Chapter IX.

Cahamana - Candella rivalry: Fall of Mahoba.

Yasovarman II. - Batesvar Inscription of Paramardi-deva is the only record which reveals the existence of a prince named Yasovarman intervening between the rulers, Madanavarman and Paramardi-deva. Before the discovery of this record it was generally believed that Paramardi, the grandson of Madanavarman, succeeded the latter on the throne due probably to the death of his (Madana's) son in his own lifetime. But the evidence of the Batesvar record clearly indicates that Yasovarman, the father of Paramardi, ascended the throne after Madanavarman for however short a time it might have been. Verses 8 & 9 of the inscription state as follows:-

"as the Moon, the crest jewel of Mahesvara, arose from the ocean, so was born from him, Yasovarman, who was an ornament of great rulers causing joy to the people, whose fame spreading in three worlds with the loveliness of jasmine and the moon, made the hair of men appear white and thus caused the unprecedented notion, that people before they had attained old age had, alas, turned grey".

The earliest recorded date of Paramardi being V.S.1223 (1165-66 A.D.), Yasovarman must have had a very short tenure
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on the throne. Dr. Ray suggests that v.9. of the Batesvar
record hints at the untimely end of his career. But the
idea that there might have been some sort of dynastic
troubles and that Paramardi achieved the throne at the cost
of his father cannot be upheld with the materials at our
disposal. It is easier to presume that Yasovarman died
normally shortly after his accession. As nothing remarkable
could have been achieved during the brief spell of
Yasovarman's reign, for which the ministerial family could
boast of, the name of this ruler may have been omitted from
their record (Man Inscription) altogether.

Paramardi. - Paramardideva, the grandson of Madana-
varman, was the last Candella ruler of eminence. He came to
the throne early in life in c. 1166 A.D., at the age of
five, according to the Parnāl Rāsa, within a couple of years
of the date of his grand-father's last dated record,
c. 1163 A.D., his father Yasovarman II having died after a
short reign. Verse 6 of the Ajaigarh Inscription of Vira-
varman (V.S. 1317) refers to Paramardi as "a leader even
in his youth, who struck down the opposing heroes, and to
whom the fortune of universal sovereignty quickly came, like
an enamoured damsel, choosing him of her own free will".
"Athābhavad-Śrī Paramardirājo bālopi-netā ripu-vīra-hantā
Sāṃrajyalakṣmīraṃ āhāmrāktā patim vareṣu samājagama"/6.
The verse indirectly hints at the suddenness of Paramardi's
accession necessitated most probably by the untimely
passing away of his father.

The records attributed to the reign of Paramardi indicate that he enjoyed a fairly long reign extending over 35 years, the earliest of his records being dated in 1165-66 A.D., and the latest in 1201-02 A.D. The period may be divided under three broad sections, of which the first was concerned with the accession and the early career, the second with the hostility between the Candellas and the Cāhamānas, leading to the fall of Mahobā, and, the third with the Muslim invasions.

For the first part of his reign we have the following records, viz., the Saura Plates (1165-66 A.D.), the Mahobā image inscription (1166-67 A.D.), the Ichāvar Plate (1171 A.D.), the Mahobā Plate (1173 A.D.), the Pachar Plate (1176 A.D.), and the Charkhari Plate (1178 A.D.). In all these inscriptions full imperial titles are used by Paramardi, viz., "Paramabhattāraka, Maharajādhirāja, Paramesvara, Paramā-māhesvara, Sri-Kālajñānadarhipati, Śrīmatam Paramardideva". These show that Paramardideva maintained the dignity of the Candellas, whose power had revived under his illustrious grand-father, Madanavarman.
The findspots of the records belonging to the reign of Paramardi indicate that he administered the entire dominion inherited by him quite efficiently and peacefully. His early years were not marred by any military reverses or anything of the sort. The Candella records do not refer to any brilliant success either during the first fifteen years of his reign (1166–1182 A.D.).

It was the second phase of his reign that was marked by protracted conflicts with the Caknaanas of Delhi, which culminated in the fall of Mahoba and the defeat of Paramardi. Strangely enough the epigraphic documents of the Candellas are conspicuously silent over this vital issue. The only explanation that may be offered for this deliberate reticence of the Candella prasastikaras is probably their unwillingness to refer to the ignominious defeat of their master. We have naturally, therefore, to rely on the popular bardic accounts still current in Central India known as the Prthviraj Raso by Cand Bardai, the Mahoba Khand (Parmal Raso)16 and the Ahha Raso by Jagnaiik Rao17. These Raso accounts refer to the serious hostilities between Prthviraj Cauhan and Parmal Candel in some details. Much of these is later fabrication by different popular bards, who were either interested in glorifying Prthviraj or Parmal. It cannot but be admitted that there is a kernel of truth in these accounts as is borne out by the evidence of the two Madanpur Stone Inscriptions which record
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the defeat of Paramardi at the hands of Prthvirāj, and the plunder of Jejāhukti (or Jejāhukti, as actually mentioned in the document) by the latter in Sam 1239 (A.D. 1182-83).§

The circumstances leading to the outbreak of hostilities between the Candellas and the Gāhānās as can be reconstructed from the bardic ballads may be briefly described here.

Prthvirāj Gauhān, while returning to Delhi after marrying the daughter of Padamsen, was attacked on the way by the Turkish hordes, who were however beaten back. Prthvīrāja’s forces also suffered some casualties. Unfortunately the party, including the wounded soldiers, having lost direction came to Mahobā, the capital of the Candellas, when it was raining. They camped in the royal garden without knowing that it was so. The keeper of the garden strongly objected to this intrusion, and in course of an altercation that followed, he was struck down. When the report reached Parmāl Candal (Paramardideva), he felt offended and sent his soldiers to take action. In the battle that followed the Candals suffered serious losses, and of the Gauhāns some 30 men were killed and 17 injured. Parmāl then, in strong indignation, summoned Udal, a leader of the Banaphar clan and one of his generals, and asked him to attack soldiers already wounded. In vain did Udal try to impress upon the Candella king that it would not only be unchivalrous to attack the wounded soldiers, but also unnecessarily antagonise a powerful ruler like Prthvīrāja. But Parmāl was under the evil influence of Māhil Parihār (Pratihāra), his

brother-in-law, who now a Samanta, nourished a secret feeling of revenge against the Candellas, and whenever there was an opportunity, either he gave wrong advice to the Candellas or helped the enemy with secret messages. In this case also at his instigation Parmāl prevailed upon the Banāphar to lead the unfair attack, but the result was no better than the previous one. The siege however was raised by Prithvīrāj, who returned to Delhi.

In the meantime the Banāphar chiefs, Udal and his brother, Ālha, finding Mahobā too hot for them due to the machinations of Māhil Pārihar, left the Candella court and sought refuge with King Jaiānand of Kanauj.

Māhil, now secretly communicated the news about the desertion of the best warriors of the Candellas to Prithvīrāj, and advised him to avail himself of this opportunity of subjugation the Candellas. Prithvīrāj took counsel with all his chiefs and set out with a strong army to attack Mahobā. The Mahobā Khand describes in detail the route followed by Prithvīrāj and the different stages of his march to Mahobā.

Starting from Delhi in Sam 1240 (1182 A.D.) on a Wednesday, as stated in the Parmāl Haṣo, Prithvīrāj marched to Gaḍh Gopaṅal (Gwalior) and encamped there for seven days. Then his army trekked eastwards to Bates‘var (near Agra) and worshipped Śiva there. Then they proceeded towards the Candella kingdom. Next halt was on the banks of the Pahuj at 19. The date is Sam 1140 according to some Mss. of the Mahobā Khand. Sri Shyamsundar Dash, the Editor of the Parmāl Haṣo, believes, it was a calligraphist’s mistake for Sam 1240. P.R., P. 60. f.n. 1.
a place called Bānāvgaḍ or Indragaḍh, near Sirsa or Sisargāḍh (Sisarwagarh). The fortress of Sisargāḍh was held by Mālkhaṇa, a valiant sāmanta of Parmāl. He was a Banāphar, and the famous heroes Albha and Udal were his cousins. Mālkhaṇa stoutly defended the fort for about eight days. Prthvīrāj at the outset tried to win him over, but Mālkhaṇa stuck to his 'svāmīdharma' (allegiance to his master) and fought bravely with all the resources at his command, killing as many as eight strong generals of the Cauhaṇa army in eight consecutive days. Prthvīrāj at last personally took the field and Mālkhaṇa bravely laid down his life in the battle along with his noble associates.

After the fall of Sirsa, Prthvīrāj marched towards Mahoba and camped on the banks of the Betwa (Vetravati). Realising the imminent danger which it would be rather impossible to forestall, Parmāl and his Sāmantas, on the suggestion of the Chief Queen Malhān Devī, decided to seek for a temporary truce for a couple of months, and to send an envoy to Kanauj recalling the Banāphar brothers, Albha and Udal.

Prthvīrāj agreed to the proposal, but remained camping on the banks of the river, practically besieging the town. Albha and Udal, on receipt of this message, were at first reluctant to come, as they had been unfairly treated by the Cauḍel ruler. But their mother prevailed upon them, that 'svāmīdharma' should not be violated. Jaicand, the ruler of Kanauj, sent along with them, some of his best generals including two of his sons and a strong contingent of soldiers. The reference to this friendly assistance of the
Gāhāḍāvālas ruler to Parmāl, in the latter's conflict with Prthvirāj, may not have been a mere fabrication by the popular bards. The Mau record refers to the existence of friendly relations between the Candella king Madanavaman the grandfather of Parmāl and the Gāhāḍāvālas.

On the arrival of the Banāphar chiefs at Mahobā at the head of the Kanauj army the Candellas felt greatly inspired and they made necessary preparations for the final battle. Prthvirāj now demanded reopening of the operations held in abeyance under the terms of the truce, or surrender of the capital city, Mahobā. The battle started in full fury, the Candela troops advancing within a range of two 'krosās' (i.e., about 4 miles) from the Cauhān encampments.

Realising the fury and intensity of the impending battle, Parmāl, it is said, became nervous and left for Kālānjīr along with some of his troops. Brahmajit, a son of Parmāl, however, along with the Banāphar heroes, Alhā and Udal led the Candel army. In this great armageddon of Mahobā, both sides suffered serious losses and numerous casualties, which included Brahmajit, Udal, the sons of Jaicānd and almost all the valiant generals on the Gandella side. Alhā was wounded but survived the battle. Prthvirāj celebrated his victory by sacking the Candella capital, Mahobā, which is corroborated by the evidence of the Madanpur Stone Inscriptions, already quoted.

A Cauhān general, Čavand Rāl, now proceeded to Kālānjīr, where Parmāl took refuge. The Cauhān army occupied the fort and plundered it and started back with their most

important trophy, Parmāl, to present him before their master, Prthvīrāj. The Prthvīrāj Rāsa stops abruptly here, and states that Prthvīrāj, raising the siege of Mahōbā, proceeded towards his own capital, Delhi, after appointing Pajjun Rai, one of his generals as the Governor of Mahōbā. But what was the fate of Parmāl? How long did the Cauhān occupation of Mahōbā continue?

Some light is thrown on these points by the Parmāl Rāso. It states that when after plundering the fortress of Kālañjar, the Cauhāns were returning along with Parmāl the Candel king, as their prisoner of war, Indal Kumār, son of Ālha, attacked them without any warning. This sudden attack of the Banaphar soldiers completely outmanœuvred the Cauhāns, and the Candel king was freed from their clutches. Parmāl then returned to Kālañjar, but according to the Rāso accounts, out of a sense of shame for his captivity at the hands of the enemies, voluntarily put an end to his life at the Gajrāj temple, who was followed by the Chief Queen, Malhan Devī and other queens. Gaṇḍ Bardāi, however, mentions that Parmāl retired to Gayā and died there.

These bardic accounts being full of unhistorical material, which was added in course of time, it is extremely difficult to trace the historical kernel in them. That Parmāl died immediately after his defeat at the hands of Prthvīrāj is disproved by the find of a number of dated Candel records, some of which were issued directly by

Paramardideva. These are, — the Kālañjara Rock Inscription\(^{23}\) and the Mahobā Stone Inscription of Saivism 1240 (A.D. 1184)\(^{24}\), the Ajaigadh Stone Inscription of V.S. 1243 (A.D. 1187)\(^{25}\), the Baghāri (Batesvar) Stone Inscription of Sām 1252 (A.D. 1195)\(^{26}\), and the Kālañjar Stone Inscription of V.S. 1258 (A.D. 1201)\(^{27}\).

That is to say, Paramardi lived for about 20 years after the Cauhan-Candela battle of 1182 A.D. This is also corroborated by the Muslim historians, Häsun Nizämi and Firishta\(^{28}\).

The occupation of Mahobā by the Cauhāns and the appoint­ment of Pājjun Rāī as the governor of Mahobā as mentioned in these accounts, are statements hardly corroborated by any other evidence. That the city fell to the Cauhāns in 1182 A.D. and that it was plundered is borne out by the Madanpur records, but it is difficult to prove that the Cauhāns retained their hold on it for any length of time. The capture of Kālañjar by Prthvīrajā’s forces is also more than can be admitted. Inscriptions are found to have been issued by Paramardideva both from Kālañjar and Mahobā within two years of its fall to the Cauhāns, i.e., 1184 A.D., as quoted above.

It may be quite probable that the fortress never passed out of the hands of the Candellas. It was there that the seat
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of the government was shifted during the siege of Mahoba.
The account of the Parma Raso about the rise of the Banaphaelars under Indal Kumar, son of Alha, and liberation of Parma, appears easier to believe. The Banaphaelars thus might have been instrumental in compelling the Cauhans to raise the siege and leave for Delhi, before they had time to consolidate their position.

According to the Prthviraj Raso, Sarajit, a son of Parma, with the help of Narasimha, an officer of Raja Jai Candra of Kanauj, captured Mahoba from Pajjun Rai, the Thanapati of Prthviraj, and ruled over the whole territory between Kalaunjar and Gaya. He is however not mentioned in any of the Candella records.

So the story of the Cauhans occupation of the Candella dominions was either a fabrication by the bardic authors, or, if there is any truth in it, the occupation may have lasted for a very short period. In fact the Candella records issued from 1184 A.D. onwards, which describe Paramardi with the usual imperial titles, do not indicate that he was relegated to a petty local chiefship. The Batesvar Inscription of 1195 A.D. mentions that 'the foot-stool of Paramardi was pale red with the lustre of the crest-jewels of kings (i.e., the Samaantes) bowing down before him'. Besides the Kalanjar record of 1201 A.D. mentions him as 'Dasarnadhina' (Lord of the Dasarna country), which has been taken by Dr. H.C. Ray as indicative of his recovery of substantial portion of his

territory. But from whom did he recover, and in which particular encounter? It is not mentioned in any of the documents how and from whom it was 'recovered'. Secondly, if it were a case of recovery, it would have been usual for the prasāstikārās to refer to it. In the absence of any such evidence it may be presumed that the Cauhāns after plundering the city of Mahōbā raised the siege and left for Delhi. The Cauhāns probably intended to cripple the Candellas. They had no intention of annexing any part of the Candella dominion to their own kingdom. Paramardi repaired the damages caused by the enemy, and stabilised his hold over Mahōbā in a short time.

But Paramardi was really an unfortunate king. Hardly could he recover from the shattering blows of the Cauhāns, when his territories came to be invaded by a more formidable foe, the Muslims. Kutubuddīn, according to the Tāj-ul-Māthir, accompanied by Śahīb Kīrān, Shamsuddīn Altāmāsh, and others, proceeded to invade Kālaṃjar in 599 A.H. (1202 A.D.). 'The accursed Parmār, the Rai of Kālaṃjar' offered stiff resistance, but could not stand the onslaught of the Muslim invaders, and agreed to surrender. As described by Ḥāsān Nizāmī, on promise of allegiance he was admitted to the same favours as his ancestors had experienced from Māhmūd Sabukti-gīn. But while he was preparing for the payment of tribute and elephants, he died a natural death wherupon his minister (Dīwān or Māhlī), Aj Deo, reorganised the forces and held

out, thus giving much trouble to the enemy. Firishta however records that the minister of Paramardi resolved to hold out and caused his master to be assassinated when he was preparing the tribute to be paid. This theory of violent death of Paramardi is, however, not accepted by all. In spite of this resistance the fort could not be defended. As the reservoirs of water in the fort dried up due to a severe drought, this last resistance also broke down, and on Monday, the 20th of Rajab, the Candella army was compelled to capitulate. The Fort thus fall to the Muslims, who destroyed the temples and converted them to mosques, and in the words of Nizami, "the name idolatory was annihilated". The invaders no doubt procured a considerable booty by plundering the establishments in the fort. The government of Kâliñjar was then conferred on Hasabaruddin Hasan Arnal.

After the occupation of Kâliñjar, Kutubuddin directed his army towards Mahoba and subdued it. Firishta's reference to Mahoba as the capital of the principality of Kalpi, has been taken by Dr. Ray to indicate that Mahoba and the surrounding regions were no longer part of the Candella dominions, which however is not true.

Thus ended the long reign of Paramardi, the last great ruler of the Candella dynasty, who had a chequered career. It was during his reign that the Candella power rose to its height. His reign was also marked by serious reverses which crippled the Candella power effectively.
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