Chapter VIII.

From Sallaksanavarman to Madanavarman.

Sallaksanavarman. - After having restored the Candella power to its former glory, Kirttivarman passed away sometime towards the close of the 11th century A.D. He was then succeeded on the throne by his son, Sallaksanavarman, also mentioned as Hallaksanavarman in the coins issued by him.1 Unfortunately he has no inscription to his credit, but records of the later Candella rulers contain references to him, which enable us to make a somewhat fair estimate of his character and attainments.

The Ma'an Stone Inscription of Madanavarman, in verses 9 and 10,2 is eloquent about Sallaksana's qualities of head and heart. He is described as 'a leader of those versed in the sacred lore, a kinsman of the virtuous, a store of arts and an abode of good conduct, and a tree of paradise to all suppliants for support'. (Dhaureyah árutasálinā—gunavatām vandhuh kalanām nīdhī sad-vṛttasya ca sadma Kalpa-vitāpi nīhsēsa puṣṭyarthinām//9). These are no doubt conventional praises of a court poet, but may be taken to indicate that due to the continuance of an well-ordered system of government in the country, Sallaksana the ruler, could devote

himself to these peaceful pursuits. The Mau record informs us that with the help of efficient ministers Sallaksana effectively carried out the work of 'kantaka-sodhana', 2 (clearing of thorns, i.e., anti-corruption drive) within his realm, and dissipated fears of his subjects. Thus Sallaks ana was able not only to establish peace and order in the state, but also to upgrade the standard of living of the people and augment the strength of the royal treasury.

It need not, however, be presumed that Sallaksana was a man of passive disposition. The same record (Mau Stone Inscription) refers to the presence in the court of Sallaksana, kings doing homage to him as well as his other dependants, 4 which reminds us of the 'sāmanta-ca kra' (circle of feudatory princes) organised by Śrī Gopāla, as mentioned in the drama, Prabodhacandrodaya, to defeat the Cedi prince Lakṣmī Karna. 5 It is quite likely that Sallaksana, the son and successor of Kirttivarman, enjoyed almost the same allegiance from the samantas as did his father, Kīrttivarman.

As for the military achievements of Sallaksana we have no definite evidence in the records. But the Mau record refers to his prowess which kept his enemies always awake (svavikramapromidritāriḥ sadā). 6 According to the evidence of the Ajaygadh Rock Inscription of Viravarman (V. S. 1317), Sallaksana is said to have taken away the fortunes of the
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Mālavas and the Cedis. (Sallakṣaṇa Mālava-Cedi-lakṣmī
lunthaka khadgah). Though no direct reference is made to any
particular battle between the Candellas and the Cedis or the
Paramāras during the reign of Sallakṣaṇa, yet a study of the
history of these dynasties may throw some leading light on the
matter.

The Kalacuris, it may be noticed, were passing through
a very critical time after the fall of Lakṣmī Karna. Yasah-
Karna, who succeeded him had to face a strong neighbour on
the west, the Paramāras, as well as another rising power
beyond the Vindhyas, the Cālukyas, According to the Nagpur
Prasasti of Paramāra Naravarman (1097-1111 A.D.), his elder
brother, Lakṣmādeva, in course of an unchecked expedition
'attacked Tripuri, and annihilated his warlike and spirited
adversaries'. The Cedi prince, who suffered the reverse at
the hands of the Paramāras, could not have been any one
else than Yasahkarna (1073-1125 A.D.). Belgami inscription
of Vikramaditya VI dated in 1091 A.D. also refers to the
Cālukya ruler's victory over Yasahkarna. In the circumstances
it might not have been very difficult for the Candella prince,
Sallakṣaṇa, succeeding to Kirttivarmān's effective organisa-
tion, to launch attacks on the Cedi country, particularly
when the situation there was so favourable for the Candella
ruler. But it must be admitted at the same time that such
expeditions could hardly claim to have any permanent
political value.
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Since Bhoja's tragic end the Paramāra power was on the wane. Jayasimha I, the son and successor of Bhoja, was also compelled to acknowledge the suzerainty of Kalacuri Lakṣmī Karna. But there was an attempt at revival by Lakṣmādeva, a son of Udayāditya, as has already been mentioned. His successes however were short lived due to the growing power of the Chālukyas, which culminated in the defeat and death of Naravarman, the brother of Lakṣmādeva, as described in the Kumārapālācarita, and corroborated by epigraphic evidences. During this period of turmoil in the Paramāra kingdom it might have been possible for the Gandella ruler to take out an expeditionary raid, referred to in the Ajaygadh record. It may be remembered that the Gandellas were already well-settled in the Betwā valley by the establishment of a 'Kirttigiri-durga' on the bank of the river during the time of Kīrtivarman, which probably marked the boundary between the Gandella and the Paramāra dominions.

Therefore it may not be wrong to presume that Sallakṣaṇa maintained the integrity of the Candella state as revived by his father, Kīrtivarman. As for his personal achievement, we have only a vague reference to his success against some unknown enemies in the Doab between the Ganges and Yamuna.
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and the Jumna (antarvedi visaya). It may be remembered that since the defeat of the Gurjara Pratihāra ruler, Rājyapāla, Candella Vidyādharā extended his influence over the Doab region. But as is evidenced by the Set Mahet Stone Inscription of Vidyādharā (V.S. 1176), and the Budaun Inscription of Lakhanapāla, the area was ruled over by a Rastrakūta, who was probably a feudatory of the Candellas. The Jhansi fragmentary stone inscription of Sallakṣāna-simha also refers to a line of Kānyakubja rulers of the lunar family. The identification of Sallakṣāna simha with Candella Sallakṣānavarman has not, however, been established beyond doubt. During the period of confusion prevailing in the country as a sequel to Muhāmād’s invasion and the eclipse of the Candella power, these local rulers of Kanauj might have assumed sovereign status. So for Sallakṣāna it might not have been impossible to make a bold bid for the recapture of the Kanauj region, as referred to in the Mau record. But it is quite well known that Candradeva of the Gāhadeva dynasty acquired sovereignty over Kānyakubja or Gādhipura by the prowess of his own arms (nija-bhujopārijitaṁ) in about 1070 A.D. So it is doubtful whether Sallakṣāna was really victorious in the 'antarvedi' region.

In the administration of the state Sallakṣāna was aided by a group of very able ministers and officials, the chief of whom was according to the evidence of the Mau Stone
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Inscription of Madanavarman, Ananta, who was a tower of strength to Kirttivarman. The success in the Antarvedi region that is claimed in the record is attributed to the policy of this very minister or his son Gadadhara. Again, it was the latter who is believed to have been mainly instrumental in clearing the country of anti-social elements (kantaka-sodhana), and strengthening both financial as well as law and order position of the state (kośasya jañāsya ca). Other sons of Ananta were also appointed by Sallakṣaṇa to very important posts in the administration. But it is interesting to note that the criterion of their selection was not that they were sons of the Chief Minister, but that they had been found suitable after proper tests conducted by the king (parīkṣya-samaya) and appointed to high offices requiring the services of wise, upright and valiant men (niyuktāhākārya-śukṣma-śuci-sūrajanocitvam).

Jayavarman. - Mau Stone Inscription and Ajaygadh Rock Inscription of Viravarman bear evidence to the fact that Jayavarman, the son of Sallakṣaṇa succeeded him on the Candella throne. It is however curious that Nāyysura Plate of Madanavarman omits the names of both Jayavarman and his
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father, Sallaksana from the Gandalla genealogy. It may be that the Nanyaura record only referred to the highlights of the family, whereas the Mau inscription of the same time, issued by one of the ministers of king Madanavarman, had no such obsession, and hence may be taken as more reliable. The former one was issued by Madanavarman himself, and as such contain references to his father, Prthivivarman and grandfather, Kirttivarman omitting the collateral branch of Sallaksana and his son, Jayavarman.

A direct epigraphic evidence for this prince is however contained in the Khajuraho stone inscription of V.S. 1059 of the time of Dhanpa, which had been "re-written in clear letters by Jayavarmanadana-narpati" in V.S. 1173 (1117 A.D.). It appears therefore that he came to the throne sometime before that date. If it is admitted that Sallaksana came to the throne in about 1150 A.D., it may be presumed that these two generations had an average-period of about 10 years each.

Both the records referred to above mention Jayavarman as a valiant hero. The Mau record describes him as a dwelling place of generosity, truth, policy and heroism, whose majesty, like the rising sun, deprived other princes of their lustre (yasya pratapa-tapanabhyudayena bhupa dipa iva kṣata). The administrative structure of the state during the time of Jayavarman continued in the same way as previously. The most influential minister of the last two generations, Ananta, however died by abandoning his body in the waters at the confluence of the Ganges and the Jumna, following the
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custom adopted by an earlier illustrious Candella ruler, viz., Bhahgadeva. In the ministerial office Ananta the chief minister of Kirttivaman and Sallakṣana, was succeeded by his son, Gadadhrora, whom Jayavarman appointed near his own person as Pratihāra. The revised Khajurāho Inscription refers to another official of Jayavarman. He was a learned kṣayastha, Gauḍa Jayapāla by name.

Prthivīvarman. - Nanyaura Plate 'O' of Madanavarmma suggests that Kirttivaman was succeeded by Prthivīvarman. But it is clearly indicated in the Ajaygadh Rock Inscription of Vīravarman that Prthivīvarman came to the throne succeeding Jayavarman, whom the Nanyaura record omitted altogether. The evidence of another record of the time of Madanavarmma (Mau Stone Insc.) proves very helpful in the matter. It states that after Jayavarman, the Candella sovereignty passed on to Prthivīvarman, the co-uterine younger brother of the illustrious king Sallakṣanavarman (Sri Sallakṣanavarmma-koṇi-nāthasya sadoravarājan/ Atha Prthīvarma-nrpaḥ). It was however an unusual succession, an uncle succeeding a nephew. In the absence of any reference to the circumstances leading to this abrupt change in the line of succession, we may presume that Jayavarman must have died childless or there was a rising engineered by Prthivīvarman, who usurped the
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throne. It is learnt however from the fragmentary Kālāmijī inscription that Jayavarman was devoted to Nārāyana and being wearied of government the king made it over to Jayavarman (this portion being broken, the earlier part of the name cannot be recovered, but evidently it must have referred to Prthvivarmman). Jayavarman, it is stated, then proceeded to wash away his sins in the divine river, probably in the same manner as had been adopted by (Shaṅga). It may not be unlikely that this was a voluntary abdication, as is evident from the expression 'made it over', and not a case of disputed succession or culminating in a coup-de-stat by Prthvivarmman, of which there is no evidence.

Candella records are curiously silent about any achievement of Prthvivarmman as well as of any political incident of his reign period. This may lead to the natural presumption that it was not a particularly brilliant period of the Candella history, and that the reference to Prthvivarmman's devotion to Nārāyana might also suggest that he was a man of passive disposition. But a study of the contemporary history of Northern India would reveal that in the second quarter of the 12th cent. A.D., besides the Candellas there were other equally potential powers on the field, viz., the Paramāras, the Cedis, and the Caulukyas. It has already been seen that in the absence of any imperial power all of them were vying with one another in a contest for supremacy. In the circumstances when we find in the
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Man Record that Prthvivarman is described to have been equal to the task in bearing the burden of the hereditary government, and was able to maintain the integrity of the boundaries of the state, it is hardly possible to believe that Prthvivarman was a weak ruler. It may be that he did not adopt an aggressive policy against other powers.

The same principles of administration were maintained during the regime of Prthvivarman. V. 13 of the Man Record states that he used to take lawful wealth and then expend the same according to the prescripts on the sacred objects, carefully protecting all being and wholly intent on securing propriety of conduct. Gadādhara, the son of a former minister, Ananta, who had been appointed by Jayavarman in the office of Pratihāra, was now in the present regime elevated to the high office of 'Mantrimukhya' (Chief Minister) in which capacity he claims to have made the government of the king prosper in all its constituent parts.

Madanavarman. - Prthvivarman's son, Madanavarman came to the throne in the first quarter of the 12th cent. A.D., and enjoyed a rather long period of reign from c. 1129-1163 A.D. During this period the Candellas flourished once again in the political scene of Northern India as an important power, for which we have evidences inscriptive and numismatic as well as traditional and literary.

It has already been pointed out that since the demise of Kīrttivarman till the accession of Madanavarman, the intervening Candella rulers could hardly achieve any
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spectacular success, though of course the state might not have suffered any territorial diminution. With the accession of Madanavarman it will be evident that the non-aggressive policy so long followed was totally reversed and King Madanavarman from the very start of his career launched a vigorous policy in reviving the strength and organisation of the Candella power and restoring respect for it among other contemporary powers of the adjacent regions, viz., the Cedis, the Parmaras, the Gahadavâlas and the Cauñukyas. This is best evidenced in V. 15 of the Mau stone inscription, which reads as follows:—

_Drâgvidrâtyeva Caidyāh samarabharañjya yasya nāmnāpi nityām kūle śa suhārdavṛtyda gamayati satatām trāsataḥ Kāśirājaḥ/ Yemunādhhatyām dadhānah sa ca sapadi samumāliito Mālavesa/ stanvanto yatra bhaktām paramavānibhūjaḥ svāsthyamanye ca bhejāh//_ (Before whose name even ever quickly flees the Cedi king, vanquished in fierce flight, and through the dread of whom the king of Kāśī always passes his time in friendly behaviour; by whom moreover the ruler of Mālwa, full of arrogance was quickly exterminated while other monarchs paying homage to him have enjoyed supreme comfort.)

The account of the Candella ruler as provided in the verse quoted above is undoubtedly an exaggerated description of the court poet. But the study of the history of the period would reveal that the condition of the powers mentioned in the verse, viz., the Kāśirāja, the Mālavesa and the Cedis, particularly during this period (i.e., the first quarter of
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the 12th cent. A.D.), was not quite strong to withstand the onslaught of a vigorous ruler of the Candella family. As such it may not be a mere praestì to describe that the Candella king Madanavarman was able to exert his political influence over those powers. There was no question of any expansion of the Candella dominion at the cost of any of these powers, but they might have had to submit before the military might of the Candella ruler, Madanavarmanadēva.

The Cedis, it may be remembered suffered a defeat at the hands of the Candella king, Sallakṣāna towards the close of the 11th cent. A.D., and since then they could not gain sufficient strength to effect a recovery. The discovery of the hoard of coins, which included some of Madanavarman, in the village named Fānwār in the Teonthār Tahsil of the Rāwā state has been taken by some scholars to indicate that the Candella kingdom extended in the south-east upto the Kaimur Range of the Vindhyas, beyond which lay the dominion of the Dēhala Kalacuris. The situation of an expanding power as an immediate neighbour is by itself dangerous which becomes more acute when the other power is weaker. Though the name of the Cedi king who might have clashed with Madanavarman is not mentioned in any record, yet there is every probability of his being identified with Gāyākarna, of whom we have a record, viz., Tēwar stone inscription, dated 1151 A.D. The Kalacuris had already lost some of their territories in the Ganges valley to the Gāhādavālas during the time of his father, Yaśā-karna (1073-1125 A.D.). Naturally their hold

in this region must have been weaker after this adverse development. For the Candellas too, an expansion of the Gahadavellas was fraught with dangerous potentialities, and as such they might have under Madanavarman annexed the region into their own dominion lest it might fall to the Gahadavellas. The claim that 'ever quickly flees the Cedi king vanquished in fierce fight' may not therefore be an idle boast. The incident hinted at in this verse might have referred to the Candella victory over the Kalacuris in the North Baghelkhand region. Increasing danger from the Candellas must have compelled the Cedis to sink their feeling of enmity with their eastern neighbour, the Paramaras, with whom now they enter into a marriage alliance. Gayukarna having married Alamanadevi, a Guhila princess, who was a grand-daughter of Paramara Udayaditya, as stated in the Bheraghat stone inscription.\(^{39}\)

The Paramaras themselves were also hardly better off. As early as the time of Kirttivarman, it has been seen, that in 1093 A.D. the Candella kingdom stretched upto Lalitpur district in the Betwa valley with the establishment of a fortress named Kirttigriridurga. Further expansion of the Candella dominion in the same direction was quite possible during the time of Madanavarman, as evidenced by the Man stone inscription (Jhansi district)\(^{40}\) and the Augasi grant (Banda district). The latter record, it will appear, was

---
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issued when the king was in residence near Bhaillasvāmin (mod. Bhilsā). This is further corroborated by the evidence of the Semra grant of Paramarddideva, grandson of Madanavarman. The Semra Plates indicate that in 1162 A.D. Madanavarman was in residence at Vāridurga (mod. Barigar) and granted the villages of Madanapura in the Jhāmsi district, Vaḍavāri (Berwārā) and Dudhāhi in Lalitpur. All these go to show that the Candella dominion not only crossed the Betwā in the south-west but also absorbed a considerable portion of the Mālāwa territory.

As to how did the Gandella power advanced or which particular Mālava prince had been defeated by Madanavarman is however nowhere indicated in any of these records. It is only vaguely mentioned in the Mau inscription that ‘the ruler of Mālāwa, full of arrogance, was quickly exterminated’. The history of the Pāravaaras would show that during the reign periods of Naravarman (1097-1111 A.D.) and Yasovarman (1134-42 A.D.) the military resources of the Pāravaara state were exhausted by protracted warfare with the Caulukyas of Gujarat. The Pāravaara records are rather reticent about any incident of the reign of these two princes. But the Caulukya records both literary and epigraphic clearly indicate how the rulers of Mālāwa suffered terrible defeats at the hands of the rulers of Gujarat. Merutūnga in his Prabandhacintāmani tells us that when Siddharāja was away from his capital on a pilgrimage, the Mālava king Yasovarman overran Gujarat and exacted submission from the minister of Siddharāja. The latter on his return
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to his capital felt very much humiliated and made preparations for an invasion of the Mālava kingdom. This led to a war of 12 years' duration ending with defeat and capture of Yasovarman before 1137 A.D., i.e., in about three years' time since his accession. As such it is quite probable that Yasovarman led the invasion of Gujarat during the reign of his father, Haravarman. Hemacandra, a contemporary of both Siddharāja and Yasovarman, in his Dwārakayāya corroborates the statement of Merutuhga though the details may somewhat differ. Other literary works like the Sukṛtasaṃkīrtana, Surathotsaba, Kirttikemundi and Vasantavilāsa also refer to the storming of Pālara by the Gujarat prince and annexation of the whole of Avantīdesa to the Gujarat empire.

It is therefore highly probable that during the early years of the reign of Yasovarman, when he was grappling with the Caulukyas in a deadly struggle, the Candella ruler Madanavarman exploited the opportunity by acquiring some portions of the Mālava country adjacent to his dominions. The Parāmāras being too busy with their enemy on the west could hardly put up adequate defence against their eastern neighbour, the Candellas. The Candella claim of having exterminated the ruler of Mālava may not be unjustifiable as their defeat at the hands of the Gujarat chief and loss of territory to the Candellas left with them with only a short strip of territory in the lower valley of the river Kali Sindhu upto V.S. 1199 (A.D. 1142).
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Therefore it must be admitted that Siddharaja's victory over the king of Malwa was more than a mere military raid. A number of Caülukya Grants of different dates designate Siddharaja as "Avantinātha." The annexation of Malwa brought Caülukya Jayasimha closer to the Candella dominions, which also by now stretched up to the eastern Malwa, and ultimately a clash became inevitable between the two powers. The Gujarat chronicles including the Kṛttikamuṇḍū refer to the invasion of Kālāñjara by Jayasimha. The Kumārapāla-carita claims that Jayasimha defeated Madanavarmā, the lord of Mahobā, but came to terms with the latter and made peace. Evidently the Caülukya ruler could not gain much from his wars with the Candellas and was compelled to withdraw his forces from Kālāñjara. The Kālāñjara stone inscription claims that Madanavarmā in an instant defeated the king of Gujurā, (identified with the king of Gujurā, i.e., Jayasimha) as Kṛṣṇa defeated Komās. There may be some exaggeration in the evidence of Candella epigraphy but it cannot be denied that the Candellas threw back the Gujarat invasion completely and this by itself may well justify the claim of Madanavarmā as recorded in the Kālāñjara record.

To the north-west of the Candella state the rising power of the Gahadavālas might have constituted a threat to their security, but as is evident from the Mau record there was continued good relationship between these two powers. The statement of the Mau inscription that through

the dread of the Candella ruler Madanavarman, 'the King of Kāśī always passes his time in friendly behaviour' should of course be taken with some reservation. The real state of affairs most probably was that both these powers realised each other's potentiality and formed a sort of alliance which enabled them to play significant roles in contemporary politics.

A study of the distribution of the records of the time of Madanavarman indicates that he enjoyed rather a long span of life occupying the Candella throne for a period of at least 34 years. The earliest of his records is dated in A.D. 1129 and the latest one dated A.D. 1163. During his regime not only do we witness a revival of the Candella power in the political theatre of northern India, but also the establishment of a strong and consolidated state with enlarged boundaries, which was possible, it must be admitted, by the steady application of Kautilyan principles of diplomacy by some efficient ministers of Madanavarman. The findspots of his inscriptions and coins suggest that in the south the Candella state verged on the Vindhyas from the Kaimur range in the west to the Bhanrer range in the east. The eastern boundary ran along the course of the Jumna beyond which lay the Gahadavāla kingdom, while in the west the Betwē course

divided the Candella dominions from the Māłwā country, then annexed to the Caulukya state. Thus the whole of the central Indian triangle including the important fortresses of Kālañjār and Ajaygadh, and the cities of Khajurāho and Mahobā, was firmly held by Madanavarman.