CHAPTER II

THE ORIGIN AND EARLY HISTORY OF THE GAHADAVALAS

Different theories examined:- Gahadavala, a sept of the Rāṭhoḍa dynasty - Solar origin - the 36 royal tribes, Cānd Rāi, the keeper of elephants at Kāryakutja. Internal and external evidence of the Gahadavala inscriptions examined. Yaśovigrha—Mahicandra.

The dynastic name, "Gahadavala" or "Gahadavala", is mentioned only in four inscriptions of the Gahadavala dynasty, namely, the Basahi grant of V.S. 1161, the Kamauli grant of 1162 V.S., the Rahan grant of V.S. 1166¹, and the undated Sārnath pillar inscription of Kumāradevi²; the Kṣatra origin of the dynasty is indicated by the claims put forward in the Candravatī inscriptions of V.S. 1150 and 1156 (cf. "Kṣatra-yamatra vahu-sakra-rath-ānuṛgyavahān-omatir-vijayate bhuvī nṛpa-vamsā")³; and the Sārnath inscription mentioned above (cf. "Jagati Gahadavale Kṣatra-vamśe prasiddhe' jeni nara-gati-candraś- Candramāmā narendraḥ"). Curiously enough, the kings of this dynasty trace their origin, not from the sun or moon or any famous mythical personage, like most of the contemporary kings, but from a modest personage, Yaśovigrha, by name, who did not even assume a royal epithet. The only other inscriptive reference to this dynastic name is found in the fragmentary stone inscription of queen Uddalladevi of V.S. 1234/1237 A.D., which records the erection of Vindhyeshvara

1. IA, XIV, pp. 101-104; EI, II, pp. 358-61; IA, XVIII, pp. 14-19
2. EI, IX, pp. 319-28.
Siva, by the queen Uddalladevi 'Paṭṭa-rājñī' of Śrīman-Mahamandadeva, a sāmanta of Śrī (dakka)malla of the illustrious Gahaḍavālā family (of: "Śrī-Kānyakübja-deś-odbhutaya Raṣṭrakula-vahā-pradipa-mahāṣaṃmanta-hāja-Śrī-Bharahadeva-sūtyā Śrīmad-Gahaḍavālā-kula-kamala-viṣeṣāna-sahastreśu-Śrī-(dakka)malla-sāmanta-śāraṇ-āgata-vajra-pamjara-Śrīmon-Mahamandadeva-paṭṭarājñīyā-Śrī-Uddalladeveś etc."). Strangely enough, contemporary literature contains no reference to the dynastic name, though Kṛtyakalpataru, a famous treatise of the period, was written at the order of the third king of the dynasty, Govindacandra, and the poet Śrīharṣa, who composed the Haṭḍadhakaritam, attended the court of the last great king Jayanācandra.

Paucity of historical material relating to the earlier days of Gahaḍavālās, has given rise to divergent theories about their origin. Dr. Hoernle once opined that the Gahaḍavālā dynasty was a branch of the Pāla dynasty of Gauḍa. This, however, is a totally rejected theory now. Two other theories have since been put forward, one of these, arguing that the dynasty was a sept of the Raṭstrakūṭa clan, identifies the first king Candradeva with a Candra Raṭstrakūṭa, mentioned in the undated Badan inscription of Lakkhanapāla; while the other disclaims the Raṭstrakūṭa origin of the Gahaḍavālās and identifies the first king with Cānd Rāi, described as "the keeper of elephants" in Selmān's account of Prince Maḥmūd's invasion of Agra. The former theory, which attaches considerable importance to the statements made in the bardic chronicles of Rajputana, tracing the descent of the Rāḍhoḍas of Jodhpur from Jayanācandra or Jaitracandra, the penultimate Gahaḍavālā king, implies that the Gahaḍavālās were in fact the Raṭstrakūṭas of Kanauj.

1. EI, XXIII, pp.186-89; also infra. p.111-12.
Gahadavāla, being the sept-name and Rāstrakūta, the clan-name. Arguments forwarded in support of this theory are as follows:¹

Firstly, the Rājā of Māndē-Bijāpur in Mīrzāpur district U.P. refers to his dynasty as Rāṭhoda and claims his descent from Manikcandra, the alleged brother of Jayaccandra.

Secondly, according to Cānd Bardāi, the author of Prithvīrāja Rāṣa, Jayaccandra’s epithets were Rāṭhoda and Kāmadhaja, which are synonymous terms.

Thirdly, the Rājataraṅgini refers to 36 clans and in the Kumārnālaseṛita, 36 clans are enumerated, but there is no mention of the Gahadavālas.

Fourthly, as the Gahadavālas themselves claim solar origin, like the Rāstrakūtas, Candra Gahadavāla may be identified with Candra Rāstrakūta, the ancestor of Lakhenapāla of the undated Badaun inscription; in this connection it has also been suggested that, in order to distinguish themselves from other Rāstrakūta clans, they called themselves after the place named Gahada, which may be a town in South India.

The above arguments, however, may be opposed on following grounds:²

Firstly, the claim of the Rājā of Māndē-Bijāpur is based on a tradition, which is current in modern times, but as no attempt has been made to test its veracity with help of earlier evidence, its value is doubtful.

As to the second argument, Prithvīrāja Rāṣa, ascribed to Cānd Bardāi, was compiled in its present form, in the sixteenth century A.D.; therefore it cannot be relied upon as a source of sober history for settlement of issues connected with a much earlier period, unless corroborated by

¹. JIH, XV (1936), pp. 24-25 (Bharadvaja).
². JIH, XV (1936), pp. 24-29.
by contemporary or other reliable data.

Thirdly, the evidence derived from the Rājatarangini and the Kumārapalacarita is extremely inconclusive in view of the fact that, the former only mentions the existence of thirty-six Kṣatriya clans, but does not enumerate them, and the latter, mentions some of the thirty-six clans, not all of them.

Lastly, to these counter arguments, I may add that the verse which has been quoted to prove that the Gahadavālas themselves claimed solar origin (i.e. "Āśīd-aśītādyuti-vaṁśa-jaṭah kṣapala-ūttāma divēm gatāsu" etc.) is found in the earliest Gahadavāla inscriptions, with no "visarga" between "jaṭa" and "kṣapala". This absence of a "visarga" significantly changes the meaning of the verse, showing that the Gahadavāla rulers really came after the destruction of a solar dynasty, rather than being themselves descended from the Sun. The verse with visarga occurs for the first time in Madanapāla's Badera inscription of V.S.1164. This verse is present in sixty-two Gahadavāla records; out of these, in thirty-nine cases, in which no rigid classification is possible on the basis, either of date or locality, the "visarga" is conspicuous by its absence, and in twenty cases it is present; about the rest, relevant material is not at present available. The evidence of the verse without visarga, is supported not only by its occurrence in most of the inscriptions but also by the landgrants of Mahārāja Govindacandra, which clearly state that the Gahadavālas came to power after the destruction of the dynasties of the Sun and the Moon (cf. "Pradāvaste some-sury-odbhava-vidita-mahā-kṣattriya-vaṁśa-draye'smin etc.") and by the Candravatī grants (V.S.1150 and 1156) of Candradeva, which assert that after the destruction of the scions of the

1. Vide IHQ, 1949, pp.32-34.
dynasty of Devapāla, who is to be identified with the Pratihāra king of that name1 (c.948 A.D.) there was the Kṣatra dynasty which acquired Kānyakubja (cf. "Āśī .... Śrī-Devapālamipati ......... etc." in the second verse and "Kālena nāśamatva tasya gatavāyai dora-daṇḍa-vikramaḥ-hath-ārjita-Kānyakubja, Kṣatro'yaṃ-stra vahu-cakra-rathānugamam-anantir-vvijayate bhuvi nṛpa-vamsaḥ" - verse three)2. If this evidence is accepted, it becomes clear that the Gahadavalas could not have belonged to the Rāstrakūta clan.

It is interesting to note how the Gahadavalas are mentioned in relation to the 36 royal tribes. Tod's comparative chart containing six different lists, is helpful in this respect3. The first of these lists, is from a detached leaf of an ancient work from Nādol and contains no reference to the Gahadavāla dynasty. The next three lists are incomplete, one being from Cānd Bardēl and the other two from the Gujārtl and Sanskrit Mss. of Kumārpālacarita; these lists also make no reference to the dynasty, but the fact that they are incomplete is a bar to any definite conclusion being reached. The chief interest, however, lies in the fifth list obtained from the Khichi bard, Moghjī, who flourished in the early part of the nineteenth century; in this list the Rāṭhodas are grouped among the tribes that subdivide and the 'Gaharwāl' tribe is expressly mentioned as a separate and single tribe. The sixth list prepared by Tod from various lists received "from every one of bardic profession from all the collectors and collections of Rājasthāna", also represent Gaharwāl as a separate and single tribe.4 In this connection it may be mentioned that,

1. According to Rāṇo the Pratihāras were Agnikula Rājpūts; but in the inscriptions they trace their origin from Śrī Rāma's brother Lakṣman, i.e. from the Solar race.
2. IHQ, 1949, p.36.
the Alhā-prastāga: (as noticed by Elliot); ... also mentions the "Gaharvāra" together with the Govila, which is enumerated as a separate tribe (cf. "Sadji Gaharvāra Gohila seka" etc.).¹ It is to be noted that the early historical traditions and the Gahādevāla inscriptions do not contradict the lists of Maghi and Tod by claiming that the Gahādevāla dynasty was a sept of the Rāstrakūta clan; moreover, the undated Sārnath inscription of Kumārskerī mentions both the dynasties, the Gahādevāla being the one to which, her illustrious husband Govindacandra belonged and the Rāstrakūta being the dynasty of her mother, but gives no indication that the former is a sept of the latter.²

Further Tod has noticed that "the Gaharwar Rājput is scarcely known to his brothers in Rājstān, who would not admit his contaminated blood to mix with theirs .......... The original country of the Gaharwar is the ancient kingdom of Kaśī".³ The Gaharwar Rājputs are generally found in the Gahā-Yamuna Doab and the Central India.⁴ It appears that after Jayacandra's defeat at Candawar in 1193 A.D., some of the Gahādevālas, who generally lived in the eastern portion of their dominion around Vārānasī and Mirzapur, migrated to the neighbouring districts and to the south of the Yamuna;⁵ most of those who stayed behind were either killed or converted into Islam; in fact, very few of them had the opportunity to migrate south west, a long way off, to Rājputā. The Rāstrakūta dynasty of Vodāmauyūta (whose scion Lakhanadāla issued the undated inscription of Badaun), on the other hand may have had conveniently migrated to Rājstān sometime after the battle of Candawar but probably before the annexation of Badaun by Iltutmish.⁶ The chaos that followed in the Gahā-Yamuna Doab, after the fall of the Gahā-devāla

dynasty, appears to have been responsible for the confusion that resulted in the identification of the local feudatory dynasty of the Rastrakutas at Vodamayuta, with the erstwhile imperial dynasty of the Gahadavals, who were the overlords of Varaṇasī, Kanyakubja and Vodamayuta; the Rastrakutas, when they evacuated Vodamayuta, carried with them the "Rastrakuta-Gahadavala" tradition and later on explained this tradition by tracing their origin from an alleged brother of "Rāthoda-Gahadavala Jayacandra". It is to be noted that though this confused tradition gained some support from the Paṭhvaraja Rāso (a work compiled in its present form in the sixteenth century A.D., and as such is full of many interpolations) and also from the references to a Rastrakuta dynasty at Kanauj found in the Surat Grant (1061 A.D.) of Cālukya Trilocanpāla, it was not universally accepted, so that most of the modern bards of Rājsthān, including Koghi, refer to the Gahadavala clan, as a separate one having no connection with the Rastrakuta dynasty.

The term Gahadavala itself has given rise to much speculation as to its origin. The Rāja of Kāntit, who claims descent from this line supplies a fanciful legend to prove that the term is a corruption of the title "Grahavāra". According to that legend this title "grahavāra" (overcomer of the evil planet) was acquired by Devadāsa the son of Yayāti, after his victory over the evil planet Sani. Crooke suggests that, the word may have been derived from the Sanskrit word "gahvara" or "dirigahvara", which was the name of a Purāṇic people who used to live in the caves. According to another author the word might have been used in the same sense as "balavon", an epithet which was assumed by the dynasty because of their vast conquest. C.V. Veidy and Dr. R.C. Majumdar believe that the name was derived from a place-name and the latter refer in this

1. IA.XII, p.201, Vol.6.
connection to a place-name "Gawarmad", mentioned in a Kanarase inscription of Saka 994 (C.A.D.1076).\(^1\) A perusal of the inscriptions of the Gañḍāvāla dynasty, shows that none of the common series of sixty-two grants, most of which were issued from Vārānasa and surrounding regions, refer to this dynastic name. The term Gañḍāvāla is mentioned only on four occasions - thrice in grants of the Maharajaputra Govindacandra, which were the first to be issued in the Pañcāladesa and once in the Sārnath inscription of Kumaradeva. It is possible, as some scholars have suggested, that there is some geographical significance behind this name, but the inscriptions themselves point not to the South India but to the newly conquered regions of the Gañḍāvāla dominion, Pañcāladesa. Probably, the need for the introduction of a dynastic name was felt for the first time, when they issued inscriptions in the newly conquered district. Curiously enough this inexplicable dynastic name never attained popularity in contemporary India; none of the numerous contemporary of other dynasties and the few literary works available seems to have been acquainted with the term Gañḍāvāla, though there are some stray and scanty references to Saka Govindacandra Ṛśva and Jayaccandra in literature.

Having accepted that the dynasty of the Gañḍāvālas is a separate and individual one, another group of scholars have tried to fathom the mystery of their early history. Dr.Ganguly was the first to suggest a new identification for the first Gañḍāvāla king Candradeva.\(^2\) In the preceding chapter, it has been noted that, during the latter part of Gadhipurādhipati Gopāla's reign, Antarvedi was once more invaded by the Muslim army according to Habīb us-Biyar it was Sultan Ibrāhīm himself, who led the army, but according to Salmān, the leader of this expedition was Prince Muhāmād.\(^3\) Anyway, when

2. IHQ IX 1933, pp.951 ff.
when the "Amir Jaipāl" was defeated after a brave struggle, princes from all quarters brought presents for the conqueror and he received so many elephants that a stable was established at Kānyakubja, with "Chānd Rāi" as its keeper. This "Chānd Rāi" has been identified with Gandradeva Gahādāvāla, who according to this theory occupies Kānyakubja after the departure of the invading army, probably with the sanction of the prince and also agreed to pay a tax to the Ghazni Sultanate which was realized from his subjects under the designation 'Turūṣka-danda'. The aforementioned invasion of Prince Māḥmūd has been synchronised with the reign period of Lakṣmādeva of Malvā (A.D. 1086-94), who in the inscriptions is said to have repulsed an attack of the Turūṣkas. In the previous chapter, however, I have shown that, there is reason to believe that this particular invasion, as a result of which Agra was reduced, most probably took place in A.H.472/1079-80 A.D. Paramāra Lakṣmādeva probably repulsed some other undated Muslim invasion, that is said to have taken place in the reign of Sultan ʿIbrāhīm (c.1059-1099 A.D.)

The above theory is now generally accepted by most of the scholars without much comment. In the following paragraph I propose to examine the compatibility of this theory with the external and the internal evidence of the Gahādāvāla inscriptions.

The identification of the first king, Gandradeva, with Chand Rāi, the keeper of elephants, appointed by Prince Māḥmūd, leads us to certain assumptions; firstly, Gandradeva's political domination at Kānyakubja was the result of the favour of the Turkish Prince; secondly his earliest conquest was Kānyakubja and later on he occupied Kāśī and Uttara-Kosāla (cf."Kāśī-Kuśik-Uttara-Kosāla-Endrasthāṇya-paripalayat-ābhīṣekya"), for it is hardly to be expected that a person, who already possessed Kāśī and Uttara-Kosāla, would accept...

1. Elliot II, p.46.
service as "a keeper of elephants" under a foreign invader. Thirdly, the term "Turuska-danda" refers to the tax, levied in the Gahadavala dominion to meet the tribute to Ghazni.

As to the first assumption it may be pointed out that in most of the Gahadavala inscriptions, Candradeva is praised for having conquered Kanyakubja (cf. "Kanyakubja-ādhirājam-asaman-dor-vikramen-ārjitaṁ" and "nīja-bhuj-opārjita-Srī Kanyakubja-ādhi-patyam")1; the Candrāvatī inscriptions of Candradeva dated in V.S.1150 and 1156 also state that Yasovigraha the grandfather of the king was born in a "kṣatra" line, which conquered Kanyakubja (cf."Dor-danda-vikrama-hath-ārjita-Kānyakubjaḥ, kṣatra-yamatra Vahu-cakra-rath-ānugamam-anmatir-vijayate bhavi nṛpa-vahā, Tasmin-veṁse samitpanno Yasovigraha saṁjñakah")2. These inscriptive claims together with the full imperial titles assumed by Candradeva (cf."parama-bhāṭaraka-mahārājādhirāje-paramaśvara-parama-Māheśvara"), seems to indicate that, he conquered and ruled over Kanyakubja as an independent sovereign and not as a protege of the Turuskas paying annual tribute to Ghazni.

As regards the second point, the contemporary geographical evidence, relating to Candradeva's reign points again and again to the region round Varanasi and Ayodhya. The dates of his inscriptions, four in number, range from V.S. 1148/1090 A.D. to V.S.1156/1099 A.D. Three of these inscriptions, were found at Candrāvatī, in the Benares District; the grant of 1156 V.S. was issued from Varanasi and that of V.S. 1150 from Ayodhya.3 The temple of Śaurinārāyan, from where the third Candrāvatī grant of V.S. 1148 was issued, appears to have been situated at Varanasi, and the land granted has been identified in the present district of Benares.4 The provenance of the fourth inscription of Candradeva, the

1. HI,IX, pp.302-5.
2. IHQ,1949,pp.32-36.
3. EI,XIV, pp. 193-209.
4. HI,IX, pp.302-5.
Bengal Asiatic Society grant of V.S. 1154 is not known, but it was issued from Vārānasi. It is to be noted that, the villages granted by these inscriptions, so far as they have been identified, were situated in Benares district. Thus the earliest inscriptive evidence shows that the Gahaḍavālas were already well established in the Vārānasi and Ayodhya region. The subsequent evidence shows that, Vārānasi was actually their seat of administration; of the sixty-five official inscriptions issued by the kings, who succeeded Candradeva about, forty were issued from Vārānasi, while only one was from Kānyakubja. A few, however, have been discovered from the vicinity of Kānyakubja; these are the Basahi grants of V.S. 1161 and 1174 from Basahi (Etawah, Uttar Pradesh), Rahan grant of V.S. 1161 from Rahan (Etawah, Uttar Pradesh) and the Chattarpur grant of V.S. 1177 from Chattarpur, near Sheorajpur (21 miles north west of Kanpur).

The Basahi inscription (V.S. 1161) of Kshariyaputra Govindacandra, issued during his father's reign, proves that for sometime at least Kānyakubja served as the capital of the Gahaḍavālas; it mentions that Candradeva made Kānyakubja his capital (cf. "Kānyakubja karod-rājā rājaḥrāmaṁ-
aminditam"). The Kausuli inscription issued by Maharaja-putra Govindacandra in V.S. 1162, however, contains all the stotras of the genealogical portion of the previous grant, except the one, that refers to Kānyakubja, as the capital of Candradeva, in fact no other inscription of this dynasty refers to Kānyakubja as the capital of the Gahaḍavālas. It thus appears that, this city was made the capital of his dominion by Candradeva, sometime after V.S. 1156/1092 A.D. (his last inscriptive date) and V.S. 1161 the date of the Basahi grant), during the later part of his reign;

1. IA,XVIII, pp.9-14.  
2. Ioner Gr.of Govindacandra, V.S.1163.  
but after V.S.1161 the change of capital seems to have
turned out to be an impractical idea and the administrative
centre was once more removed to Vārānasi, from where, most
of the subsequent official records of the dynasty were
issued. If the identification of Cānd Rāj with Candradeva
is accepted, it is difficult to explain why Cand-Rāj-
Candradeva, who rose to power at Kānyakubja, a city with
long imperial tradition, delayed till after V.S.1156 to make
it his capital, but in the meantime issued land grants
from Vārānasi and Ayodhyā, indicating his already consoli­
dated authority in this area. If it is contended that
Cand-Gandra enjoyed political influence in Vārānasi and
Ayodhyā prior to his occupation of Kānyakubja, such a person
could hardly be expected to accept service as the keeper of
elephants under a Muslim raider; in this connection the
fact that Candradeva's father Mahītala or Mahīyala is
described as a 'nāpa' or ruler of chief with some military
successes to his credit, should not be overlooked (cf.
"Abhūn-nāpa Gahaḍavāla-vamse Mahītalanāmā jīt-āri-akraḥ").

On the other hand, if we refrain from identifying
Cānd Rāj and Candradeva, as one and the same individual, not
only the delay in making Kānyakubja his capital can be
explained satisfactorily, but also certain other character­
istics of some of the Gahaḍavāla inscriptions may be accounted
for. It would thus appear, that Candradeva, whose father
Mahīyala or Mahīandra (sometimes described as a'nāpa')
had some political standing in Benares region, rose to power
in that area and conquered Kānyakubja, possibly after the
inroad of the Yāmnī prince, Māhīmūḍ; after some work of
consolidation in the newly conquered area, the imperial city
was made the capital of the Gahaḍavāla dominion, after
V.S.1161, issued by Govindacandra during his father's reign
was the first Gahaḍavāla inscription of this region, so far
discovered. This inscription, and the two other inscriptions of this reign, referring to this region, namely the Kamuli grant of V.S. 1102 and Rahan grant of V.S. 1166, contain some peculiarities, which are absent in other grants of the dynasty. Thus, in the genealogical and 'prasasti' sections of these three grants, some new verses are introduced, which were not repeated in any subsequent inscriptions; also the dynastic name Gahaḍavāla or Gahaḍavāla is mentioned for the first time in these inscriptions. Further, some taxes, mentioned in these inscriptions (e.g. 'viṣati-astu-prastha', 'viṣati-chhavata' 'akṣa-patala-prastha', 'akṣa-patala-adaya', 'pratihāra-prastha, 'vara-vajjha', 'vāhyāvāhyā-sarasiddhi' etc.) are not found in other Gahaḍavāla inscriptions, while marked departure from usual terminology may be noticed in the agrarian concessions (e.g. "sajala-sthalah saloha-lavane-ākaraḥ samatay-ākaraḥ saparṇa-ākaraḥ sahaṛt-paryantaḥ sadaś-āparādha-śadaha etc."). These characteristics may be easily explained if we contend that these inscriptions refer to a time, when Pancaśīladesa was a recent annexation and taxes in that region, were still being collected according to the local system and the characteristics Gahaḍavāla taxes, imposts and terminology were not yet introduced. The necessity for mentioning the dynastic name "Gahaḍavāla", may have been felt for the first time at this period, when 

1 The Village Vasbhi, in Jāvatī pattaia, mentioned in the grant of V.S. 1161 has been identified with modern Basahi village in Etawah. IA, XIV, p. 102. The inscription of 1162 grants another village (unidentified) in Jāvatī pattaia in Pancaśīladesa; the places mentioned in the third grant, have not been identified but both the first and the third were made from the same place, - 'Asatikā' on the Yamunā, See infra. p. 225.
official records, relating to this country, where the dynasty was comparatively new, were issued in V.S. 1161, 1162 and 1166. It may be noted in this connection that the only other Gahadavāl inscription, which referred to the dynastic name was issued by Kumāradevi, the daughter of Rāstrakūta Mathanadeva and queen of Govindacandra; this inscription was composed by a Gauda poet, Kunda by name, who may have felt the urge to mention the rather unfamiliar dynastic name.¹

Thirdly, about the unique tax Turaskadāṇḍa, it has been pointed out by me,² that this term may as well refer to a special tax, levied on the subjects of the Gahadavālas to meet the extra expense, incurred to maintain a standing army ("dāṇḍa") to fight the frequent raids of their dangerous neighbour, the Turuṣkas. This contention is supported by the facts that, this tax was continued to be levied even after Govindacandra's claim of having defeated the Hammira, when he certainly was an independent ruler all intents and purposes and that the tax was suddenly discontinued in the reign of Jayacandra, by whose time, the Cāhamāna occupation of Delhi was an established fact, and the Turuṣkas ceased to be the dangerous neighbours of the Gahadavālas.

The external and internal evidence of the Gahadavāla inscriptions thus seems to make it highly probable that, Candradeva first rose to power in his ancestral domain in Kāśī-Ayodhyā region and subsequently conquered the Pāncāla-deśa, issued inscriptions as an independent king; such a person can hardly be identified with Cānd Rāj, who accepted the post of the keeper of elephants at Kanyakubja, under a Turuṣka raider. Here similarity of names is not a convincing proof; in all ages the names of famous heroes, leaders and contemporary kings have been popular, and according to Gardizi, when Mahmūd of Ghazni invaded Antarvedi in 1018 A.D., there was a "Chānd Rāj, one of the greatest men of Hind."³

---

¹. HI, IX, pp. 319-28
². IRQ, 1949, pp. 135-138.
³. Elliot, II, p. 46.
Having shown that "Chānd-Rāi-Candradera" theory is not compatible with the inscriptive evidence of the dynasty, I shall now endeavour to trace the early history of the Gahaḍavālas.

Yaśovitra, the first known member of the family, was the grandfather of Candradeva; in most of the Gahaḍavāla inscriptions, he is described as a noble personage, who lived after the demise of the kings of the Solar race (cf. "Asid-sāfita-dyuti-vāmā-jāta-
-kamāpāla-mālamu dīvasa sākṣaḍ-vivavān-iva būri-dhāmā
nāmā Yaśovitraha ity-udaharā")¹ The Candravati inscriptions of V.S. 1150 and 1156 further detail, that the Kṣatras dynasty, in which Yaśovitra was born, forcefully occupied Kānyākubja after the destruction of the descendants of the King Devapala (cf. "Asid-asid-
-naraṅgita-kirita-koti-sākṣaṭṭita-flatita-lasan-mani-pāda-pithah,
Sri-Devapāla-nṛpati-trajagat-pragītīa-kumēndu-dhāmā-hima-kaivra-
kānta-kirtti. Kālēna nāśam-atha tasya gate' anvavaye dor-dandu-
vikrama..............naga-vamśah")² This king Devapāla of Kānyākubja may be identified with the Pratihāra King Devapala, whose existence is testified to by the Siyadoni inscription of V.S. 1005/948 A.D. ³

This king was the second son of Mahīpāla I (c.914-943 A.D.) and reigned for a short period after his elder brother Mahendrapāla II (c.945-46 A.D.) Nothing of importance is known about Devapāla except that, he was compelled to surrender to his Candratreya feudatory Yaśovarman, a celebrated image of Vaikuntha, which he received from the king of Kīra; this image was first obtained from the Kailāsa mountain by the king of Bhōta, who presented it to the Kīra king as a token of friendship. Evidently when Devapāla reigned, the glorious days of the Pratihāras were already over and the process of disintegration has set in. It is curious to come across the name of this rather unimportant Pratihāra king, who reigned only for a short period, in an inscription issued in V.S. 1150, when about a century and a half had elapsed since his time. It may, however, be suggested that this Pratihāra king probably granted some substantial favour to some unknown ancestor of

Candradeva and for that reason was remembered by his dynasty even after such a long time. The "Aṣṭādyuti-vāṁśa" or the Solar race, mentioned above, is to be identified with the Pratihāra dynasty, which claimed descent from Laksmana the brother of Śri Ramacandra of Solar race.1 Another sloka in these Candravatī grants states that, Yaśovigrėha seized the earth and made her fond of the sceptre of the king (or justice) (cf. "Tasmīn vāṁśe samipamno Yaśovigrēha saṃjñākṣaḥ, vigrēha mendini yena danda-pranayiṁ kṛta")2. The use of the words "danda" (i.e., royal sceptre or army) and "pranaya" implies that he had some conquests to his credit and may have ruled over a small territory; he however appears to have been a

1. In the Ep.Ind.Vol.XXVI (p.270, fn.3) another suggestion has been put forward by Krs.Krishna Deva, who identifies Devapāla, an ancestor of Lakhānapāla, who issued the undated Badaun inscription; the genealogy of Lakhānapāla is detailed in this inscription as follows (vide Ep.Ind.I, p. 61-66 and DHETI, I, p.553)

Candra

Vigrēhapāla

Shuvanapāla

Gopāla

Trikūṇovapāla Hādanapāla Devapāla

Bhāmapāla

Surapāla

Amṛtapāla

Lakhānapāla

Kielhorn on palaeographical considerations places the inscription in the twelfth or thirteenth century A.D. Candradeva's inscription on the other hand clearly states that the family of Devapāla had perished even before Candradeva occupied Kānyākubja (cf."Kalena nāṣem-atha tasya gate anvā vai"); the reference to "anvā" indicates that after Devapāla some kings of his dynasty ruled over that city. Thus the identification of these two homonymous chiefs as the one and the same individual would imply that Lakhānapāla, the last known member of the "anvā" of Devapāla, issued the Badaun inscription in about the 8th decade of the eleventh century and perished before Candradeva occupied Kānyākubja and issued his first inscription in 1089-90 A.D. Obviously, if Kielhorn's opinion on the palaeography of the undated Badaun inscription is seriously considered, Devapāla of this grant cannot be identified with Devapāla mentioned in Candradeva's inscription. Moreover, in a previous paragraph, I have already pointed out that, there is nothing in the inscription of Lakhānapāla which may imply that his dynasty ever had any connection with Kānyākubja.

2. Epq.1949, p.36.
subordinate chief, as the absence of any royal epithet before his name indicates. Assigning twenty-five years to each generation, we can place him in about the middle of the eleventh century A.D.; consequently he may have served under the great Kalacuri conqueror Lakṣaṇi-Karna (c. 1042-70 A.D).

Yaśovigraha’s son Mahicandra (or MahItala or Mahiyala) is vaguely praised by most of the Gahadavala inscriptions, which claim that his fame spread to the other side of the ocean (cf. "Tat-sutoh-bhūn-Mahicandraḥ-candradehāma-nīkhaṇa-āniḥjam yen-apāram-akūpāra-pāre vyāpāritaṁ yasah"). The Rahan grant of Kaharakaputtra Govindscandra and Rāmak Lavarpravaha, however, states that he was a nyāpa (ruler or chief) who had defeated a host of enemies (cf. Abhun-nyāpa Gahadavala-vacāde MahItala nāmā jīt-ūri-ekkṛte). Mahicandra thus appears to have been a feudatory chief, with some military conquests to his credit. He may have fought under Lakṣaṇi-Karna during the latter part of his reign and later on, after the defeat of the king, he probably carved out a small principality for himself, out of the crumbling Kalacuri empire. The modest title "nyāpa" may, however, indicate that he never attained political sovereignty; he may have continued to acknowledge the overlordship of either Yaśāśi-Karna, the successor of Lakṣaṇi-Karna, or, more probably, of the Gorakhpur branch of the dynasty, whose existence is revealed in the Kabila inscription of Kalacuri Soḍhadeva, issued in V.S. 1134/1079 A.D.

Candradeva, the third known member of the dynasty, also appears to have begun his career modestly in his small ancestral domain in Vērāpasi-Ayodhyā region; however, taking full advantage of the disturbed and uncertain political condition of the period, he declared himself independent and occupied the country between Indrāsthānīyakā (to be identified with modern Delhi region) and Kaśi sometime before V.S. 1148/c. 1000-00 A.D., when he issued the first Gahadavala inscription.

---

1. ibid.
2. IA, XVIII, pp. 14-19.
from Candrāvatī in the Benares district. In this inscription Candradeva is described as "Parama-bhattāraka Mahārājadhīrāja Paramēśvara-nījā-bhujā-opārjita-Śrī-Kānyakubja-adhipaty-Śrī-Candrādeva."