is because of this reason that the shape of the pillar bases as also the size and depth vary from pillar base to pillar base. I do not agree with the suggestion that the pillar is round in shape and the brick bats set in regular courses and having two stone slabs in the middle. However, it is true that two concrete slabs are there in the middle. I do not agree with the ASI report that it is a pillar base.” (Page 114)

“Since I do not accept that any pillar bases were found during excavation except in the northern area, I do not agree with ASI report that pillar bases were found in the area of the 39 anomalies having been pointed by the GPR survey report. The pillar bases which are acceptable to me form part of Z series of trenches. The area of the Z series of trenches was surveyed by the GPR survey team but I am not hundred percent sure as to whether they had covered that area or not.” (Page 120)

“Prof. Mandal has referred to the findings of pillar bases of Prof. B.B. Lal and he has contradicted Prof. Lal's theory of pillar bases.” (Page 131)

“The ASI has reported about the existence of 50 pillar bases at one place and perhaps 67 at other place but according to me, the number does not seem to be correct as there is no consistency.” (Page 131-132)

“I clarify that no pillar base was exposed by ASI. Rather it were floor bases that were exposed and partially

cleared and partially it was left exposed and then labelled as so called pillar bases.” (Page 132)

“An archaeologist can create pillar bases even in the section by pulling out brick bats from the section while excavating and preparing the section.” (Page 132)

“Such so called pillar bases appearing in the section were not created in my presence but from the close study of the section, I could say that there were created pillar bases.” (Page 132)

“It is wrong to suggest that it is not possible to create a pillar base in a section of baulk; rather it is very easy to do so. Pillar base shown in the baulk of F2 G2 was created in my presence and I lodged complaint against ASI observations. It was created between 16 to 20 May, 2003. Besides me, Mohd. Abid was also present at the time of aforesaid pillar base being created. This pillar base and pillar base no. 21 were created during aforesaid period of five days. I complained against the ASI to the observer about both the aforesaid pillar bases. The complaint was lodged in writing. I completely disagree with the suggestion that I am making a wrong statement to the effect that the aforesaid pillar bases were created by ASI.

I do not know whether the GPR report has revealed anomalies exactly on the spot where subsequently ASI has shown the pillar bases. I do not know whether ASI has indicated 22 pillar bases exactly on such spot where anomalies were shown in GPR report. No doubts the ASI has sketched a chart in its report indicating the places of pillar bases allegedly found on the spots on the anomalies.

Since I do not accept the very existence of pillar bases, I did not considered it necessary verify the genuineness of ASI report on the basis of GPR report." (Page 133-134)

*"In the second line of para 14 of my affidavit I have used the words created 'pillar bases' because in my opinion and observation floor bases were cut and pillar base created. **In my opinion barring pillar bases 1 to 8, 13 and 14, all other pillar bases were created by ASI.** According to me this creation of pillar bases was right from the beginning of the excavations till the end of it. When I was at the site in April 2003 no pillar bases had been excavated when I returned to the site around 10th May 2003 some pillar bases had already been excavated from 10th May onwards I begin observing and between may 16th and 20th I found that pillar base was created in trench G-2 and on may 21st a complain was filed in this regard. Except the complaint which are mentioned in para 14 of my affidavit some other complaints were also filed by Dr. Jaya Menon."*(Page 155-156)

"I do not agree with the suggestion that in plate 43 of the ASI report Vol. II pillar bases have been shown. In fact, the pillar bases asserted by the ASI are part of the floor base." (Page 165)

"As a matter of fact, they were crated before me. I did make complaint regarding creation of pillar bases by ASI. The complaints made by me were given to the Muslim parties, who passed it to the observers, present there."(Page 166)

3895. The ASI has discovered 50 pillar bases during

excavation out of which twelve were completely exposed, thirty five partially and three were traced in section. The pillar bases traced in section were F2, G2 in baulk (pillar base no.20), F8 F9 in baulk (pillar base No.40) and trench No.F8 F9 in baulk (pillar base no.41). Confirming GPR survey report, twenty pillar bases have been excavated in trenches no.E2, E9, F8, F9, ZG1, G2, G5, G8, G9, ZH1 and H5. In all these trenches, one pillar base each was discovered. Besides, in Trench F-6, three pillar bases, Trench G-2, two pillar bases and Trench H-1, two pillar bases have been found. Foundation of these pillar bases are circular, square, oval or irregular in shape. Pillar base no.3 shows square sandstone block with orthostats provided on its four sides, contemporary with floor 2. Multiple courses of brick bats set in mud mortar incasing rectangular blocks of calcrete stone fixed with lime mortar were provided as foundation to the pillar bases. Figure 3A shows alignment of pillar base and details of respective distances. The important feature pointed out is that there were seventeen rows of pillar bases from North to South, each row having 5 pillar bases. There is no North-South row of the West of wall 16 and 17, as is being read and suggested by the aforesaid experts of plaintiffs (Suit-4). Though we are not agreeable to the allegation that some of them, or many of the pillar bases are created but even if, for a moment, we assume as claimed by three witnesses i.e. PW-29 Jaya Menon, PW-32 Dr. Supriya Verma and DW-6/1-2 Mohd. Abid that they sought G-2 and F-6 trenches wherein pillar bases were created by one Trench Supervisor S.K. Sharma and one more person, that will not be sufficient to belie and also cannot explain several other pillar bases found by ASI whereagainst no such complaint is

there.

3896. Archaeology provides scientific factual data for reconstructing ancient historical material culture, understanding, archaeology for the past is a multi disciplinary scientific subject and requires a team of workers for effective results. Excavation of ancient sites is one of the major works of Archaeologists. As it is a scientific discipline, it uses scientific methods in its working. All archaeological excavations are constructive and also at the same time destructive; revealing in the sense they yield unknown data like structures, antiquities etc., destructive that as one digs layer after layer, the upper layer have to be removed to go deeper and deeper to know more and may cause destruction of the site for any future excavation at that place.

3897. The term "Archaeology" came to be considered by Apex Court in **Joseph Pothan Vs. The State of Kerala AIR 1965 SC 1514** and in paras 13 and 14 it observed:

"13. The Constitution itself, as we have noticed earlier, maintains a clear distinction between ancient monuments and archaeological site or remains; the former is put in the State List and the latter, in the Concurrent List.

14. The dictionary meaning of the two expressions also brings out the distinction between the two concepts. "Monument" is derived from monere, which means to remind, to warn. "Monument" means, among others, "a structure surviving from a former period" whereas "archaeology" is the scientific study of the life and culture of ancient peoples. Archaeological site or remains, therefore, is a site or remains which could be explored in order to study the life and culture of the ancient peoples.

The two expressions, therefore, bear different meanings. Though the demarcating line may be thin in a rare case, the distinction is clear.”

3898. The Court also held that Ancient and Historical Monuments and Archaeological Sites and Remains (Declaration of National Importance) Act, 1951 apply to ancient and historical monuments referred to or specified in Part 1 of the Schedule thereto, which had been declared to be of national importance.

3899. In this case, ASI did not work on an unknown subject and site but was backed by a scientific investigation report of GPR Survey which is a well known scientific system used in such matters. The survey has pointed out a number of anomalies underneath. The actual excavation needed to confirm and verify those anomalies and their exact nature to avoid any doubt. Regarding Pillar Bases, a number of such anomalies were already pointed out by GPR Survey and ASI simply found the existence of pillar bases so as to confirm the anomalies pointed out by GPR Survey at those places. If we look carefully to GPR Survey, as also the pillar bases confirmed by actual excavation of ASI, a total number thereof we find comes to about twenty. They are:

Sl. No. of the report	Trench No. of the Report/ (GPR)/ Page No./ Report	Pillar Bases (with depth) P.B.	Page no. of the report	Confirmation of Pillar Bases with pillar base No.
25	E-2/P. 23	1. Rectangular Pillar Base (1.80 m.)	23	*
29	E-9/ P. 24	1. Pillar Base (0.60 m.)	29	43, 65
35	F-6/ P. 25	1. Pillar Base (0.70 m.) 2. Pillar Base (0.55 m.) 3. Pillar Bases (01.60	25	40, 41, 65

		m.)		
36	F-8/ P. 25	1. Pillar Base (0.20 m.)	25	38, 65
37	F-9/ P. 26	1. Pillar Base (0.50 m.)	26	44, 66
38	ZG-1/ P. 26	1. Pillar Base (0.50 m.)	26	8, 55, 11, 58
39	G-2/P. 26	1. Pillar Base (2.20 m.) 2. Pillar Base (2.20 m.)	26	21, 60, 24, 61
42	G-5/P. 27	1. Pillar Base (2.50 m.)	27	26, 62
45	G-8/ P. 27	1. Pillar Base (0.90 m.)	27	28, 39, 63
46	G-9/ P. 28	1. Pillar Base (0.20 m.)	28	45, 66
47	ZH-1/ P. 28	1. Pillar Base (0.55 m.)	28	8, 58
48	H-1/ P. 28	1. Pillar Base (0.70 m.) 2. Pillar Base (1.50 m.)	28	18, 60, 19
52	H-5/ P. 29	1. Pillar Base (0.820 m.)	29	27, 62

3900. Interestingly, we find that in the two major complaints dated 21st May, 2003 and 7th June, 2003 submitted to the Observer when the excavation was going on, the allegations of creation of pillar base mainly were made in those very trenches where the GPR Survey has already detected anomalies in the form of pillar bases etc. The complainants were already to some extent aware of likelihood of finding pillar bases in those trenches. Trenches No.F1, F6, F8, F9, G1, G2, G5, G8, G9, H1, ZG1 and ZH1 are in that very category. In other words, it can easily be appreciated that the mind of two experts instead of working for the assistance of the Court in finding a truth, tried to create a background alibi so that later on the same may be utilized to attack the very findings. However, this attempt has not gone well since some of these very pillar bases have been admitted by one or the other expert of plaintiffs (Suit-4) to be correct.

3901. Sri M.M.Pandey, learned Advocate appearing on behalf of defendant no.2/1 (Suit-4) while justifying ASI report in respect to the various pillar bases, submitted that centre to centre distance can not be measured correctly, except for those

found completely topped by sandstone blocks and attached to floor. It is not possible to fix the point where the finished sand stone block would have been placed on top of the calcrete blocks. Two pillar bases that have been found in sections (Fig. 8 & 9) demonstrate vividly that the sandstone block was not necessarily placed in the centre of the calcrete block and brickbat foundation rather was shifted as per the requirement of alignment. Exposition of a structure that exists is done in an excavation. The question of creation of any structure including pillar base does not arise. Nothing was ignored during the excavation. Utmost care was taken to ensure that each and every find is documented and mentioned in the Report. No "calcrete topped brickbat heap" is either found or identified as pillar bases. Brickbats in the pillar bases are not heaped up rather they are carefully laid in well defined courses. It is to be remembered that pillar bases, except those found complete with sandstone blocks in the northern area whose existence and genuineness is admitted by Sunni Central Board of Waqf and its companion parties, are essentially the foundation part required to remain buried in ground. Once this fact is borne in mind then the picture may be clearly understood. When the floor of sub-Period VII B is "weathered enough to be replaced, debris of brick structures was leveled to attain the desired height. In this deposit foundations to support pillar or columns were sunk" to different levels. Floors 1, 1A, 1B and 1C belonged to the disputed structure (Period VIII & IX), Floors 2, 3 and 4 belonged to period VII and the brick-crush floor existed in the earlier Period VI. There appears to be some attempt on part of the plaintiff to twist the facts and mislead by creating some sort of confusion.

The transition from "calcrete topped brickbat heaps" through "brickbat heaps" to "some kind of loosely-bonded brickbats deposits" is very clear. The plaintiff at least accepts some sort of bonding in brickbats which cannot be in case of "heaps" (random deposit). This at best may be termed as self contradicting argument.. Floor (F1.2) around most of the pillar bases is found broken with pillar base foundations in much disturbed condition.: (p.42, 2nd para). The evidence of broken floor as above most of the pillar base foundations, completely finished pillar bases and the evidence of finished pillar bases partly excavated and partly visible in section when combined together, point to the fact that all these 46 pillar bases belonged to the one and the same period and were constructed in association of wall 16 and F1.2. The pillars that have actually been recovered are from the debris of the disputed structure. Further, nowhere in the report it is said or hinted at that these stone pillars were standing over these pillar bases. It is nothing but wilful negation of the evident fact, nothing more can be said in this regard. Layers of pillar bases are clear from the perusal of the report. The objections of the plaintiff regarding creation of pillar bases, distances and alignments and its interpretation one without any substance. It is well established in archaeology that walls can not be cut and shaped like pillar bases. The walls alleged to have been cut and shaped like pillar bases are at the maximum 0.55 m wide, whereas the pillar bases show much bigger dimension which prima-facie falsifies the objection of the plaintiff. The plaintiffs challenging the identity of pillar bases alleged that unused brick broken or entire have been used to fill hollow to raise the level of ground or to function apron for

a building. In this connection it may be mentioned that a perusal of report shows that most of the pillar bases are attached with the floor 2, 3 & 4. If "hollow" is a synonym for foundation pit, then certainly it is a good explanation. But 'fill' would be wrong expression, as the brickbats are laid in defined courses. Raising of ground is done uniformly and throughout and not as if "a pile of unused bricks" or "to fill hollows". It is surprising to note that the "heavy wall" disappears without leaving any trace except the "pile of unused bricks" to "shore up". As "apron" for which building? Apparently all the objections tendered above are emanating from technically ignorant persons and willful attempt to mislead the Court. All the interpretations were reached after exploring all the possible explanations. ASI conducted excavation at the behest and orders of this Court as Court Commissioner and submitted its scientific Report to the Court and did not engage in creation and that too in the presence of judicial officers.

3902. The pillar bases traced on spot make 64 squares in between 17 rows of 5 pillar bases each. The seventeen rows of pillar bases were constructed along the north-south running brick wall (wall No. 16). The distance of the first pillar base in each row from the wall is 3.60 to 3.86 m. Seventeen rows of pillar bases could be categorized in three different groups whereas east-west distance which varies in different groups whereas east-west distance from the centre to centre of each pillar base vary from 2.90 to 3.30 m. Six rows of the pillar bases on north and south were at the equidistance which ranges from 3 to 3.30 m. Central five rows consisting of twenty-five pillar bases show different equations- two rows on either side of the

central row were placed approximately at the distance of 5.25 m whereas the other two rows on either side of these three rows were at the distance of 4.20-4.25 m. The pillar bases are in alignment. The ASI unit report in figure 23B has given an isometric view of the pillar bases and in figure 23A the isometric view of the excavated site with different floors and pillar bases.

3903. The foundation of the pillar bases are circular, square, oval, or irregular in shape and the foundation has been filled with brick bats covered with orthostat which prima facie establishes its load bearing nature. It is also clear from the report that all the fifty pillar bases, more or less are of similar pattern except the orthostate position. The factual position is that the pillar bases of northern side which are admitted by the plaintiffs and other objectors to be pillar bases are undisturbed and unexposed whereas the pillar bases of the southern side are damaged and exposed but in any way there is no basic difference between the two. The isometric view is a geometrical drawing to show a building in three dimensions. The plan is set up with lines at an equal angle (usually 30°) to the horizontal, while verticals remain vertical and to scale. It gives a more realistic effect than an axonometric projection, but diagonals and curves are distorted. The existence of pillar bases was challenged by the objectors on the ground that the distance between the pillar bases, the spot position is not common as such the same may not be considered pillar bases. In this connection reference may be given of plan of Ukha Mandir temple converted in to a Masjid published at surveyor general office Calcutta in 1877 in which square pillars were found with

different angles and distances. Similarly in temple of Vishala Devi pillar bases of different sizes with different distances were found which too have been lithographed at the Surveyor General office Calcutta in July 1877. Examples of plan of Shiva Temple at Bastar, Shiva Temple at Shighanpur, Shiva Temple at Chindgaon, Shiva Temple at Chitrakoot, Shiva Temple at Narayanpur are relating to 10th Century A.D. may be given. A perusal of photographs of the pillar bases, videography and the time of excavation also falsify the allegations of the objectors regarding creation of pillar bases.

3904. A perusal of the report particularly at page 54 shows that all the 50 exposed pillar bases are attached with floor 2 dateable to 1200 A. D. and most of them are resting over floor no. 4 which has the earliest floor,. The carbon dating report referred at page 69 of the report also proves that in a trench ZH-1 the date reported between floor 2 & 3 is between 900-1300 A.D. which prima facie makes it clear that floor 2 was not made after 1300 A.D. and not before 900 A.D. while floor 3 was made before 900 A.D. It is also clear from the report that all the pillar bases exposed are attached with the floors existing prior to the floor of disputed structure. Pillar base is reported from the same trench, i.e. ZH-1 along with the floor which confirms the association of floor 2/3 and pillar bases along with C¹⁴ date between floor 2 & 3 (S. No. 47 of pillar base in page no. 28). The same pillar base of ZH-1 was predicted as an anomaly in the GRP Survey. Therefore, it is clear that floor 4 which supports the foundation of pillar bases was the most extensive floor belong to period VII A (page 42 of the report & fig. 23 & plate 35). The timing of period VII-A is the beginning of 12th

century (page 41 of the report.).

3905. It is clear from the report that floor 4 which supports the foundation of pillar bases was a floor of a Temple. It cannot be the floor of Idgah or Kanati Mosque because pillars are always absent in Idgah so that maximum persons could be accommodated in minimum space for offering prayer.

3906. Association of pillar bases has been reported at page 56 to 68 and a perusal of the same shows that pillar bases no. 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 14 total 8 are projected over floor no. 2, pillar bases no. 15, 19, 21, 23, 24, 30 total 8 are projected over floor no. 3 which have penetrated downward by cutting floor no. 2 and pillar bases no. 10, 11, 13, 16, 17, 18, 22, 26, 27, 28, 29, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50 total 29 pillar bases are projected over floor 4 which have penetrated downward by cutting floor no. 2 & 3. In addition to above pillar bases no. 20, 40, 41 are pillar bases in the section whereas pillar bases no. 4 and 25 are not associated with any floor due to damaged condition.

3907. We find substance in the submission of Sri Pandey. We may also notice at this stage that though most of the pillar bases were excavated at earlier point of time but complaint thereof particularly about so called creation was made after much gap. To start with, the first complaint of 21st May, 2003 was confined only to one pillar base found in trench G-2 but a number of such pillar bases were included in the second complaint dated 7th June, 2003, when both the so called authors of the objections were not on the site. On the basis of record these details can be shown in the form of a chart as under:

Pillar	Shape/Size	Site	Note	Date	of	Name	of
--------	------------	------	------	------	----	------	----

Base/ Trench	in cm	Book No./ Page No.	Excavation/ Date of objection, if any	Supervisor
1/ZH3- ZH2 baulk	Square/63x 61.5x9	41/43	22.4.03	S.K. Sharma
2/ZF2	-	7	15.05.03	G.L.Katade
3/ZG2	Rectangula r/60x53.5x 7	30/36	13/14.05.03	A.R.Siddiqui
4/ZG2	Square (?)	30	13/14.05.03	A.r.Siddiqui
5/ZH2	Square/61x 60x11 including the thickness of missing western orthostat	41	19/22.04.03	S.K.Sharma
6/ZH2-ZJ2 Baulk	Square/58x 56 including the thickness of missing northern orthostat	7	11.06.03	G.L.Katade
7/ZF1	Square/55x 55x6.5	30	29.04.03, 3/13.05.03	A.R.Siddiqui
8/ZG1	Square/59x 61.5x5	30/31-39	03/16.05.03/ 07.06.03	A.R.Siddiqui
9/ZH1	Probably square foundation/ 125x105x7 5	41/25-26	14/15 to 20.04.03/07. 06.03	S.K.Sharma
10/ZF1	Irregular shaped foundation/ 150x100x4	30/24-29 depth 65 cm	29.04.03 13.05.03/07. 06.03	A.R.Siddiqui Plaintiff occupied by barbed wire.

	0			Only southern portion excavated
11/ZG1	Circular (?) foundation partially exposed/97x94x26	30	03/04/16.05.03	A.R.Siddiqui
12/ZG1	Circular (?) foundation badly damaged and partially exposed/N S 55 Ht 60	30/31-35	03/04/13.05.03/07.06.03	A.R.Siddiqui
13/ZH1	Square/Also available in section. Top 54.5x46.5 foundation EW 122 Ht. 69 (from top to bottom)	41/25-27	14.04.03 to 20.04.03/07.06.03	S.K.Sharma
14/ZH1-H1	Square/63x63x6.5	30	12.07.03	A.R.Siddiqui
15/F1	Rectangular (?) foundation square top/130x138	30/14-21 depth 98 cm	22.04.03 to 27.04.03/07.06.03	A.R.Siddiqui
16/F1-G1	Irregular baulk/130x120x55 foundation partially exposed	30	22/27/18/23.04.03	A.R.Siddiqui

17/G1	Square foundation partially exposed/140x125x45	30/5, 6, 7, 8	19/20.04.03 18.06.03/07.06.03	A.R.Siddiqui
18/H1	Square foundation partially exposed/150x130x56	41/3-9 11-14	12.04.03/07.06.03	S.K.Sharma
19/H1	Square foundation partially exposed/78x110x38	41/3-14	06/18.05.03/ 07.06.03	S.K.Sharma
20/F2 G2 Baulk	Partially exposed/N S 55 Ht.22	7-8, 32, 45	08.07.03 17.07.03 02.08.03 24.05.03 03.06.03 10.05.03 20.05.03	Zulfiqar Ali, G.L.Katade, C.B.Patil, S.K.Sharma
21/G2	Square (?) foundation partially exposed/E W 140 Ht. 28	32/49-54 27-85	10/20.05.03/ 07.06.03 21.05.03	S.K.Sharma Zulfiqar Ali
22/F2	Square foundation/122x115x25	7-8	08/17.07.03	
23/F2-G2 baulk	Square (?) foundation partially exposed/105x72x33	7, 8, 32, 45	-	
24/G2	Oval foundation partially exposed/15	32 20 45/22 49 37 30	17.07.03 02.08.03 10.05.03 20.05.03/	Zulfiqar Ali S.K.Sharma

	0x125x32		07.06.03	
25/F3	Square (?) foundation partially exposed/65 x145x55	16	21.05.03 30.05.03 19.07.03	Sujeet Nayan
26/G5	Irregular foundation with square top partially exposed/12 0x165x90	13/1 22 23	24.05.03 21.05.03 10.06.03 / 07.06.03	Sujeet Nayan
27/H5	Square (?) foundation partially exposed/10 0x25x35	40	26/30.04.03	Bhuvan Vikrama
28/F6	Irregular foundation partially exposed/14 8x147x54	23	24.05.03 01.06.03	Zulfiqar Ali
29/F6	Rectangular foundation partially exposed/76 x170x51	19/3-4	29.04.03 to 06.05.03/07. 06.03	G.L.Katade
30/G6	Rectangular foundation partially exposed/83 x55x40	33	07/11.05.03	G.L.Katade
31/F6-F7 balk	Elliptical foundation partially exposed/12 6x198x38	15, 19, 23	-	
32/F6-F7	Irregular	15-F-7 19-	19.04.03	G.L.Katade

	foundation partially exposed/95x155x40	F-6, 23	10.09.03 19.04.03 06.05.03 24.05.03 01.06.03	Zulfiqar Ali
33/G6-G7 baulk	Square (?) foundation /70x40x35	21	-	
34/E7-F7 baulk	Square or Rectangular foundation partially exposed/100x100x34	12	05.04.03 08.05.03 14.05.03	Zulfiqar Ali
35/F7	Rectangular (?) foundation partially exposed/170x160x38	15/ 1 to 31	19.04.03 to 13.05.03/07.06.03	G.L.Katade
36/G7	Square (?) foundation partially exposed/80x40x40	21	20.05.03 09.07.03 10.07.03 07.08.03	N.C.Prakash
37/F8	Circular foundation /170x170	44/ 2 to 45	15.04.03 to 23.05.03/07.06.03	Sameer Dewan
38/F8	Circular (?) foundation partially exposed/700x145x37	44/13	15.04.03 to 23.05.03	Sameer Dewan
39/G8	Circular foundation / 42x130x30	30 10/86 to 90 10	24.06.03 to 27.06.03 09.05.03 10.05.03/07.06.03	A.R.Siddiqui N.C. Prakash Sujeet Nayan
40/F8-F9 baulk	-/EW-120 Ht.33	44	-	

41/F8-F9 bault	-/EW-80 Ht. 35	18	10/19/17/30. 04.03	N.C.Prakash Sujeet Nayan
42/G8-G9 bault	Circular foundation/ 43x120x28	30, 10	24.06.03 27.07.03 09.05.03 10.05.03	A.R. Siddiqui Sujeet Nayan
43/E9-F9 bault	Rectangular foundation / 55x130x20	22, 35	04.07.03 20.04.03 07.05.03	Sujeet Nayan
44/F9	Square foundation / 95x142x30	18/ 3-34	08.04.03 to 30.04.03/07. 06.03	Sujeet Nayan
45/G9	Circular foundation /Dia- 118 Ht. 34	10/3-9 14- 22	06.04.03 to 09.04.03 to 11.05.03 14.05.03/07. 06.03	N.C.Prakash Sujeet Nayan
46/G9-H9 bault	Square foundation partially exposed/11 0x80x45	10	06.04.03 09.04.03 11.05.03 14.05.03	N.C.Prakash Sujeet Nayan
47/E10- F10 bault	Circular foundation partially exposed/14 0x55x48	9	18.05.03 22.05.03	Zulfiqar Ali
48/F10	Circular base and square top of the foundation/ 155x145x4 0 square 90 Ht. 12	9/37 to 45 38 45	18.05.03 to 22.05.03/07. 06.03	Zulfiqar Ali
49/G10- H10 bault	Square foundation/	-	-	

	115x120x50			
50/H10	Circular foundation/ 115x90x48	-	-	

3908. This chart would reveal that most of the pillar bases were found during excavation in the months of April and May, 2003 which could have cleared to anyone having an idea on the subject as to what inference those excavations is likely to cause. It appear that in these circumstances under the Expert's advice the complaints were made as a ground, so as to utilize later. It cannot be doubted that as and when the pillar bases have been excavated on that very day mentioned in the site notebook.

3909. We have very carefully perused the site note book, day-to-day register as also more than twenty five video cassettes as well as the photographs but find nothing unusual which may create any suspicion in what the ASI has said in respect to pillar bases in his report except minor typographical mistakes, which is quite understandable in the manner they have worked and with the pace with which have accomplished such a gigantic job, that too under unusual circumstances where they were constantly watched by huge number of persons and officials of the Court.

3910. We may reproduce at this stage some part of the statement of PW-29, 30, 31 and 32 again which would show that in general, the finding of ASI about pillar bases, was not found incorrect:

3911. **PW-29 Dr. Jaya Menon-** She said:

"In my opinion 10 pillar bases were found in the northern side of the disputed site. All these 10 pillar bases

on the northern side were beyond the disputed structure. ...” (Page 204)

“...I think one pillar base was found in the section in the northern part of the disputed site. I remember that one pillar base was identified by the ASI in the baulk of the trenches F2 and G2 and two so-called pillar bases were identified by the ASI in the baulk of trench F8 and F9 but according to me these were not actually pillar bases. ...” (Page 204-205)

“...approximately they are 6 in number. It does not appear on the perusal of figure 23 that some of the so called pillar bases from floor 3 have penetrated down to floor 4. Approximately 25 so called pillar bases have been shown in figure 23a as associated with floor 4 and floor 4a. I do not remember whether floor 2 and 3 were carbon dated by ASI from 900 to 1300 AD or not. In my opinion floor 1 is the floor of Babri Masjid which is approximately dated to the 16th century. Floor 2, floor 3 and 4 were associated with the pre Babri Masjid structure. I don't have separate dates for floors 2, 3 and 4 but approximately these floors may be dated from the end of the 12th century to the 16th century AD. According to me walls and structures prior to 12th century were found in excavation but no floor prior to 12th century was found at the site. According to me the oldest wall found in excavation was of first to third century AD. And the oldest structure found would be structure 5 which may be of 6th century AD.” (Page 205)

3912. Dr R.C. Thakran (PW-30) admitting the existence of pillar bases stated that:

“मैं उस रिपोर्ट में लिखी इस बात से सहमत हूँ कि पिलर बेसेज पत्थर के पैडेस्टल्स पर टिके हुए थे। . . . मैंने अयोध्या की खुदाई के दौरान सभी पिलर बेसेज को देखा था। उसमें पैडेस्टल्स स्टोन कहीं पर नहीं हैं। केवल मात्र सीता की रसोई की तरफ कुछ पिलर बेसेज के ऊपर पत्थर पाये गये हैं। जो पेडेस्टल से भिन्न हैं। . . .जब तक मैं खुदाई स्थल पर रहा, ऐसा नहीं है कि ए0एस0आई0 वालों ने पिलर बेस बनाये हों, बाद में अगर उन्होंने कुछ किया हो, तो मुझे इस बात का ज्ञान नहीं है। यदि सभी ट्रेचेज में लगातार वीडियोग्राफी हो रही हो, तो पिलर बेस बनाना सम्भव नहीं है।” (पेज 116/118)

“ . . .मस्जिद में जो पिलर बनाये जाते हैं, उनके लिए पिलर बेसेज की आवश्यकता होती है। उपरोक्त धारा 22 में इन पिलर बेसेज के सम्बन्ध में चर्चा की गयी है तथा पिलर बेसेज के ऊपर जो पिलर्स खड़े किये गये हैं, उनकी भी चर्चा है।” (पेज 176)

“I agree with the fact mentioned in that report that the pillar bases rested on pedestals of stone I had seen all the pillar bases in course of the Ayodhya excavation. Pedestal stones were nowhere in them. Only towards Sita Rasoi, above some pillar bases have been found stones, which are different from the pedestals.... As long as I stayed at the excavation site, it is not that the A.S.I men carved pillar bases; but if they did so later on, I do not have knowledge about that. If all the trenches are constantly being videographed, it is not possible to carved pillar bases.” (Page 116/118)

“...For pillars to be carved in a mosque, there is requirement of pillar bases. The aforesaid para 22 discusses about these pillar bases and also about the pillars which have been erected above the pillar bases.”(Page 176)

3913. Dr Ashok Dutta (PW-31) admitting the existence of

pillar bases underneath of the disputed structure stated as under:

“...Plate no. 82 and 83 of ASI report vol. II were shown to the witness who stated that stones slabs are possibly of black basalt with some decorative motifs can be seen in these plates. Black basalt is a kind of rock, which is igneous rock. ...” (page 109)

“...Learned cross examiner drew the attention of the witness towards paper no. 200 C-1 after seeing photographs no. 122 and 123 the witness stated that it appears to me from the photographs that the stones used in stole pillars is possibly black basalt. It appears that the pillars which are seen in paper 122 and 123 are similar to that as shown in plate 82 and 83 of ASI report vol. 2. ...” (page 110)

“...As an archaeologist at least I have that amount of knowledge to differentiate between mosque and temple. I don't have any idea whether this type of stone slabs having decorative motif were used in the mosque or not. In plate no. 83 there are flower designs on the stone slab lower part of this stone slab is not distinct and clear. After seeing plate no. 83 with the magnifying glass the witness stated that some objects are visible in this stone slab. They appear to be lower part of a figure. But whether it represents human being or any thing else is difficult to ascertain because the foot is shown in different way than the man. In the centre of this plate it gives an impression of a 'Ghat with flower'. I don't have any idea whether these type of decorative motifs are used in mosque. ...” (Page 110-111)

“...I know that the depiction of human and animal figures

is prohibited in the Muslim architecture.

So far I remember there was no figure of human beings on the black basalt pillars. ...” (Page 140)

“...I believe the theory of ‘Super imposition’. I believe that according to the theory of ‘super imposition’ creation of the pillar bases in the trenches is impossible but in certain cases some super imposition is found. ...” (Page 266)

3914. Dr Supriya Verma (PW-32) stated as under:

“16. That the so called “pillar bases” were only part of a floor construction technique. Each lime-surkhi floor was underlain with several layers of brickbats interspersed with stone blocks and slabs and other material as fillers. ...” (Page 12)

“...It was for the first time in the year 1989 in an article published in a magazine, namely, ‘Manthan’ that the existence of pillar bases was mentioned by him (Prof. B.B. Lal). ...” (Page 127)

3915. Prof. Suraj Bhan (PW-16) who visited the site for three days only, as mentioned by him at page-34, admitting the existence of pillar bases, stated as under:

“अयोध्या के इस स्थल पर बाबरी मस्जिद के ढांचे के तुरन्त नीचे वाले ढांचे के साथ वाले फर्श और पिलर बेस का एक साथ फोटो लिया जा सकता था बशर्ते कि इस दृष्टि से खुदाई की गयी होती। . . .” (पेज 227)

“At this site of Ayodhya, the floor appurtenant to the structure immediately below the structure of the Babri Mosque could have been photographed, provided excavation had been done from this angle...” (Page 227)

“विद्वान् जिरहकर्ता अधिवक्ता ने साक्षी का ध्यान ए0एस0आई0 रिपोर्ट व्यूलूम 2 के प्लेट संख्या 42 पर आकृष्ट किया। साक्षी ने इसे देखकर प्रश्न किये जाने पर बताया कि इस प्लेट में दो ऐसे कन्स्ट्रक्शन हैं जो पिलर बेस

के रूप में मान लिये गये हैं, परन्तु इनको प्रमाणित करने के लिए क्रॉस सेक्शन ठीक से नहीं दिख पा रहा है।” (पेज 228)

“The learned cross-examining counsel drew the attention of the witness to Plate no. 42 of the A.S.I. report, volume 2. After looking at this the witness on being questioned replied that in this plate there are two such constructions as have been taken to be pillar bases but cross section, capable of establishing them, is not properly seen.”(page 228).

“एक दीवार को शायद काट कर जिसे पिलर बेस कहा जा रहा है शायद उसे बनाया गया है।” (पेज 229)

“What is being termed as pillar base, is perhaps carved out from a wall.”(Page 229)

“पिलर बेस हम उसे कहते हैं जो किसी स्तम्भ का आधार हों। सर्वे की रिपोर्ट के मुताबिक प्रो० बी०बी०लाल के उत्खनन में पाये गये कन्स्ट्रक्शन को इसलिए पिलर बेस कहा गया है क्योंकि उनके अनुसार उन पर तथाकथित मन्दिर के स्तम्भ खड़े माने गये थे।” (पेज 232)

“We term as pillar base what is the base of any pillar. As per the survey report, the constructions discovered at the excavation carried out by Prof. B.B.Lal have been termed as pillar bases because the pillars of the so called temple, in his opinion, rested on them.”(Page 232).

“प्लेट संख्या 46 के बारे में साक्षी ने इसे देखकर पूछने पर बताया कि मैंने यहाँ यह कहने का प्रयास किया है कि तथाकथित पिलर बेसेज पर न तो कोई सिम्बोलिक आकृतियाँ हैं और न ही उनके साथ एक भी पत्थर का स्तम्भ अथवा उसके टुकड़े मिले।” (पेज 234)

“On being queried about plate no.46, the witness, after looking at the same, stated that here he had tried to say that there are no symbolic shapes on the so –called pillar bases and not a single stone pillar or its fragments were

discovered with them.”(Page 234)

“मुझे इस समय यह याद नहीं है कि उपरोक्त फिगर 3ए में दर्शित 50 पिलर बेसेज में से कितने मेरे निरीक्षण के समय एक्सपोज हो चुके थे। स्वयं कहा, इनमें से कुछ स्टेक्चर्स उत्तर में, कुछ पश्चिमी भाग में तथा कुछ दक्षिण में स्टेक्चर्स पार्टली या पूरी तरह एक्सपोज हो चुके हैं, जिन्हें पिलर बसे कहा जा रहा है। ए0एस0आई0 द्वारा प्रदर्शित पिलर बेसेज में एलाइन्मेंट तो दिखाई देता है परन्तु फिर भी इनमें अन्तर तो है ही और रिपोर्ट में भी यही लिखा गया है।” (पेज 464)

“At present I do not remember how many of the 50 pillar bases shown in the aforesaid figure 3A had been exposed at the time of my observation. (Stated on his own) Out of these structures, some have been partly or completely exposed in the north, some in the western part and some in the south, which structures are being called pillar bases. Alignment is certainly seen in the pillar bases shown by A.S.I., but they definitely have differences, and this very fact is written in the report.”(Page 464)

“प्रायः यह कन्स्ट्रक्शन फर्श बनाने के लिए भरी गयी मिट्टी के लेबल को मेन्टेन करने के लिए थी या किसी और परपज के लिए प्रमाण अभी नहीं है।

प्रश्न—इन पिलर बेसेज के सम्बन्ध में ए0एस0आई0 द्वारा प्रस्तुत टेंच नोटबुक, डायरी व डायरी रजिस्टर आदि का भी आपने पिलर बेस के सम्बन्ध में कोई जानकारी किया है अथवा नहीं?

उत्तर— मैं तो रिपोर्ट के अध्ययन से ही और साईट पर विजिट करके तथा अपने इन्टरएक्शन द्वारा ही अपना मत बनाया है। इन सुपरवाइजरो की डायरी या एन्टीक्यूटी रजिस्टर को मैंने नहीं देखा है। रिपोर्ट में भी उनका कोई विशेष उल्लेख नहीं है।” (पेज 470)

“As of now, there is nothing to show whether these constructions were often meant to maintain the level of soil for floor making or for any other purpose.

Question- Whether any inquiry in respect of these pillar

bases, has been made by you or not of the Trench notebook, diary and diary register etc. submitted by ASI ?

Answer- I have formed my opinion on studying the report, visiting the site and by my interaction. I have not seen the diary of Supervisors or the Antiquity Register. There is no special reference of these in the report as well." (Page 470)

3916. Prof. Dhaneshwar Mandal (PW-24) who was again examined as expert witness after excavation by Sunni Central Waqf Board, appreciated the work of ASI and its methodology, but nowhere alleged anything against ASI or manufacture of pillar bases by them. Rather he admitted the existence of pillar bases and the reference of the same in the report. Prof. Mandal stated that:

"रिपोर्ट के अनुसार 50 तथा-कथित स्तम्भ आधारों (pillar bases) के नीव की पहचान की गयी है। उन्हें Floor 2 (या Structure 4 की अन्तिम अवस्था) से सम्बद्ध कहा गया है (ASI Report, Vol.I, p.54).

इस कथन से यह स्पष्ट संकेत मिलता है कि उनका निर्माण Floor 2 के समय हुआ होगा। इस स्थिति में दोनों परस्पर समकालिक हुए। (पेज 118)

"According to the report, the foundations of 50 alleged pillar bases have been identified. They have been termed as attached to Floor 2 (or the last stage of Structure 4) (ASI Report, Vol.1,p.54). This statement clearly indicates that their construction would have taken place at time of Floor 2. In such situation both of them are mutually contemporary. " (page 118)

"पुरातत्व विज्ञान के अनुसार जिस सतह से यह खाई खोदी Pit जाती है वह उसके निर्माण काल का समकालिक माना जाता है। . . . रिपोर्ट में लगभग 14 स्तम्भ आधारों का सेक्शन तथा प्लान प्रकाशित है।" (पेज 118)

"According to the archaeology, the level from which this

pit is excavated, is considered to be contemporary with its period of construction..... The section and plan of about 14 pillar bases have been published in the report." (page 118)

“...मैंने कल अपने बयान के बाद जी०पी०आर० सर्वे रिपोर्ट तथा उसमें उल्लिखित जिन एनामिलीज़ की पुष्टी ए०एस०आई० द्वारा की गई है उसके संदर्भ में रिपोर्ट का पुनः अवलोकन नहीं किया है, इसलिए मैं आज भी नहीं बता सकता हूँ कि जी०पी०आर० रिपोर्ट में उल्लिखित जिन एनामिलीज़ की पुष्टि एएसआई ने उत्खनन द्वारा की है, वह रिपोर्ट में उल्लिखित हैं अथवा नहीं। ए०एस०आई० में अपनी रिपोर्ट में पिलरबेस का आइसोमेटिक व्यू दिया है जिसको मैंने देखा है। एएसआई द्वारा दिए गए इस आइसोमेटिक व्यू में दर्शित पिलरबेसिस का सत्यापन मैंने विवादित स्थल से नहीं किया है। विवादित स्थल पर जो स्ट्रक्चर पाए गए हैं, उनका विवरण ए०एस०आई० में अपने रिपोर्ट वाल्यूम 1 के फिगर 3 और 3ए में दिया है। विवादित स्थल पर पाए गए जिन स्ट्रक्चरस का उल्लेख फीगर 3 तथा 3ए में किया गया है, वह विवादित स्थल पर हैं, इससे मैं सहमत हूँ। ए०एस०आई० ने अपनी रिपोर्ट में चार फ्लोर्स का उल्लेख किया है, जिससे मैं सहमत हूँ परन्तु जहाँ तक ए०एस०आई० द्वारा दिखाए गए फ्लोर 4ए का प्रश्न है, उससे मैं सहमत नहीं हूँ क्योंकि इसका उल्लेख एएसआई की रिपोर्ट वाल्यूम 1 के पृष्ठ 37ए (टेन्टेटिव पीरियडाइज़ेशन ऑफ दि डिस्प्यूटिड साइट एट अयोध्या) में भी नहीं है। फ्लोर 1 डिस्प्यूटिड स्ट्रक्चर की फ्लोर है। फ्लोर 2, फ्लोर 1 से पूर्ववर्ती फ्लोर है जिसमें रिपोर्ट में सभी पिलरबेसेज़ व स्ट्रक्चर्स को दिखाया गया है। फ्लोर 3, फ्लोर 2 के पूर्व की है, ए०एस०आई० ने अपनी रिपोर्ट में फ्लोर 3 से अटैचड जो वॉल तथा पिलर बेसेज़ हैं उसको दिखाया है, परन्तु मैं उससे सहमत नहीं हूँ। वॉल के संबंध में मेरी असहमती नहीं है ...” (पेज 275)

".....After my yesterday's statement, I have not re-perused the report in context of the GPR survey report as well as the anomalies mentioned therein, which have been verified by ASI. As such even today I cannot tell whether the anomalies mentioned in the GPR report and verified by ASI

through excavation, have been mentioned in the report or not. The ASI has given isometric view of the pillar bases in its report, which has been perused by me. The verification of the pillar bases appearing in this isometric view given by the ASI, has not been done by me from the disputed site. The details of the structures found at the disputed site have been given by the ASI in Figure 3 and 3A of Volume 1 of its report. I agree that the structures found at the disputed site and mentioned in Figure 3 and 3A, are at the disputed site. In its report, the ASI has mentioned about four floors, with which I agree, but so far as the Floor 4A shown by ASI is concerned, I do not agree with the same because it has not been mentioned even at Page 37A(tentative periodisation of the disputed site at Ayodhya) of Volume 1 of ASI report. The Floor 1 is the floor of the disputed structure. The Floor 2 is anterior to the Floor 1, in which all the pillar bases and structures of the report have been shown. The Floor 3 is anterior to the Floor 2, in its report the ASI has shown those walls and pillar bases which are attached to Floor 3, but I do not agree with the same. I have no disagreement regarding the wall....."(Page 275)

“...विवादित स्थल पर हुए उत्खनन में कुल कितनी दिवारें मिलीं थीं, उनकी संख्या मैं नहीं बता सकता। कुल 50 पिलरबेसेज उत्खनन के दौरान मिले थे। कुल पिलरबेसेज सेक्शन से जुड़े हुए थे, उनकी संख्या लगभग 14 हैं।...” (पेज 276)

".....I cannot tell the total number of walls found in the excavation at the disputed site. A total of 50 pillar bases were found during the excavation. Few pillar bases were attached to the section, their number is around 14

....."(Page 276)

"... उपरोक्त फिगर 3ए में उत्खनन के दौरान जो भी दीवारें आदि मिली हैं, उनको एएसआई द्वारा प्रदर्शित किया गया है। यह वॉल तथा स्ट्रक्चर अपने स्थान पर ही फिगर 3ए में प्रदर्शित हैं या नहीं, इसको बिना इन्वेस्टीगेट किए नहीं बताया जा सकता। मैंने इस बारे में आज तक कोई इन्वेस्टीगेशन नहीं किया है कि फिगर 3ए में जो दीवारें तथा स्ट्रक्चर दिखाए गए हैं, वे यथा स्थान इस फिगर में प्रदर्शित हैं अथवा नहीं।...चूंकि मैंने फिगर 3ए में स्ट्रक्चर तथा दीवारों के यथास्थान दिखाए जाने के बारे में कोई अध्ययन नहीं किया है इसलिए मैं इस बारे में नहीं बता पाऊंगा।" (पेज 276-277)

".....The walls etc. found during excavation, have been shown by ASI in the aforesaid Figure 3A. Whether this wall and structure have been shown at their respective place or not in the Figure 3A, cannot be told without being investigated. I have not carried out any investigation in this behalf till date as to whether the walls and structures shown in Figure 3A have been shown or not at their respective places in this figure..... Since I have not carried out any study regarding the depiction of structures and walls at their respective places in Figure 3A, as such I will not be able to reply in this behalf. "(Page 276-277).

3917. One of the objection with respect to the pillar bases is that nothing has been found intact with them saying that the pillars were affixed thereon. The submission, in our view, is thoroughly hollow and an attempt in vain. The other parties i.e. Hindus categorically claimed that the erstwhile structure was removed i.e. demolished so as to construct the disputed structure. If we assume other cause to be correct for a moment, in case of demolition of a construction, it is a kind of childish expectation to hope that some overt structure as it is would remain intact. There cannot be any presumption that the pillar

bases was remained intact along ancillary material. Whatever has been found that has to be seen in the context and not what is not found. All the things have to be seen carefully and nothing independently and in isolation. The pillar bases were detected by B.B.Lal also in 1976-77 when he made excavation on the western and southern side of the disputed site along with a wall structure. The Archaeologist said that the matter needs further investigation. It is thus further investigation which has infact fortified and explained the earlier structure also. The pillar bases in general were found during excavation in regular phases for columns constructed in a proper pattern with equal distance pattern in regular style. The calcrete stones were topped by sandstone blocks over which pillars must have rested. Brickbats were used in their foundation in the same manner as brick aggregates were used in foundation of walls. The brickbats course of the foundation rested under the ground. The question of falling apart of the brickbat foundation could not have arisen. The calcrete blocks topped by the sandstone blocks is capable of supporting pillar bearings, the load of the roof. Even if there is some minor variation in the measurement of the pillar bases that would not invite the approach of total rejection of something which is otherwise apparent from the existence of the above pillar bases. There may be a reason for having variation in the measurement of the pillar bases that the actual centre of the pillar bases could not have been pointed out since the top sandstone blocks are missing from most of them. Figure 3A in any case has been confirmed to be correct by most of the Experts (Archaeologist) of plaintiffs (Suit-4).

3918. In general, therefore, we do not find any substance

in the objections relating to pillar bases and the same is hereby rejected.

3919. The next objection is with regard to the Walls and Floors. This has been complained by the plaintiffs (Suit-4) under the title "Archaeological Evidence of Massive Structure" Para 4.1 to 4.14 in the objections dated 28.10.2003. It says:

"4. ARCHAEOLOGICAL EVIDENCE OF "MASSIVE STRUCTURE":-

4.1 That the theory of a so called "massive structure" below "Babri Masjid" (P. 54), given by the A.S.I., is based mainly upon nearly 50m long wall (wall 16) in the west and the dumps of brick bats which it claims to be "pillar bases", to its east. According to the A.S.I. they found 17 rows of the so called pillar bases from North to South; each row having 5 pillar bases while actually they have referred to 50 only, out of which only 12 were said to be completely exposed, 35 were said to be partially exposed and 3 could be traced in section only. The A.S.I. also asserts that the central part of the pillared structure was important and special treatment was given to its architectural planning. The A.S.I. also claims that the so-called pillar bases found in these excavations have settled the controversy regarding association of these so-called pillar bases with different layers and load bearing capacity while the report fails to give any details about the actual regular layers and accurate depth of all these so called pillar bases. The remarks of the A.S.I about the central part of the pillared structure also seem to be without any evidence. On what basis the A.S.I. is saying that this part was important and

special treatment was given to it in architectural planning, is also not evident from the report.

*4.2. That the A.S.I. failed to take into account that any medieval temple in classical style would be expected to have a Central portion with thick internal walls to support a high superstructure like a Shikhara, while the Key Plan of Structures shows, in H1, two lengths of a narrow wall or two walls, each less than a metre long, with a gap of about 70 cm. Between them. No **further information** is given to **convince** us that there is an "exposed entrance" as stated on P. 69.*

*4.3. That the A.S.I. Report itself describes traces of inner walls having a width of 0.48 m to 0.55 m, attached with the earliest activities alongwith wall 16. These internal walls not only appear to be narrow and not more than two or three brick courses high, but also consisting of brickbats only. They are plastered over the sides and upper surface and it is **difficult to infer that they were load bearing walls:***

4.4. That regarding the said wall 16, an unexplained anomaly is that from the inner side its first phase of 10 courses is said to be plastered while on the exterior side plaster was provided in the second phase of its raising (four courses).

4.5. That no single example is offered by the A.S.I. of any temple of pre-Moghal times having such a lime-Surkhi floor, though one would think that this is an essential requirement when a purely Muslim structure is being appropriate as a Hindu one. Once this appropriation has

occurred (page 41), we are then asked to imagine a "Massive Structure Below the Disputed Structure", the massive structure being a temple. It is supposed to have stood upon 50 pillars, and by fanciful drawings (Figures 23, 23A and 23B), it has been "reconstructed". [Though one may still feel that it was hardly "massive" when one compares Figure 23 (showing Babri Masjid before demolition) and Figure 23B (showing the reconstructed temple with 50 imaginary pillars!)] Now, according to the A.S.I.'s Report, this massive structure with "bases" of 46 of its alleged 50 pillars now exposed, was built in Period VII, the Period of the Delhi Sultans, Sharqi rulers and Lodi Sultans (1206-1526): This attribution of the alleged Grand Temple, to the "Muslim" period is not by choice, but because of the presence of "Muslim" style materials and techniques all through. This, given the distorted view of medieval Indian history, must have been a bitter pill for the A.S.I.'s, mentors to swallow; and, therefore, there has been all the more reason for them to imagine a still earlier structure assignable to an earlier time. Of this structure, however, only four alleged "pillar bases", with "foundations" attached to Floor 4, have been found; and it is astonishing that this should be sufficient to ascribe them 10th -11th century and to assume that they all belong to one structure. That structure is proclaimed as "huge", extending nearly 50 metres that separate the "pillar-bases" at the extremes. Four "pillar bases" can hardly have held such a long roof, and if any one tried it on them it is not surprising that the result was "short-loved" (Report, p.

269). *All of this seems a regular part of the Mandir propagandist archaeology rather than a report from a body called the Archaeological Survey of India.*

4.6. *That the four alleged pillar bases dated to 11th -12th centuries are said "to belong to this level with a brick crush floor". This amounts to a totally unsubstantiated claim that surkhi was used in the region in Gahadavala times (11th - 12th centuries). No examples are predictably offered. One would have thought that Sravasti (Dist. Bahraich), from which the A.S.I. team has produced a linga-centred Shavite "circular shrine" of the said period for comparison with the so-called "circular shrine" at the Babri Masjid site, would be able to produce a single example of either surkhi or lime mortar from the Gahadavala-period structures at Sravasti. But such has not at all been the case. One can see now why it had been necessary to call this period (Period V) "Medieval-Sultanate" (p. 40) though it is actually claimed to be pre-Sultanate, being dated 11th - 12th century. By clubbing together the Gahadavalas with the Sultanate, the surkhi is sought to be explained away; but if so, the "huge" structure too must come to a time after 1206, for Delhi Sultanate was only established in that year. And so, to go by A.S.I.'s reasoning, the earlier allegedly "huge" temple too must have been built when the Sultans ruled!*

4.7. *That the way the A.S.I. has distorted evidence to suit its temple theory is shown by its treatment of the mihrab (arched recess) and taq (niche) found in the western wall, which it turns into features of its imagined temple. The absurdity of this is self evident and particularly so when the*

inner walls of the niche are also found plastered, and the A.S.I. is able to produce no example of similar recess and niche from any temple.

4.8. That the structure denoted by wall 17 and a brick Crush floor in Period VI has not been allotted any number by the A.S.I. and the A.S.I.'s claims about the attribution of the walls and floors of " Periods VI and VII" to two successive temple structures can not be accepted. The A.S.I.'s report in this respect also is full of contradictions and other infirmities.

4.9. That the reason why would the western wall to be so massive (1.77 m) and the other walls so thin (0.48-0.55) is quite obvious. It should be noted that Wall 17 also was 1.86 m wide. Such wide western walls are a features of mosque construction and not of temples. Temple walls, in fact, are of uniform thickness. If, as the A.S.I. points out, the Babri Masjid used this Wall 16 as a foundation for its western wall, then this Wall 16 can only have been the foundation of the Babri Masjid itself. Moreover, no Hindu temple has a long continuously straight western wall-this is only a feature of the mosque in India. In the case of a temple, a plinth or raised platform would be required and the walls would be broken by offsets, providing a cruciform plan to the temple form. Moreover, the temple would have mandapas in front of the grabagriha (the sanctum santorum) and any at the side of the latter would be very small and insignificant in nature. According to Krishna Deva, "the main compartment of the temple are axially articulated." (See Temples of India by Krishna Dewa,

1995, Vol. I) In this case, as being suggested by the A.S.I., the central area now under the makeshift structure was the garbagriha and hence if so, the rest of the temple structure should have mainly projected towards the east, and not to such an extent to the north and south (as in Fig. 23A or 23B). The kind of structure as indicated in Fig. 23B indicates the pre-eminence of the western wall which can only be the case in a mosque.

4.10. That the foundation of the Babri Masjid has some decorated stone blocks along with plain sandstone and calcrete blocks and bricks. This is natural in the construction of a foundation where any available motley material would be used, as the foundation would not be visible. It has been pointed out by the A.S.I. (pp. 68, 269-70) that material, from the structure associated with Wall 17, was reused to make Wall 16. However, if this had been the case, decorated blocks would have been used for the upper portions of walls rather than in the foundation. To corroborate their statement of the reuse of decorated blocks, the A.S.I. gives the examples of the Dharmachakrajina Vihara of Kumaradevi of the 12th century A.D. at Sarnath. However, as can be seen in Plates 27-28, decorated blocks were used not for the foundations but in the enclosure wall of a vihara. Moreover, this structure was a vihara and cannot in any way be compared with a Hindu temple.

4.11. That it can also be pointed out here that Krishna Deva mentions (on P. 11) that a temple customarily has a vedibandha consisting of moulded courses. Even if the

southern part of Wall 16 has not been excavated on its outer face to indicate the presence or absence of mouldings, we have the evidence of the outer face of Wall 16 in Trench ZE 1, to the north, where no mouldings are to be seen. This kind of a plain wall with nothing but niches on its inner face can only be a mosque/ Eidgah wall.

4.12. That On p. 68 are described two niches in the inner side of Wall 16 at an interval of 4.60 m I trenches E6 and E7. These were 0.20 m deep and 1 m wide. A similar niche was found in Trench ZE2 in the northern area and these have been attributed to the first phase of construction of the so called 'massive structure' associated with Wall 16. Such niches along the inner face of a western wall, are again characteristic of mosque/ Eidgah construction. Moreover, the inner walls of the niche are also plalstelred (as in Plate 49) which indicates that the plaster was meant to be visible. A temple niche (and if found, would be on the outer wall) would not be plastered if it were to hold a sculpture or a relief. In the first phase of construction, the supposed massive structure was confined to the thin wall found in Trenches ZE1-ZE1 in the north and E6-H5/H6 in the south (p. 41). How then does one explain the location of niches outside the floor area of the said massive structure ? This is typical of a mosque, which has a long, wide north-south wall, with niches at intervals on its inner face and there may be a small covered area in the center. Which would have narrow demarcating walls.

4.13. That according to the A.S.I. (p. 42), the massive structure in sub-period B collapsed and its debris of brick

and stone was levelled to attain height. " In this deposit, foundations to support pillars or columns were sunk which were overlaid with a 4-5 cm thick floor, which had a grid of square sandstone bases for pillars projecting out, only a few still survive."

If, as implied, the structure of sub-period B had collapsed and another floor constructed with another set of pillar bases, then these are not phases of construction of a structure but three separate structures. What is perhaps a more plausible explanation is that in the beginning of the 13th century, some Muslim structure was built with a well-polished lime surkhi floor. There was a low enclosure wall (0.40-0.50 m wide) demarcating the area from E6 to ZE! And extending east to the H series of trenches. Within this enclosure was probably a small central covered area of which the northern wall with a niche can be seen the Trench F2. This wall was narrower (0.35-40 m) thick. Probably this was wall structure only as can be seen by the narrow walls with no deep foundation. When this collapsed, the entire area was filled in with brickbats, stone slabs, calcrete blocks, brick nodules and mud to raise the level in order to construct the next lime-surkhi floor. This floor probably now functioned as an Eidgah or so as no structural activity has been observed in association. When this floor was degraded, another floor was raised, both floors being of poor quality.

4.14. That wall recesses or niches are observed in the mosque/ Eidgah structure in a higher stratum also (P. 53) but the report fails to discuss about the same.

3920. PW-29 (Jaya Menon) however in para 11 and 12 of affidavit on this aspect has said:

A. That the Period VI structure according to the ASI consisted of a 50 metre long wall and a brick crush floor, and had 4 (so called) pillar bases associated with it. However, nowhere are any specific (so called) pillar bases associated with the brick crush layer.

B. That the brick crush layer was not a floor but a levelling mechanism to level the area for the building of subsequent structures. This is because the brick crush layer can be seen to be of varying thickness in different trenches.

C. That Structure 4 to the ASI essentially seems to consist of a massive western wall and (so called) pillar bases and has been considered to have been a (so called) temple. The important point is why should the western wall have been so massive (1.77 metre) and the other walls so thin (0.48-0.55 metre)? Such wide western walls are a feature of mosque construction and not of temple construction. Temple walls, in fact, are of uniform thickness.

D. That the western wall of the Babri Masjid had a slight tilt towards the east which is a feature of the western wall of the mosques in India because of the direction of Mecca. If, as the ASI points out, the Babri Masjid used Wall 16 as a foundation for its western wall, then this Wall 16 could only have been the foundation of the Babri Masjid itself as it shows the same tilt. It should be noted that Wall 17, supposedly associated with the Period VI structure, also had this tilt and was 1.86 metre wide. Also, if Wall 16

and 17 were temple walls, why should they have had the same tilt towards the east?

E. That no Hindu temple has a log continuously straight western wall-this is only a feature of the mosque in India. In the case of temple, a plinth or raised platform would be required and the walls would be broken by offsets, providing a cruciform plan to the temple form. Moreover, the temple would have a linear alignment with mandapas in front of the garbagriha (the sanctum sanctorum) and any at the side of the latte would be very small and insignificant in nature. In this case, as being pointed out by the ASI, the central area now under the makeshift structure was the alleged garbgriha and hence if so, the rest of the temple structure should have mainly projected towards the east, and not to such an extent to the north south. The king of structure as indicated in Fig. 23B of the Final Report indicates the pre-eminence of the western wall which can only be the case in a Eidgah mosque.

F. That the foundation of the Babri Masjid has decorated stone blocks along with plain sandstone and calcrete blocks and bricks. This is natural in the construction of a foundation where any available motley material would be used, as the foundation would not be visible. It has been pointed out by the ASI (pages 68, 269-270) that material, from the structure associated with Wall 17, was reused to make Wall 16. However, if this had been the case, decorated blocks would have been used for the upper portions of alleged temple walls rather than in the foundation.

G. *That temple walls customarily have mouldings on the outer face. The outer face of Wall 16 in Trench ZE1, to the north, is available to view where no mouldings are to be seen this kind of a plain wall with nothing but niches on its inner face can only be an Eidgah or mosque wall. On page 68 of the Final Report are described two niches in the inner side of Wall 16 at an interval of 4.60 metre in trenches E6 and E7. These were 0.20 metre deep and 1 metre wide. A similar niche was found in Trench ZE2 in the northern area and these have been attributed to the first phase of construction of 'massive structure' associated with Wall 16. (Such niches, along the inner face of a western wall, are again characteristic of Eidgah or mosque construction.) Moreover, the inner walls of the niche are also plastered (as in Plate 49) which indicates that plaster was meant to be visible.*

H. *That two Mughal coins were found in Trench K5 in layer 3 "below (sic) the brick pavement" and from layer 3 in Trench L7. According to the ASI, the brick pavement extended east from Trenches J4, J5 and J6 upto the junction of the K and L series of trenches. The pavement has been accorded great ritual significance by the ASI and has been dated to Period VII, i.e. Medieval/Medieval-Sultanate (end of 12th century to beginning of 16th century AD/ before AD 1526). (Final Report pages 41-42). However, if the brick pavement is pre-Mughal, it is impossible for later period (Mughal) coins to be found in a stratified context under it. Thus, clearly, the brick pavement cannot be of pre-Mughal date.*

I. That the ASI's sections in Figures 5 and 19 of the Final Report make no mention of "the massive structure" (their so called temple) and only to "the disputed structure" (the Babri Masjid), which means the hypothesis of a temple was added at a later stage of the writing of the Report."

3921. Sri D.Mandal PW-24 has mainly confined his objection with regard to stratification. Sri Suraj Bhan -PW16 has made a general statement against the conclusion of ASI that underneath the disputed building there was a temple structure. PW 30 R.C.Thakran and 31 have not said anything about various walls excavated by ASI.

3922. The excavation of 28 walls by ASI virtually has been admitted by the experts of plaintiffs (Suit-4) i.e. PW-16 at pages 153, 199, PW 29 at Pages 146, 147, 158, 159, 163, 164 and 181. PW-32 Dr. Supriya Varma very categorically on page 137 has said:

"from walls 16 to 28 except wall 18D are the walls underneath the disputed structure."

3923. **PW-30 Dr. R.C.Thakran** specifically at page 190 page 46/190 said:

"मैं यह मानता हूँ कि जहाँ-जहाँ जी०पी०आर० तकनीक के द्वारा एनामलीज की तरफ इशारा है, वहाँ - वहाँ कुछ ठोस सब्सटान्स या वस्तु प्राप्त हुई हैं।" (पेज 190)

"I hold that wherever anomalies have been alluded to through the G.P.R. technique, some solid substances or objects have been discovered." (E.T.C.)

3924. The ASI has discussed the walls and Floors as under:

"Excavations in trenches D6, E6, F6, D7, E7 and F7

brought to light the remains of foundation wall and floors of the southern square chamber (Pl. 21, Fig. 4) of the disputes structure (structure 3) which internally measured 6.14 m in north-south and 6.10 m in east-west direction with its western wall (wall 5) measuring 3.0 m wide having five courses of calcrete blocks with occasional use of sand stone blocks as veneers filled in the core with brick-bats. There is a recess of 0.75 m depth and 2.10 m in length in the wall 5 in the inner side. Two decorated sand stone blocks from an earlier structure, one having the damaged figure of a possible foliated **makara-pra āla** were found reused in the foundation of wall 5 on its outer face (Pls. 22-23). The wall 5 of the structure 3 was found resting directly (Pl. 24, Fig. 5) over an earlier plastered brick wall (wall 16) having a foundation of five to six courses of calcrete and sand stone blocks. Some of them reused from yet another earlier structure as they are decorated ones with foliage (Pls. 25-26) and other decorations. Similar nature of wide brick walls with plain and decorated stone members of earlier structures reused in their foundations (Pls. 27-28) have been noticed at the Dharmachakrajina Vihara of Kumāradevī, queen of Gahadwal ruler Govindachandra of the twelfth century A.D. at Sarnath exposed after excavation conducted in 1907 and 1908. The wall 16 has externally as well as internally plastered surface (Pl. 29) below the level of the twin floors of structure 3.

The southern foundation wall (wall 6) of structure 3 directly rests over two pillar bases of earlier period (PB 34

and PB 35) below its middle and south-eastern corner (Pl. 30). It has three courses of calcrete blocks and a width of 1.55 m with 0.15 m off-set and the length in east-west direction of 10.70 m out of which 4.0 m in south-west is disturbed and damaged. It takes a turn from south-eastern corner towards north forming wall 7 of the front side (eastern side) of the southern chamber of the structure 3. The wall 7 of structure 3 in front of its southern chamber rests over three pillar bases of the earlier period (PB 29, PB 32 and PB 35) which were attached through floor 2 of it to the wall 16 (Fig. 6). The width of wall 7 is 1.54 m and there was an entrance to the southern chamber in the middle of the wall having a gap of 2.65 m. There was a northern wall or wall 8 of the southern chamber of structure 3 measuring no less than 8.53 m in length and whose width could not be determined due to debris on the raised platform. Through wall 8 there was an entrance to the central chamber of the structure 3.

Due to close proximity of the Ram Lala on the raised platform, the central chamber could not be exposed fully, but only a small cutting of 3 x 2 m in between trenches F4 and F5 was made to collect more evidence and to verify the anomalies mentioned in the GPR Survey report and the floor of the central chamber was found besides earlier floors. In an area of 2.50 x 2.50 m in F3 also the same floors were encountered with parts of the inner faces of the southern wall (wall 10) and eastern wall (wall 11) of the northern chamber of the structure 3 (Pl. 31). Ten extant courses of calcrete blocks of wall 10 and eight courses of

wall 11 were noticed with three such courses in the foundation.

Parts of the western, eastern and northern walls (walls 5, 11 and 12 consecutively) of the northern chamber of structure 3 were found in trenches E2, F2 and G2. Wall 5 at the north western corner seems to be 2.40 m in width made of reused bricks and brick-bats having two courses of calcrete and sand stone blocks in its foundation. This part is raised over the earlier brick wall (wall 16). Three courses of calcrete blocks were found in the foundation of the eastern wall (wall 11) of the northern chamber with its extended lime floor over it in the courtyard and floors 1 and 1A in the inner side with decorative coloured cemented surface painted with black and buff coloured arched rectangles pointing towards west, a feature of the mosque (Pl. 32). The width of wall 11 is 1.60 m and its two courses of calcrete blocks plastered from inside were found in trench F2. While laying the foundation of the wall, the pillar base 23 was cut as noticed in the baulk between F2 and G2.

The northern wall (wall 12) of the structure 3 has four courses of calcrete blocks in its foundation with one course of bricks above the last courses of foundation blocks. The wall over the foundation was plastered with 4 cm thick lime plaster. Width of the wall is 1.70 m and there is a recess in the middle of the wall, 0.70 m deep and 2.50 m in length. The total length of wall 12 is 8.38 m (Fig. 7) which in trench F2 rests just over the pillars base 22.

As mentioned earlier, remains of an outer wall was

found in the section facing north in between trenches E10 and E11. Exact nature of the wall could not be studied, but it seems to be the wall enclosing the outer pathway which led to the back of the structure 3. In the western side the damaged wall (wall 14) was traced partly in trenches D6, D7 and D8 attached with a lime floor pathway. On the northern side similar wall (wall 15) running in east-west direction as noticed in the section facing south in the baulk between ZF1 and ZF2. The C14 date from the contemporary deposit of the foundation of the disputed structure is 450 ± 110 BP (1500 ± 110 A.D.) which is quite consistent as determined from the charcoal sample from trench G6.

The Massive Structure Below the Disputed Structure

As stated earlier the disputed structure or structure 3 was found directly resting over an earlier construction, structure 4 (Pls. 33-34) which has survived through its nearly 50 m long wall (wall 16) in the west and 50 exposed pillar bases to its east attached with floor 2 or the floor of the last phase of structure 4 (Pl. 35).

A square sandstone block placed at the top and the orthostats provided on its four sides, contemporary with the floor 2 was the prima facie nature of the pillar base which primarily served as base for the pillar erected over it. Their foundations were circular or square or irregular in shapes made of brick-bat courses laid in mud mortar, most of them resting over floor 4, top of which was provided with sandstone or calcrete blocks in lime mortar; these blocks were also encased with brick-bats and somewhere sandstone

chips were used to get the desired height and level." (Page 51-54)

"The wall 16 having its existing length around 50 m, with its unexposed middle part, is 1.77 m wide. Its ten lower brick courses are original and belongs to the first phase of its construction, but the upper six courses as seen in trenches E6, E7 and E8 are added at a later date- four courses during the second phase of construction and top two courses when its southern length outside the disputed structure was utilized in later constructions by reducing the width of the wall for the new structure along with the structure 3. It is also noticed that the first phase of wall 16 has been plastered in the inner side with lime plaster while on the outer side the plaster was provided in the second phase of its raising. There are a few square cavities at intervals on both the faces of the wall in the second phase which might have been used for providing reinforcement to the wall. At an interval of 4.60 m in the inner side of the wall 16 in its first phase of construction two recessed niches were found 0.20 m deep and 1.0 m wide along the face of the wall and 0.78 m wide at its deeper side with 0.02 m thick lime plaster in trenches E6 and E7. The niche in E6 was exposed while the niche in E7 was found attached with the E7-E8 baulk. A similar niche was found in ZE2 in the northern area with same dimensions (Pl. 49). All of these three niches were closed during the second phase of construction when the floor level was raised and wall was raised above the ten original courses. A band of decorative bricks was perhaps provided in the first phase of

construction or in the preceding wall (wall 17) of which scattered decorated bricks with floral pattern were found reused in the wall 16. Walls 16 and 17 were found running on almost the same alignment in north-south orientation in trenches ZE1 and ZF1 (Fig. 14). Measurements of bricks of bricks of wall 16 comprise 22x14x5, 24x16x5.5, 26x17x5.5, 29x19x6 and 28x14x5 cm. Due to restrictions in an area of about 15x15 m comprising trenches D3 to F3, D4 to F4 and D5 to F5 forming the central part of raised platform, the precise arrangement of the central part of the construction below the level of the disputed structure and also the elevation of the super structure of the former construction cannot be ascertained. A layout plan of trenches showing index of various sections can be seen at a glance in Fig. 15.

The wall 17 which is a brick wall was found to be 1.86 m wide having the maximum of four courses in the northern area (Pl. 50) and six courses in southern area. It was found to be of the same length as that of wall 16, through having a slight deviation in its orientation in the cardinal direction. Thus, it runs in the lower level than that of wall 16, almost parallel to it in the northern area and comes out below the wall 16 in the southern area as noticed in trench D7 where in the northern part it is projected 0.74 m below wall 16 and in the southern part it is projected 1.07 m below wall 16 having provided decorated stone blocks on its top and also refixed in its veneer (Pl. 51), probably at the time of the construction of wall 16 to serve as its foundation. A thick floor of brick

crush (Pl. 52) spread over a large area in northern and southern areas with varying thickness was found associated with wall 17. The floor was cut for foundation trench of wall 16 with which were associated three lime floors raising the ground levels in three different phases described earlier in chapter III. Amongst the three lime floors associated with this wall 16, the lowest was found in a limited area within the inner walls 18A, 18B and 18C. The upper two floors (Pls. 53-54, Fig 16) were found spread in the area along wall 16 and show signs of repair patch works (Pl. 41). Thus the evidence of three phases of the structure 4 suggests its long span of existence. The available C14 dates from the deposit between floors 2 and 3 in the trench ZH1 is 1040 ± 70 B.P (910 ± 70 A.D.) having the calibrated age range of A.D. 900-1030. The early date may be because of the filling for leveling the ground after digging the earth from the previous deposit in the vicinity. A pavement no less than 29.25 x 6 m of large square bricks in the eastern area as described in chapter III is associated with the period.

Attached with the earliest activities along with wall 16 are traces of inner walls having a width of 0.48 m to 0.55 m having one exposed entrance to the east found in trench H1. The inner walls are attached with the wall 16 in the northern as well as southern areas. In northern area the inner wall (Pl. 55) or wall 18A runs to a length of about 15.0 m in east-west direction and takes a turn to south in trench ZH1 (Fig.8). It was traced upto a length of 6.0 m (wall 18B) after which due to the existence of the

barricaded gangway it was not possible to dig further. The two parallel running walls 18C and 18D were traced in trenches E6-F6, G6 and in E7 respectively. Traces of a retaining brick wall (wall 19) with eroded outer face were noticed in trenches ZE2, ZD2, C1 and C2.

Just below the levels attached with wall 16 and possibly associated with wall 17 are remains of brick structures located in parts of trenches ZH1 (Pl. 56), G2, F3, G5, J5 (Pl. 57) and F8 in the forms of walls, platforms and brick foundations (structures 6 to 11 respectively). A structure of calcrete blocks with calcrete block flooring was found in trench G5 (structure 9). The exact nature and plan of these structures could not be studied due to existence of structures and floors of later phase resting above their levels. Some skeletons lid in north-south orientation with their faces turned towards west, which are apparently in Muslim graves excavated through the top floor and sealed by layer 1 were found in northern (Pl. 58) and southern areas." (Page 67 - 70)

"The wall 19A rests over a still earlier wall (wall 20) which is 0.62 m wide having damaged with which seems to be attached a brick floor to its north. The end of another wall (wall 21) attached with the section facing south in trench F8 was found whose length was traced upto 1.39 m where it goes in the section facing west. The minimum distance of this wall from the structure 5 at the corners of the walls is 0.51 m. Still another wall (wall 22) of six courses of bricks running to a length of 5.43 m in east-west direction and its western part going below the foundation

of wall 16 (Pl. 62 was exposed along the section facing north with a passage, 0.55 m wide, between it and wall 19A (Pl. 63) seems to be an earlier wall than the structure 5. Parts of two more brick walls (walls 23 and 24) attached with sections facing east and west respectively in trench G7 belong to the same level. Although their width could not be confirmed as they were attached with the sections, the wall 23 was found to be a brick wall of six courses having broken length of 1.60 m. The wall 24 was noticed having only two extant courses, the corner of which was found attached with section facing west which is 0.75 m projected from the section.

Layer 5A has contemporary deposit of structure 5 below which lie walls 19A and 20 respectively datable to post-Gupta and Gupta periods. The layer below their working level is layer 7 from which the charcoal sample from trench E8 has been dated to 1810± 80 B.P.(or 140 ±80 B.C.) on C14 determination of which the calibrated age range is A.D. 90-340.

Two more walls noticed in J6 belong to the Gupta periods. The wall 25 (Figs. 19-20) runs in east-west direction having only four extant courses of brick-bats, the dimensions of which could not be seen as it was attached with the section. Same is the case of another earlier wall, wall 26 which also runs in east-west direction and which is made of 17 courses of broken bricks. 52 cm below the course of wall 26 was noticed wall 27 (Pl. 64) which seems to be a wall of the Kushan period having 22 courses of bricks of the size 38 to 41 to 43x25 to 27x5 to 7 cm running

in north-south direction. The length of the wall in the trench is 3.90 m though it runs further on either sides. Attached with this wall was a floor like level having huge calcrete blocks (Fig. 21) which at one place had three such blocks resting one over the other. This construction also seems to be a large one and not an ordinary house complex. Working levels of Kushan period were noticed in the trench J3 (Pls. 65-66).

Structural activity of Sunga period is represented by a calcrete stone wall (wall 28) in the trench J3. It was not found in the two excavated trenches in the respective levels (Fig. 22) during NBPW period but can be inferred from the presence of brick-bats from both the Sunga and NBPW periods and reed impressions (Pl.68) from NBPW levels on burnt clay, the latter suggesting constructions of hut like structure of wattle and daub. Pictorial views of upper levels of excavated trenches showing conjectural representation of the disputed structure and deposit below it. Figs. 23-24 give a fair idea of the succession of structural activity at the site." (Page 71-72)

3925. Let us examine the manner of recovery of the walls and the inference which may be drawn.

3926. During excavations, in all 28 walls were traced as shown in Fig. 3A out of which wall no. 1 to 15 are either cotemporary to the disputed structure or belong to disputed structure. Walls no. 16 to 28 are earlier to the disputed structure and were found underneath the disputed structure. The details of the walls found in excavation and their relative position, with reference to the report, are as under:-

- Wall No 1 & 2 = of Modern time (p.48 of the report)
- Wall No 3 & 4 = of 1856 (p.49 of the report)
- Wall No 5 = (3 m. wide & 6.10 m. in east-west direction is the foundation wall of the southern chamber of mosque towards west side and its north-south direction as foundation of southern chamber is seen in p.21) (p.51 & 52 of the report). Two decorated sand stone block from an earlier structure one having the damaged figure of the possible foliated maker-pranala were found reused in the foundation of Wall 5 on its outer face (pls. 22-23, page 52 of the report)
- Wall No 6 = It is a north-south direction wall which was a foundation wall of southern chamber or str. 3 (p.52 of the report)
- Wall No 7 = It is the extension of wall 6 in the eastern side, therefore it is also a foundation wall of the southern chamber of the mosque towards east (p.52 of the report)
- Wall No 8 = It is the northern wall of the southern chamber of the mosque.
- Wall No 9 = (8 m, in east-west direction) is the southern enclosure wall of the disputed structure (after 1526 A.D.) (p. 49 of the report)
- Wall No 10 = Southern wall of the northern chamber of the mosque (p.53 of the report)

- Wall No 11 = Eastern wall of the northern chamber of the mosque (p. 53 of the report)
- Wall No 12 = Northern wall of the northern chamber of the mosque (p.53 of the report)
- Wall No 13 = (is also like wall no. 9) i.e. wall of 1526 or after 1526 (p.49 of the report)
- Wall No 14 = South-north direction wall, present west of southern chamber (fir. 3-A) p.54 of the report.
- Wall No 15 = As wall no. 14 are present in west, like that wall no. 15 is present on northern chamber running east-west direction contemporary to mosque (1500±110 A.D.) (p.54 of the report)
- Wall No 16 = Wall no. 5 is the wall of the mosque which is directly resting over 50m. long wall no. 16 running in north-south direction (p. 52 of the report) and further projects towards north and south beyond the excavated area.
- Wall No 16 = (1) Wall no. 16 is attached with floor no. 2 (page 52 of the report) belong to period VII-A i.e. end of the 12th century A.D. (page 52 & 54 of the report) and 50 pillar bases to the east of wall no. 16 is attached with floor 2 (page 54 of the report)

Wall no. 16, Floor No. 2 and 50 pillar bases were contemporary and belong to period VII-A i.e. end of the 12th

Century A.D.

Wall No. 16 has 16 course of brick constructions relating to three phases (page 67 of the report)

(1) Its 10 lower brick courses are original and belong to its first phase of construction (page no. 67 & plate 52 of the report)

(2) But the upper 6 courses are of second phase of construction, out of which 4 courses are of 2nd phase and top 2 courses are of later construction (page 67 of the report)

(3) The lower phase i.e. 6 courses of wall no. 16 has been plastered in the inner side only i.e. towards east by lime while upper 4 courses of wall no. 16 has been plastered by both inner & outer side i.e. both in the east & in the west (page 67 of the report)

(4) At interval of 4.60 meter in the inner side of wall no. 16 two inches were found in the lower phase of its construction towards east (page 68 of the report)

Wall No 17 = Wall no. 17 is of the same length as that of wall no. 16 (50 m) in north-south direction below wall no. 16 though having a slight deviation in its orientation in north-east direction (p. 68 of the report). When wall 17 was not in use, it served as a foundation of wall 16 (page 64 of the report)

(1) It is a 1.86 meter wide wall (plate 50)

(2) It function as a foundation wall for wall no. 16 having decorated stone blocks on its top and also re-

fixed in its veneer (surface covering) (page 51 & page 68 of the report)

(3) Since wall no. 17 in the foundation of wall no. 16 (period VII-A) therefore it belong to period VI (1100-1200 A.D.)

- Wall No 18-A = In northern position, this wall is in north-south direction, attached with the same floor of wall no. 16 (p. 69 of the report)
- Wall No 18-B = In northern portion this wall is 15 m. long in east-west direction and perpendicular to wall No. 16 like wall No. 18-A (pl.55) (p. 69 of the report)
- Wall No 18-C = In southern portion this wall is in east-west direction and attached with westerly wall No. 16 like wall No. 18A & B this wall also runs perpendicular to wall No. 16.
- Wall No 18-D = This wall is parallel to wall No. 18-C in southern portion (p. 69 of the report)
- Wall No 19-A = In east west direction outside circular shrine.
- Wall No 19-B = In south-north direction outside circular shrine.
- Wall No 19-B = is sealed by layer 5A, which is contemporary layer of structure 5 or circular shrine (p. 70 of the report)
- Wall No 20 = Wall No. 19-A rests over wall no. 20 in east-west direction (Gupta period p. 72

- of the report) therefore, wall no. 20 is earlier than wall no. 19-A (p.71) A brick floor in north is attached with wall No. 20
- Wall No 21 = 1.39 meters east-west direction wall towards north side of the circular shrine.
- Wall No 22 = 5.43 meters long wall running east west direction south to circular shrine, and entered below the foundation of wall no. 16 in west (p. 71 of the report) This shows that wall no. 22 is earlier than wall no. 16.
- Wall No 23 = Running south –north having broken length of 1.60 m (p. 72 of the report)
- Wall No 24 = Present in sections, therefore, direction is not traceable (p. 72 of the report)
- Wall No 25 = Run east-west direction of Gupta Period (p.72 of the report) in east of disputed structure (J-6)
- Wall No 26 = It is an earlier wall to wall no. 25, in east-west direction in east of the disputed structure (J-6)
- Wall No 27 = 52 cm below the course of wall No. 26, a wall No. 27 is present running north-south direction of Kushan Period. (page 72 of the report) Huge calcrete block is attached. with wall no. 27 of Kushan Period (p. 72 of the report)
- Wall No 28 = Calcrete stone wall in J-3 of Sunga

Period (east of disputed structure).

3927. As the main wall of the disputed structure i.e. wall No. 5 was filled with brick bats, it implies that it was constructed with reused material. These brick bats *prima facie* establish that they must be of the previous structure. Structurally the date of the designing of pillar bases has also been confirmed with example of Sarnath in which decorated octagonal stone blocks were found in Trench F-7 belonging to 12th century A.D. (page 56 & pl. 39 & 40 of the report). Plate 45 shows disputed structure resting over pillar base No. 29. Wall No. 6 (foundation wall of southern chamber of mosque) was directly resting over two pillar bases no. 34 & 35 (Pl. 30). Wall No. 7 (foundation of southern chambers of mosque towards east) is resting over 3 pillar bases (No. 29, 32 & 35) (P. 52) read with Fig. 6. Wall No. 12 (Northern wall of Northern Chamber of the Mosque) rests just over the pillar base No. 22 (P. 53).

3928. The statements of Experts (Archaeologist) of plaintiffs (Suit-4) in respect to walls and floors have already been referred in brief saying that there is no substantial objection except that the opinion ought to be this or that, but that is also with the caution that it can be dealt with in this way or that both and not in a certain way. In other words on this aspect witnesses are shaky and uncertain. We, therefore find no substantial reason to doubt the report of ASI in this respect.

3929. The next serious objection is about "Circular Shrine" which has been detailed in para 6 (6.1 to 6.10) as under:

6. THE ALLEGED "CIRCULAR SHRINE":-

6.1. *That the sub-heading given to the discovery of a structure of burnt bricks as "The Circular Shrine" at page 70 is indicative of the mindset with which the A.S.I. team*

did the excavation work. The A.S.I. team should have just said "The circular structure" because there is no evidence to make this structure a shrine. Just by comparing it with certain temple structures and not with circular walls and buildings of Muslim construction one can not come to the conclusion that the circular structure was a Hindu shrine. No object of Hindu worship was found on this layer. The story of "pranala" is also a sheer figment of imagination and a conjecture without any evidentiary basis. The comparison at page 71 is irrelevant and also unrealistic. The layer on which this circular structure was discovered did not throw up any material to justify the naming of this circular structure as a shrine. The surviving wall, even in A.S.I.'s own drawing, makes only a quarter of circle and such shapes are fairly popular in walls of Muslim construction. And then there are Muslim built domed circular building also.

6.2. *That the scale of the Plan (as given in Figure 17 of the Report), would have an internal diameter of just 160 cms. or barely 5 ½ feet. Such a small "shrine" can hardly be worth writing home about. But it is, in fact, much smaller. The plan in Fig. 17 shows not a circle (as one would have if the wall shown in Plates 59 and 60 are continued) but an ellipse, which it has to be in order to enclose the entire masonry floor. No "elliptic (Hindu) shrine" is, however produced by A.S.I. for comparison: the few that are show are all circular. As Plate 59 makes clear the drawing in Fig. 17 ignores a course of bricks which juts out to suggest a true circle, much shorter than the elliptic*

one: this would reduce the internal diameter to even less than 130 cms. or just 4.3 feet ! Finally, as admitted by the A.S.I. itself, nothing has been found in the structure in the way of image or sacred piece that can justify it being called a "shrine".

6.3. *That "the southern part of the said structure was found resting over a 0.75 m wide brick wall (Wall 19A) of 9 courses belonging to earlier period which runs in east-west direction and joins the end of the north-south oriented brick wall (Wall 19B) having 7 extant courses of bricks and a width of 0.55 m, making the south-western corner of the earlier structure."*

"The Wall 19A rests over a still earlier wall (Wall 20) which is 0.62 m wide".

Another wall (Wall 21) is about 0.51 m away from Structure 5 and northeast of it.

Wall 19A and Wall 20 are considered to belong to the Post Gupta (Period V) and Gupta (Period IV) periods respectively. It appears from their description and from Plate 59 that the 'circular shrine' was built over existing walls without removing the walls. These earlier walls were of the preceding period as well as the same period. These earlier walls could not have been used as the foundation for the structure as they are of completely different dimensions and shape.

6.4. *That the size of Structure of 5 has an outer diameter of 1.6 m and measures 0.6 m in the inner area. The entrance is 0.5 m wide and length of the 'passage', from the entrance to the inner area, is 0.4 m. Comparisons are being*

made with circular brick temples at Sravasti, Kurari, Masaon, Tinduli and Chandrehe (p. 71, Fig. 18). The outer diameter of these structures range from 6.1 m (Masaon), 5.8 (Chandrehe and Chirenath), 5.5 m (Tinduli), 4.9 m (Kurari I) and 3.6 m (Kurari II) (See Fig.18). The inner area of Kurari II, the nearest in size to the Ayodhya structure is 1.4 m, Kurari I is about 1.8 m and Chirenath is 2 m. The entrance measurements are 0.9 m for Kurari II and 0.7 m for Kurari I. The length of passage is 0.6 m for Kurari II and 1.5 m for Kurari I.

6.5. *That all the circular shrines have a mandapa except for the Kurari temples. Kurari I is also on a plinth with steps on the east. The closest in size to Structure 5, Kurari II, is more than double the former structure. The inner area of Structure 5 is too small to even allow anyone to enter it. Where is the possibility, then, of performing any kind of abhisekha?*

Out of all the temples illustrated in Fig. 18, four have the entrance from the west, one from the north and one from the east. Thus, it seems that the comparison between Structure 5 and these shrines is being stretched too far. Structure 5 has been dated to the 10th century AD. However, as will be evident from the Report, the layers associated with this structure have mixed material, preventing any chronological determination of the structure.

6.6. *That if, as pointed out by the A.S.I., subsequent structural activity (in Period VI) damaged the circular shrine, it is surprising that a later so called temple would*

destroy an earlier Hindu religious structure. Moreover, a later temple could easily have incorporated an earlier temple into its plan and maintained the sanctity of the earlier structure. Instead, what is being suggested is that the central part of the later temple is much further away to the north, about 20 m away. Thus, it seems highly unlikely that this structure was a Hindu religious shrine.

6.7. *That Structure 5 could well have been a stupa, belonging to perhaps the 6th or 7th century AD. Figure 24 giving a bird's eye view of the structure, shows a slight difference in diameter between the first few lower courses of bricks and the courses above them. This difference recalls the two parts of the stupa, the medhi (or the drum) and the anda (or the higher rounded portion of the stupa). The 'opening' towards the east could well have been a niche for a Buddha figure. One of the reasons for considering this structure as a stupa is that it is too small to enter, which one would not have to do in the case of a Buddhist stupa. These religious structures symbolizing the Buddha are meant to be walked around and not entered.*

6.8. *That According to the Table placed after Page 37 (A.S.I. Report) this period V is represented by layers 6 and 5. Layer 6 is a flood deposit and layer 5 belongs to Gupta period. So the formulation of Period V assigned to Post Gupta – Rajput times is arbitrary. Thus whatever structures are said to have belonged to Period V, in fact, they belong to Period IV (Gupta Period).*

6.9. *That the Text says that layer 5 A is a contemporary layer of the shrine (structure 5) "below which lie walls 19A*

and 20.....The layer below their working level is layer 7....."(page 72 of A.S.I. Report). There is existence of only one layer between layers 5A and 7, the layer 6 (A.S.I. Section, F8, Fig 16). Layer 7 has been dated to 140-80 BC on 14c determination. The calibrated date reads AD 90 – 340 (Page 72 A.S.I. Report). The range of calibrated date is extremely wide. However, on its maximum range it reads about 4th C. A.D. While layer 7 is dated to 4th century A.D. and layer 5A is being said to be contemporary to the Shrine which has been dated to 10th century A.D. The shrine on stylistic grounds has been dated to 10th century A.D. (Page 71, A.S.I. Report). The concerned two layers (i.e. 5A and 7) is intervened by only one layer. That is layer 6. Could this lone layer represent a temporal duration of about six centuries? It is ridiculous and fantastic. It is simply not possible. Thus the dating of the shrine to about 10th Century A.D. is arbitrary. The structure 5, whatever it may be either a simple structure or a Buddha circular Stupa, in view of the radiocarbon data seems to have belonged to slightly later than circa 4th Century A.D. That is Gupta Period.

6.10. That there is yet another important feature of the so called Shrine that needs comment. It is about its suggested water channel. Stylistically, its northward orientation has been marked to have some special significance.

The channel does not have a uniform width throughout. It does not have even a gradually decreasing width from south to north. It becomes suddenly very narrow at nearing its end. Thus it appears that it was not made for

the purpose it has been suggested. It seems to have taken the existing form by the removal of mortar during excavation as was filled therein.

It did not function for draining water from south to north is evident by the fact that there is no evidence of slope towards the direction in question. It has been measured by the levelling instrument at three different points of the channel. It was found that there is no slope on its surface.

Further, had the so-called channel been in use for draining water for a longtime, then there should have been the remains of water residuals in the channel. Such evidence could be expected on the northern side of the circular wall corresponding along to the area of water discharge. But there is no such evidence either in the channel or on the surface of the wall in question.

3930. ASI has recorded its finding on 'Circular Shrine' from page 70 to 71 as under:

"A partly damaged east facing brick shrine, structure 5 (Pls. 59-60, Fig. 17, 24 and 24A) was noticed after removal of baulk between trenches E8 and F8. It is a circular structure with a rectangular projection in the east, the latter having been already visible before the removal of the baulk. The northern part of the circular part has retained its lower eight courses above the foundation of brick-bats while the southern half is damaged by constructional activity of the subsequent phase whose brick-bats have damaged the structure upto its working level. The structure was squarish from the inner side and a 0.04 m wide and

0.53 m long chute or outlet was noticed on plan made through the northern wall upto the end where in the lower course a 5.0 cm thick brick cut in 'V' shape was fixed which was found broken and which projects 3.5 cm outside the circular outer face as a pranala to drain out the water; obviously after the abhisheka of the deity, which is not present in the shrine now. The entrance of the structure is from east in the form of a rectangular projection having a twelve course of bricks interlocked with the circular structure and having a 70x27x17 cm calcrete block fixed in it as the threshold. Two sizes of bricks were used in the construction of the shrine measuring 28x21x5.5 cm and 22x18x5 cm. The rectangular projection of entrance is 1.32m in length and 32.5 cm projected towards east. The southern part of the structure was found resting over a 0.75 m wide brick wall (wall 19A) of nine courses belonging to earlier period which runs in east-west direction and joins the end of the north-south oriented brick wall (wall 19B) having 7 extant courses of bricks and a width of 0.55 m, making the south-western corner of the earlier structure. The north-south length of wall 19B was exposed upto a length of 2.72 m when it joins section facing south in the trench E8. It is sealed by layer 5A which is contemporary layer of the structure 5.

The brick shrine is similar (fig. 18) on plan to the Chirenath brick temple at Sravasti exposed recently by the Archaeological Survey of India though which is larger (approximately 5 m in diameter including its projections). Its central part is 2.20 m square where a Siva Linga is

placed in the centre (Pl. 61). It has also affinity with circular Siva temples near Rewa in Madhya Pradesh at Chandrehe and Masaon belonging to C. 950 A.D. and a Vishnu temple and another without deity at Kurari in Fatehpur district of Uttar Pradesh and Surya temple at Tinduli in Fatehpur district. V.V.Mirashi thought that temples having circular garbha-griha were a speciality of the Chedi country and were built for the first time by the Acharyas of the Mattamayura clan as in the case of Chandrehe temple which was built by Prasanta siva as per the Chandrehe stone inscription of 972 A.D. Thus on stylistic grounds, the present circular shrine can be dated to c. tenth century A.D. when the Kalachuris moved in this area and settled across river Sarayu. They possibly brought the tradition of stone circular temples transformed into brick in Ganga-Yamuna valley." (Page 70-71)

3931. 'Circular Shrine' more virtually its existence that was found by ASI has been admitted by most of the Experts (Archaeologist) of Muslim parties though a reluctant attempt has been made for diverting the identity by suggesting that it may be a "Buddhist Shrine" or a tomb of erstwhile Islamic religious structure. PW-30 has categorically admitted it on page 15 and has said that his statement in para 14 of the affidavit was not after looking to the shrine at the spot but on the basis of its photo only.

3932. Circular shrine has been admitted by the experts of plaintiffs (Suit-4). **PW-30 Dr. R.C.Thakran** on page 150 and 129 as said:

‘मुझे ए0एस0आई0 की रिपोर्ट वाल्यूम – 1 के पृष्ठ – 70ए पर

फीगर – 17 के नीचे वाले चित्र में दाहिनी ओर एक पतली सी नाली दिखाई पड़ रही है। यह कहना सही है कि इस फीगर – 17 के अनुसार यह नाली उत्तर की ओर जा रही है। यह भी कहना सही है कि उत्तर की ओर जाती हुई ऐसी नाली बौद्ध स्तूप में नहीं होती है।
 यह कहना सही है कि ए0एस0आई0 की रिपोर्ट वाल्यूम-2 के प्लेट संख्या-60 में बाईं ओर एक तीर का निशान बना हुआ है। इस प्लेट में एक पतली सी नाली नज़र आ रही है।” (पेज 150)

"A slender drain is visible to me on the north side in the picture below figure 17 on page 70-A of the ASI report volume-1. It is correct to say that as per this figure 70, this drain is going northwards. It is also correct to say that the Buddhist stupas do not have such north-bound drains. It is true to say that there is an arrow mark on the left side in plate no.60 of the ASI report, volume-2. A narrow drain is seen in this plate." (E.T.C.)

“सर्कुलर श्राइन, जिसका उल्लेख मैंने अपनी बयान हल्की के प्रस्तर –14 में किया है, उसको मैंने व्यक्तिगत रूप से देखा नहीं है, बल्कि फोटो देखकर मैंने यह बयान दिया है।” (पेज 129)

"I have not personally seen the circular shrine of which I have made mention in para 14 of my sworn statement; but I have given this statement after seeing the photograph." (E.T.C.)

3933. PW 32-Dr. Supriya Verma on page 147-148 (page 14) said:

*"...it is correct to say that plate no. 60 is insitu photograph of circular shrine. **It is true that Budha stupa is always solid. The structure shows a Pranal** but Experts who visited site and measured the angle of slope with the help of spirit Level had found that the slope which was necessary for the water to pass out was not there. It is*

correct that I was not present when this structure was exposed nor I have visited this spot there after but I can express my opinion on the basis of information given by expert as well as the information in the final report and site notebooks. Prof. D. Mandal, Prof. Ratnagar and Prof. Suraj Bhan have given this information.” (Page 147-148)

3934. PW 29 (Dr. Jaya Menon) on "circular shrine" said:

"Since circular shrine" was not found in my presence, I have not seen its stratigraphical association. In my view "circular shrine" was probably a Buddhist Stupa. There appears a hollow space within the excavated "circular shrine". Stupa is not always solid. It is generally made of bricks or stone and mud brick bats.It is a non-Islamic structure. . . . It is probably of Gupta or late Gupta period." (Page 202-203)

"In my opinion, the finding of ASI report regarding circular shrine as recorded at page 73 is not based on any result of carbon-dating. In my mind, the ASI report on the point is not clear at page 72 of the report. I do not agree with the ASI report that it was a circular shrine mentioned from pages 70 to 73 with figures 24 and 24-A. In my opinion, the alleged circular shrine structure dates back to around 6th century AD. It is correct to say that the alleged circular shrine shown in plates 59 and 60 belongs to Sixth century AD, although ASI's report says that it belongs to post-Gupta period." (Page 225-226)

3935. During excavation at the disputed site between trenches E-8 & F-8 a circular structure of burnt bricks facing east was recovered, commonly termed as "circular shrine",

detailed at page 70 to 72 of report, volume 1, and shown in figure 17, 24, 24A, and plates 59, 60 & 62 (volume 2) of the report. The bricks used here are of two sizes: 28x21x5.5 cm and 22x18x5 cm. The bonding material was mud mortar. On its eastern side, there is a rectangular opening, 1.32 m in length and 32.5 cm in width, which was the entrance of the structure. A calcrete block, measuring 70x27x17 cm, has also been found here, fixed, obviously, as the door-sill.

3936. An extremely important feature of this structure is the provision of a gargoyle (Pranala) made in its northern wall. The ASI Report records that it is 0.04 m wide and 0.53 cm long, projecting 35 cm from the northern wall of the structure. It is 'V' shaped so that water may drop a little away from the wall. In this connection it may be mentioned that in books of history, in Sanskrit Literature, reference of circular shrine and Pranala finds place. A famous book styled as "**Aaprajit Prichchha**" by Bhuwan Dev in its book in chapter 207 at serial no. 23 mentions about it.

3937. The elevation, as shown in the drawing (Fig. 17 of the ASI Report) suggests that this structure was built on a raised platform, viz. adhisthana. The gargoyle, or the drain, was provided on the northern side. The structure may be dated to 9th-10th century A.D. (The ASI carried out C-14 determination from this level and the calibrated date ranges between 900 A.D. and 1030 A.D.)

3938. This was an independent miniature shrine. The architectural features suggest that, that it was a Shiva shrine.

3939. It is unthinkable that inspite of these clear features of Shiva shrine, the objectors are identifying the same as a

Muslim tomb.

3940. Secondly, it is too small a structure for a tomb, from inside it is only 4.4 ft. square. Neither could it accommodate a grave in its interior, nor a Qiblah-Mihrab on its western wall ; Qiblah was an integral and essential part of tomb-structure during the Sultanate period (1192-1526 A.D.) as is illustrated by numerous examples all over northern India.

3941. Thirdly, there is no trace of an arch required for constructing dome over the tomb. There are no hook-shafts to bear and no structural trace to suggest any lateral thrust of the mihrab. It may be noted that the sub-structure of the mihrab is built massively on the edges of the four corners, to counter the lateral thrust. One wonders, if it was a tomb without any arch or dome, and without even a grave?

3942. Thus, on the one hand the dimension of this structure are too small for a tomb and on the other the gargoyles were never in tombs while it was an integral feature of the sanctum of Shiva temples to drain out water poured on the Sivlinga.

3943. Shrine is a holy place where worship is performed. It is a structure where holiness is enshrined. Denial for the sake of denial should not be allowed. "No evidence to make this structure a shrine" and "a sheer figment of imagination and a conjecture without any evidentiary basis", such comments grossly lack technical acumen and clearly show the dearth of logical thinking. These themselves are mere arguments lacking "evidentiary basis". By these and many like arguments show the 'ostrich attitude' of the plaintiff.

3944. A structure is identified by its shape and/or by the

use it was put to or by the function it was supposed to perform. This circular structure was found with a well defined 'Pranala' (water chute to drain out ablution liquids). The pranala could well have been denoted as drain but the area from where it was issuing was only 40 x 60 m (including the squarish hollow chamber for fixing the object of worship and the small entrance of the east) which could not be used for bath room or for kitchen, a few alternatives where water is required to be drained out, thus, the only valid explanation was it being a 'pranala' of a shrine, small only a subsidiary one and not the main shrine holding central/main deity.

3945. Circular Shrine is found resting over wall 19A and others, this single fact, does not make the 'Circular Shrine' Contemporary to the said walls, as the working level for the 'Circular Shrine' is much higher, and only foundations of Circular Shrine rest over the existing walls, which have been incorporated as foundation of Circular Shrine, these walls definitely are not made for providing foundation to the circular Shrine. Apparently, when the Circular Shrine was built the wall 19A and others were all buried under the ground and foundation of the circular shrine just reached upto that level.

3946. Circular shrine is compared with other pre-existing and published circular shrines of proven dates found at different places, primarily to compare the style and not size. These circular shrines are not the exact replicas of one another. All the shrines reproduced in comparison are independent shrines while the structure 5 shrine is of subsidiary nature. Layers producing mixed material are dated on the basis of the latest material found in their milieu. Therefore, the period, of Circular Shrine (Str. 5)

is stratigraphically placed in the correct period much earlier to early medieval period.

3947. The Circular Shrine which was stated to be "not a circle but an ellipse" (para 6.2 of the objection) has also been alleged to be a "Stupa"; a circular Buddhist stupa in which on the east was a niche to support image of Buddha. Logic given in support is that "it is too small to enter". There are several miniature shrines which are even smaller in dimension and under worship. In such miniature shrine, often called subsidiary shrines, devotee is not supposed to enter but offers his/her worship from out side.

3948. The famous writer of classical Sanskrit literature Varahmihir in his book "Brihat Samhita" has described 20 types of temple in which besides kunjara and Guhrajya types which are apsidal nature, circular temple such as sanduga, padma, Vrish, Ghata and Vritta have been mentioned. Padma is shaped like a lotus but other three types sanduga, Vrish and Vritta are clearly Circular Shrines.

3949. A circular brick temple has been noticed recently at Sikhara Kohanda in Siddharthnagar district, about 6 miles from Domariyaganj, where eight brick structures- four circular and four square have been noticed and have been roughly dated to approximately eleventh century A.D. Another prominent circular brick temple has been excavated at Chirenath in Sravasti whose sikhara is missing but on plan the temple upto its jangha portion is circular from exterior having a circumference of 14.70 m. with three niches in all the three cardinal directions and entrance in the west. The garbhagriha is roughly square, measuring 2.10 x 2.10 m. with a 1.70 m high Sivalinga of red

sandstone in the middle (IAR 1997-98 p. 193-95 p. 136).

3950. "The temple's interior is square (side 6 ft. 8 in.) and the exterior is circular –stellate having 16 bhadra-facets and 16 karna-projections. Of the bhadras four are sham and four are real, each separated from the other by an acute-angled projection produced by turning the square. The doorway which, originally was preceded by a praggriva, faces north, while the three bhadras face the remaining cardinal directions.

3951. The hypaethral and circular temples of yoginis are well known in north and Central India. They have been mentioned by Krishna Deva as at Dudhai in Jhansi district, Mitaoli in Morena district. Bheraghat in Jabalpur district, Ranipur Jharial in Bolangir district and Surada near Kalahandi and Hirapur near Bhubaneswar in Orissa. They range from 16.72 m to 39.52 m in outer diameter, with 65 to 81 peripheral chapels and a principal shrine, normally in the centre of the courtyard. Inscribed yogini images from Central India suggest more such temples and one such shrine has been excavated and identified as Golakimatha in Jabalpur district (Krishna Deva 1999). The proliferation of circular temples with their identification with the types mentioned in classical treatises require further investigative studies of their origin and developmental process.

3952. In the overall view we find no reason to doubt the findings of ASI on this aspect also and the objections otherwise are accordingly rejected.

3953. Then comes two items i.e. “**The Divine Couple and Other Architectural Members**” referred to in para 7 (7.1 to 7.8) and “Figurines” (Para 9.1 to 9.3) which are as under:

7. THE "DIVINE COUPLE" AND OTHER ARCHITETURAL MEMBERS:-

7.1. That the stone "mutilated sculpture of a divine couple" (p 272) is described on p. 130. (Reg. No. 1184) and Plate 235. The lower portion alone is present, below the waist. The piece is so damaged that it is almost undecipherable. What aspects of this incomprehensible piece make it a "divine" couple, we are not told. Thus the report shows clear bias in the use of the adjective "divine" and also "couple".

7.2. That further, and more important, the recorded findspot (p. 130) of this piece is Trenches K3-K4 (in the east) and the recorded layer is "Debris". Clearly, this piece of sculpture does not come from a stratified context, leave alone the strata of Period VII.

7.3. That so too, a black, schist pillar with a square base and octagonal shaft and intricate carving comes from surface debris above the topmost floor (Floor I) in Trench F3 (p. 140), which is also of no relevance.

7.4. That regarding the octagonal stone that was said to have been carved in twelfth-century style, it may be noted that according to the text (on p. 56), it was found in Trench F-7, on pillar base 32 but as per table (on P. 63) that was "resting on Floor 2", in Trench F-6-F-7, while its foundation was resting on floor 4. It may be noticed that in the Section Facing South Sest-East (E-F), no floor marked "Floor 4" is indicated.

7.5. That the theory of the so-called temple rests on some other reported architectural fragments also. Out of about

380 pieces have been tabulated, 205 are featureless with only marks of dressing or in some cases are completely undressed stones. To give examples, No. 122 (Reg. No. 882) kept in Manas Bhawan is a rectangular piece with pecking marks and partially polished (p. 129), No. 131 (Reg. No. 953) is a "rectangular slab with one of its sides nicely polished" (p. 129), No. 3 (Reg. No. AYD-1/74) kept in the tin shed at the excavated site is "a rectangular partly dressed sand stone slab with an open groove meant for dowel" (p. 131). The majority of these came from the dump or fill and were in many cases part of the Masjid walls. There were numerous others (particularly of calcrete) that were removed from the dump from trenches, during excavation, that were thrown away and are not tabulated. Out of 383 architectural fragments, only 40 came from stratified contexts. Out of this 40 too, none were specified to a temple, even the 8 that have been separately mentioned: pillar, doorjamb, octagonal shaft of pillar, amalaka, divine couple, slab with srivatsa motif, lotus medallion and a re-chiselled slab with lozenge design, are of no significance. The srivatsa design is associated with Jainism and the lotus design could as well be Buddhist or even Muslim. The lozenge design could well belong to a Muslim structure. It is also interesting that the floral design on the architectural fragment in Plate 90 matches the lower portion of the Arabic inscription in Plate 92. The latter depicts a floral design and the design, as well as the method of carving, in the two pieces are very similar. It is also mischievous to label a sculpture showing the waist portions

of two human figures as representing a divine couple. Moreover, all the above noted 8 pieces came from the debris. The octagonal shafts has, in fact, not even been tabulated. Many of the architectural fragments are, as admitted, of different materials (pink sandstone, buff sandstone, spotted red sandstone, calcrete, and so forth), and it is well known that temples do not use stones of diverse colours and types for decoration.

7.6. That report admits that there are few architectural members (plates 92 to 94) which can clearly be associated with Islamic architecture and on stylistic grounds which might belong to 16th century A.D. onwards. (page 122). On the same page in earlier sentences the report described certain architectural members. The photographs of these architectural members appear on plates 79, 80, 81, 84, 85, 86, 87, 89, 90. The report says that stylistically these architectural members in general and pillars in particular may be placed in a time bracket of 10-12 century AD. In Indo-Muslim architecture elements of early Indian architecture which were consistent with Islamic traditions were freely used. Foliage, floral and geometric designs as found in early Indian architecture were copied and used in the Indo-Muslim architecture and this is the important feature which distinguished Indo-Muslim architecture from that of Arabian Land and Persia. The elements and designs in plates 79, 80, 81, 84, 85, 86, 87, 89 and 90 are found in many Muslim religious and other buildings. Lotus medallion as in pl. 70 are found as apex-stone in domes.

On what basis the style and design contained in plate

no. 93, 94 is attributed to 16 century, is also not mentioned.

The architectural members shown in plate no. 79, 80, 81, 84, 85, 86, 87, 89, and 90 do not contain any carving of a Hindu deity. Such elements and designs have been used in Indo-Muslim architecture and hence these architectural members may have been parts of a Muslim structure. On what basis the A.S.I. remarks that these "emphatically" speak about their association with temple architecture", is not known. What is the basis for placing these architectural members in time bracket of 10-12 century A.D. is also not given in the report. Plate No. 81 is not amalaka but a part of petal design. It has to be noted that the so-called amalaka (pl. 81) is a surface collection found in debris above floor -1 (Page 141 Sr. No. 125)

7.7. That the octagonal stone block having so-called floral motif has been dated to 12th century A.D. on its alleged similarity with that one found in the Dharmachakrajina Vihar or Kumardavi at Sarnath (Plates 39 and 40). Even a cursory inspection clearly reveals that there is not the least similarity between the two. The Sarnath Specimen is rectangular on plan while the Ayodhya one is Octagonal. Again the Sarnath specimen has depiction of floral motif but the Ayodhya specimen has a different motif. Further, apart from the stylistic dissimilarity there is dissimilarity in their architectural technique as well. On the Sarnath Specimen the depiction of motif is in slightly low relief while on the Ayodhya one it is in very bold relief.

There is of course one very distinct similarity

between the two. Both belong to the category of reused material. The Sarnath Vihar in question has been built mainly by reused earlier materials such as broken bricks, stone architectural members, both plain as well as decorated etc. The stone pilaster as cited for comparison with octagonal stone block is also a reused specimen. It, thus, cannot be contemporary to the builder of the builder of the Vihar in question. There is no question on the date of Kumardevi. It is early 12th century A.D. But there is of course a big question over the date of the pilaster cited for comparison. It is certainly of some earlier date it could be even of Gupta period.

So it is obvious that of the listed architectural members (stored in Manas Bhawan as well as in the Tin Shed at the excavation site, mostly collected from the surface or debris above floor 1) majority of them are fragmentary and plain in nature. It is also obvious that they cannot be dated on stylistic ground.

7.8. That in view of the evidence drawn from the depositional history of the site there was no habitation at this site after Gupta period for a long time. It was reoccupied after a long desertion in 13th century A.D. Under this situation, many of the remains of architectural members having so called association with temples, as alleged, could have belonged to Gupta period. Some of these said to have belonged to 10th - 12th century A.D., could have been brought here to be used as building material from some neighbouring sites. This is the situation also of the decorated / moulded bricks. Needless

to mention that moulded bricks were quite prevalent in Gupta Period.

Figurines

9.1. That during the excavation, the A.S.I. found 62 human 131 animal figurines. These discoveries are irrelevant to the question under inquiry. A large number of them belong to ancient period. The A.S.I. unnecessarily took pains to give details of terracotta figurines and to include their 33 plates (Pls. No. 104 to 136) knowing well that these figurines, most of which belong to ancient periods, were not at all relevant to the question contained in the Hon'ble Court's order. The chart below gives an idea of this exercise in futility. It is possible that the A.S.I. gave detailed description of human figurines and their photographs to lead credence to its theory of an alleged temple-like structure beneath Babri Masjid.

<u>Plate No.</u>	<u>Period of the Figurine</u>	<u>Page of Vol. 1</u>
104	Late level (period not specified)	177
105	2 nd Cent. A.D.	179
106	1 st Cent. A.D.	179
107	2 nd Cent. A.D.	177
108	2 nd Cent. A.D.	183
109	3 rd Cent. A.D.	181
111	3 rd Cent. BC	177
112	Gupta level	180
113	Gupta level	182
114	6 th Cent. A.D.	182
115	1 st Cent. A.D.	184
116	4 th Cent. A.D.	184