Chapter X.

After Paramardi: Temporary restoration under Trailokyavarman.

Trailokyavarman. - It has already been mentioned that the Prthviraj Raso refers to one Samarjit as a son of Parmal, who recovered Mahoba from Pajjun Rai, the Thanapati of Prthviraj, and held the territory between Kalanjar and Gaya, till he himself was defeated and killed by Binaeuddin, a Musalman. Binaeuddin, according to some scholars, may be a misreading for Bahāuddin Turhril, the governor of Bayana in 1196 A.D., who later became the head of a state in Central India after the death of Kutubuddin. But there is no epigraphic corroboration of the facts stated in the Raso regarding this. The Candella inscriptions, on the other hand, give the name of Trailokyavarman as the immediate successor of Paramardi. Trailokyavarman, the earliest of whose records is dated in Y.S. 1261, i.e., 1205 A.D., within a period of three years from the date of the last record of Parmardideva (Kalanjar Inscription of 1201 A.D.), ruled for about 36 years, as understood from the Rewa Copper Plates of 1240-41 A.D. Thus it appears that in spite of the crippling attacks on the Candalas during the reign of Paramardi, their power was not
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entirely lost, and that a fresh lease of life was given to it by Trailokyavarman. This successor of Paramardi quickly recovered Kālanjar from the Turkish occupants of the hill fortress and once again the Candella ruler Trailokyavarman found himself justified in using the family's favourite title 'Kālanjarādhipati'. The recapture of the fortress from the Turks is clearly indicated in the Garra Plates of Trailokyavarman himself as well as in the Ajaygadh Inscription of Viravaran.

The object of the issue of the Garra Plates is to record the grant of Kādohā-grāma in the Pāniūli visaya (modern Pānā), and Lohasihi-grāma in the Vikrāumī visaya (modern Bījāwār District), to Rauta Śāmanta, son of Rauta Pāpe, of the Bhaḍrāvāja gotra, who was killed at Kakadadaha in a battle with the Turuskas. The Ajaygadh record describes Trailokyavarman as a veritable Boar incarnation of Viṣṇu, whose superhuman power was shown in recovering the Candella state, submerged by the waves of the Turuska invasion.

Available evidence therefore indicates that although the Candella power was eclipsed by the Turuska invaders, who captured Kālanjara fort, lying under their occupation for
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sometime. Trailokyavaman was able to strengthen his position to such an extent that its recapture was made possible and actually accomplished under his leadership. But the success must have been won at the cost of valuable lives. It is to be learnt from the Garra Plates that in the battle at Kakadadaha Hānta Pāpe laid down his life. A grant of 'Mrtyukavṛtti' was made for the maintenance of the family of the deceased warrior who had contributed to the victory of the Gandellas. The improvement of the Gandella position in the reign of Trailokyavaman, as depicted in the Ajaygadh Inscription, cannot be regarded as unreal in view of the specific details discussed above. The assumption of the title of 'Kālānjārādhipati' by Trailokyavaran after its reconquest by him seems to have been quite proper.

That the fortress passed out of the Muslim hands and remained with the Gandella chief is also evident from the account of the Tabaqat i Nāsiri, in which it is stated that in the year 631 H. (A.D. 1233) Malik Nusratuddin Tāishi led an army from Gwaliyur towards Kālīnjār, causing discomfiture to the Rāj of Kālīnjār, who had not the courage to face his enemy. The Muslim General plundered the city and obtained a fabulous booty. Thus it is a clear proof that the fort must have continued to be in the possession of the Hindus until 1233 A.D. The Ajaygadh Rock Inscription not only gives credit to Trailokyavaran for the recovery of Gandella dominions but also mentions that he was 'a very creator in
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providing strong places' (durgga-pravidhāna-vedah) which probably means that a reshuffling of fortifications at Kālaṇjar was carried out after it had been recaptured by him. The Muslim account says that he fled without giving a fight to the Turkish attackers in 1233 A.D. But on this point one cannot however vouch for the strictest accuracy of the Muslim writer.

The victory at Kakadadaha, recorded in the Garra Plates evidently gave back to the Candellas the respect, which they were fast losing in the estimation of the contemporary political powers, and more than that, confidence in their own strength and capacity, without which further development was impossible. Trailokyavarman after this momentous victory marched along the south-eastern side to the north Baghelkhand and extended his power at the cost of the Kalacuris. It may be mentioned that the Mahārāṇakas of Kakaredika (modern Kakreri) were feudatories of the Kalacuri rulers Jayasimha and Vijayasimha, as recorded in the Rewa Grants of 1175 and 1195 A.D. But the Rewa Grants of 1240-41 A.D. show that the same family of the Mahārāṇakas of Kakaredika had subsequently transferred their allegiance to the Candella ruler Trailokyavarman. In referring to their new overlord the prasastikāras of the Mahārāṇaka family used even the epithets particularly
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associated with their previous master, the Kalacuris, viz., "Paramabhattāraṇa Mahārājādhirāja Paramesvara Parama-mahēśvara "Vaiśnavadāmākāśa Mahārājādhirāja Paramabhattāraṇa Mahārājādhirāja Paramesvara Parama-mahēśvara Trikaliṅgadhipati nijabhujopārjita asvapati gajapati rājatrayādhipati Trailokyavarmadeva kalyāṇa vijaya rājya".

The exact date of this transfer of authority is however not indicated in these records, but it must have happened sometime between the years 1205 and 1240 A.D. It is quite likely that the incident came about close on the heels of the victory of the Gandellas over the Turks at Kakajadaha in about 1205 A.D., which revived the political importance of the Candellas. Some light is thrown on this matter by the damaged Tripuri Inscription of Kalacuri year 962 (1211 A.D.) as deciphered by Dr. N. P. Chakravarti and the Dhureti Copper Plate of K. 963 (1212 A.D.). The former refers to the Kalacuri ruler Vijayasimha and evidently was issued during his reign. But the latter acknowledges Gandella Trailokyavarna as the ruling sovereign. If the contention of Dr. Chakravarti in reading the date of the Tripuri record is admitted then it may reasonably be presumed that the area passed under Gandella occupation sometime in K.962-63 (1211-12 A.D.). What is more significant in this connection is that the record mentions one Malayasimha, a Mahāmātakā and Mandalika, appointed as a minister (mantrin) by Trailokyavarna.18 He is identified with a Sāmanta and Mandalika of same name, mentioned in the Cedi records of K. 944 and K.962.
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That is, this chief officer of the Kalacuris not only transferred his allegiance to the Candellas but served the Candella king in the capacity of his minister.

The find of the Panwar hoard of coins which included some of the coins of Madanavarman also led scholars to presume an extension of the Candella boundaries in the northern Baghelkhand region during the reign of Madanavarman. But a simple find of a coin-hoard of a particular royal family in a region adjacent to its own is not always a sure proof of the extension of administrative boundaries as coins could be carried from one place to a neighbouring region for various reasons. On the other hand the Rewa Grants of the Maharanakes of Kakaredika owing allegiance to the Cedi rulers, as mentioned above, furnish positive evidence of the latter's hold on the region upto 1195 A.D. The presumption that the region had formerly been conquered by the Candellas from whom it was recaptured during the gloomy period of Paramardi's reign, is not also based on indisputable evidence. The find of the Panwar hoard on the basis of which a previous Candella occupation is sought to be proved cannot be regarded as a dependable piece of evidence. The Bhureti Copper Plate of the Saiva teachers (1212 A.D.) and the Rewa Grants of 1240-41 A.D. of the Maharanaka family accepting Candella Trailokyavarman as their overlord, furnish however a positive proof of the expansion of the Candella territory to the upper courses, of the Son in the northern Baghelkhand.

and the continuance of the Chandella hold on the area even at the time when the Kalânjar fortress was lost to the Muslims.

The Rock inscription from Ajaygadh of the time of Bhojavarma refers to the subjugation of the tribes, viz., the Bhillos, the Sabaras and the Pulindas (ājñākarun-palīnivāsinyam cakāra Bhillo-Sabarun-Pulindan) by Kayastha Ananda, a military officer of Trailokyavarma, who appointed him as the governor of Jayadurga (Ajaygadh fort) (durggadhikāre nṛpatih pracakre). Vēsa or Vēsaka, the elder brother of Ananda, was also an important military leader under Trailokyavarma. His victory against 'the irresistible' Bhojuka (Bhojukam yuddhi yuddhādurummadamādiā), who was ' rending the kingdom into two' (dvairājyam janayantam), is highly eulogised in the record. The identity of Bhojuka is most uncertain. Kiellhorn has suggested the identification of Bhojuka, killed by Vēsaka, with Āsavāvaidya Thakkura Bhojuka, father of Abhayadeva of Ajaygadh Stone Inscription of the time of Viravarman, dated 1268 A.D. In the absence of clearer evidence it is difficult to accept the contention. But from the nature of the expression ' rending the kingdom into two' it may be presumed that Bhojuka was an internal enemy of considerable power and influence, possibly a rebel trying to create disaffection against Trailokyavarma. For the signal service rendered by Vēsaka he was decorated with the title of 'Visisa' of Jayadurga by Trailokyavarma and was granted the village of Varbhavari.
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Thus we find that Trailokyavarma was an able ruler who did much to save the Candella power from annihilation and also contributed to its expansion in a most difficult period of its history. He came to the throne at a very critical moment, when the fortunes of the state were enveloped by darkness. The particular merit of his service is emphasised in the passage which stated that he was 'a Visnu in lifting up the earth immersed in the ocean formed by the streams of the Turuskas'. At the time of his accession the Candellas were in a miserable plight. The citadel of Kālānjara was then under a Muslim governor and the seat of government had to be shifted to Ajaygadh. It was due to Trailokyavarma's superb organising power that the Candella strongholds were recovered by him and Candella authority established from the Betwā in the west to the Son in the east, and from Bāndā and Ḥamīrpur districts in the north to Panna in the south. Trailokya was not an insignificant chieftain of his time. The Mahārāṇakas of Kakareśika were among the feudatories who accepted him as their overlord.

It is not unlikely that the fort of Kālānjara could not be permanently annexed by the Muslims as a result of their attack in 1233 A.D. Cunningham refers to a passage in the Tabaqāt-i Nasirī which may indirectly render it likely that
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Trailokyavaman ruled over Kalânjar as late as 1247 A.D. The account mentions a Râna named 'Dalaki wa Malaki' as ruling in a mountainous tract not far from Kara (Allahabad District) which was plundered by Ulugh Khan in the reign of Sultan Nasiruddin in 645 A.H. (1247 A.D.). According to Firishta 'Dalaki wa Malaki' (and not two Häjâhs Dulky and Mulky as translated by Briggs) resided at Kâlânjar. Cunningham holds that the correct original form was 'Tilaki waâ Deo' (Trailokyavarmadêva), which was corrupted as Kâlaki wa Malaki by Persian calligraphists. If the contention of Cunningham is accepted, the story quoted above may be taken as applying to Trailokyavaman, who must have in that case ruled for a few more years till 1247 A.D. But the question arises as to whether he did recapture the fortress of Kâlânjar once again after its fall in 1233 A.D. It may be mentioned here that Kâlânjar remained in the possession of Viravaran, the son and successor of Trailokyâ. It seems quite probable that Tâishi, the Muslim invader, plundered the fortress, which was not really conquered, and that the Candellas did not lose possession of it, which continued to remain in their hands in spite of repeated attacks till the 16th century.
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Viravaman. - Viravaman succeeded Trailokyavarman to the throne, but the exact date of his accession is not known. The earliest record is dated in 1317 Y.S., 1259-60 A.D. If 'Dalaki wa Malaki' of Tabaqat-i-Nasiri is taken to be identical with Trailokyavarman, Viravaman may be presumed to have ascended the throne sometime between 1247 and 1259 A.D. Of his reign we have the following records, (1) the Chārkhari Plate of Y.S. 1311, (2) the Ajaygadh Rock Inscription of Y.S. 1317, (3) the Jhansi Inscription of Y.S. 1318, (4) the Dahi Plate of Y.S. 1337, and (5) the Gurhā Satī Stone Inscription of Y.S. 1342 (1286 A.D.). Two more inscriptions from Kālañjar were noticed, one by Cunningham, which traced the Candaña genealogy from Vijayapāla to Viravaman, and the other by Kielhorn, dated in Y.S. 1340 (A.D. 1283), which falls within the reign-period of Viravaman. Another stone inscription dated Y.S. 1372 (1315 A.D.) of the reign of Viravaman, was found from Ajaygadh. But as we have an Ajaygadh record of Y.S. 1345 (A.D. 1288), in which Bhojavarman is mentioned as the king, Dr. Ray doubted the proposed reading of the date, and that of the name of the king.
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recorded in the other inscription. It is not unlikely, as suggested by Cunningham, that Yiravarman of the latter record might have been a second prince of the same name succeeding Bhojavaranam sometime after 1288 A.D.

The Chârkhâri Plate (V.S. 1311) mentions the battle of Sondhi, in which one Dabhyadavarmen of Candresvarânvaya was defeated by Râuta Abhi, a general of Viravaranam. Sondhi is identical with Sondhâ fort, now called Kânhâgarh on the banks of the Sind river in the Bâtî State. Rai Bahadur Hiralal, who has edited the inscription suggests that it was a battle between persons of the same family, viz., the Candellas. It is difficult to believe that Dabhyadavarmen was a member of the Candella family, occupying any portion of the territory against the lineal descendant of Trailokya-Varman. On the other hand the suggestion that the gift of a village to the general who achieved the victory would accrue religious merit to the predecessors of the king, indicates that he was either a usurper or a rebel trying to create troubles within the state.

Viravaranam fortunately had not to encounter any Muslim attack during his rule, at least the Muslim chronicles do not mention any. He seems to have enjoyed a peaceful reign maintaining direct control over large part of his ancestral territory including Khajurâho, where a unique gold dramma
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of Viravarman has been recovered. If the evidence of the findspots of the records of his reign is taken into consideration, it may be permitted to draw such an inference about the extent of his kingdom. His dominion, comprising the fortresses of Kalanjär and Ajaygadh, extended up to the Betwa on the west, near which was found the Gurha Stone Inscription.

The evidence of the Dahi Grant suggests that the western boundary extended further. This inscription seems to claim that his territory was bounded by Nalapura or Narwar and Gopagiri or Gwalior in the north west, and Madhuvana or Mathura in the north. According to this record, Mallaya "an illustrious chief of distinguished bravery", is said to have conquered the lord of Narwar (Nalapurapati), Gopāla, the ruler of Mathura (Madhuvanakādhipa) and Harirāja of Gwalior (Gopagiri). It should be pointed out that there is hardly any corroborative evidence in support of the claim advanced. It is not clear how in the face of the growing power of the Muslims in the second half of the 13th and the first half of the 14th centuries, how it was possible for the Gandellas to have held sway over such an extensive kingdom without fighting a battle with the Muslims. Muslim accounts, including Firishta, mentions Sultan Nasiruddin's subjugation of Bundelkhand and his appointment of a governor in about 1251 A.D. The regions subdued were Gwalior, Chanderi and Mālwā. But the Muslims could not completely eliminate

indigenous rule in the principalities mentioned above, where local dynasties are known to have continued, although much reduced in power. The account given above in the Gurhā Stone Inscription may just mean that the Candella ruler may have obtained some success in local feuds against those chieftains of Narwar, Gwalior and Mathura, but these were of no lasting value.

Verses 8 and 9 of the Ajaygadh Record (1317 A.D.) in a conventional style paint him as a great fighter. He is described as one who delighted the damsels of heaven by sending them, as lovers, the hostile heroes whom he cut down in the field of battle. He is compared with Visnu riding on Garuḍa, and also Śiva roaming about on his bull extirpating elements of wickedness on the earth, which may mean that he ruled with firmness at a time when disorderly forces were trying to gain the upper hand.

The Ajaygadh record of V.S. 1317 was issued to record the benevolent and pious activities of the chief queen of Vīravarman, named Kalyānadēvi, who built a well with perennial water, a hall for the supply of its water, and a tank at Nandipura (Jayadurga). The record also refers to the genealogy of the queen. She hailed from the Dadhici-vamsa (V. 10), and was the daughter of Mahēśvara (V. 11), who was revered even by the crowned heads. His mother was Vosaladevi, the daughter of king Govinda (V. 13), who according to Cunningham, may have been identical with king Govindaraja of Narwar (Nalapura).
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Bhojavaman.- Ylravarman appears to have been succeeded by Bhojavaman between the years V.S. 1342 (1286 A.D.) and V.S. 1345 (1288 A.D.). As already mentioned, the last dated record belonging to the reign of Ylravarman is V.S. 1342; while the earliest known of Bhojavarman's is dated V.S. 1345. It is probable that Bhojavarman was the son and successor of Ylravarman, but there is no definite evidence on the point.

The available records assigned to the reign of Bhojavarman are all found from Ajaygadh. They are, - (i) a Stone Inscription dated in V.S. 1345, "(ii) a Sati stone record dated V.S. 1346," and (iii) a Rock Inscription, which is undated. Excepting the Sati Record, both the other Ajaygadh inscriptions were issued by ministers of Bhojavarman, the dated one by Kāyaśtha Nāma, and the undated one by another Kāyaśtha, named Subhāta, the Kośādhipati. These records however do not throw any light on the political condition of his time, nor do they ascribe any achievement to Bhojavarman. It is evident that the Candellas had now little scope or opportunity left for conspicuous action in the political field. But a study of documents of their ministers reveal that though the power of the Candellas must have been declining, their administrative organisation was maintained with the help of efficient councillors and officials, whose loyalty to the throne was an inherited virtue.
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It is not possible to ascertain the exact limits of Bhojavarman's dominion due to paucity of data. But that the Ajaygad fort was still under the possession of the Candellas is evident from two records mentioned above. The Kalanjar fort was also under the Candellas till V.S. 1365, when in a Sati Stone Record found in the territory held by a feudatory prince, Mahārājāguttra Vāghadeva, the last known Candella ruler, 'Śrīmad Hammīravarmadeva', their overlord, is mentioned as 'Kālañjarādhipati' (Lord of the Kālañjar fort). That the Candella occupation of the fortress of Kālañjar did not cease in the intervening period is evident from the Gharkhari record of V.S. 1346, which also refers to Hammīravarmadeva as 'Kālañjarādhipati', though the reigning king was Bhojavarman. The question whether Hammīravarmadeva held the fort of Kālañjar as Bhojavarman's viceroy or independently as the latter's rival has raised controversy. Rai Bahadur Hiralal suggests that the absence of the grandiloquent titles in the case of Hammīravarmadeva indicates that he was never recognised as the Mahārāja while his elder brother, Bhojavarman, was on the throne. The view that the two were brothers is not based on any evidence, but is a pure assumption, which may be probable, but cannot be proved to be true. Further, the explanation offered by Hiralal regarding the assumption of the most favourite epithet of the Candella rulers, viz., Kālañjarādhipati, by the brother of the reigning prince, is also a guess. It may not be unlikely that Bhojavarman had a short reign and that after his
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death in V.S. 1346, Hammiravarman occupied the throne in the same year sometime before the month of ‘Bhadrapada’.  

Hammiravarman. - The last known ruler of the Candella family was Hammiravarman, of whom we have a copper plate grant in V.S. 1346 mentioned above. in that record he has been definitely mentioned as meditating on the feet of Sri Viravaranmanadeva. It is difficult to prove that they were brothers, as already stated. The succession appears to have, however, been peaceful.

Three records are available for his reign. Those are, (i) the Gharkhari Plate of V.S. 1346, (ii) and (iii) two Sati Stone inscriptions, one from Ajaygadh fort and the other from Bāmhni, a village in the Dāmoh district in the Central Provinces. The findspots of these records suggest that Hammiravarman not only held the ancestral dominion of the Candellas including Mahoba region in the Hamirpur district, and Ajaygadh, but also portions of Dāmoh and Jabalpur districts of the Central Provinces, on either side of the Bhanrer range of the Vindhyas. The Bāmhni Sati record furnishes the interesting information that Maharajaputra Sri Vaghadeva, the local ruler, described as a 'Pratihāra chief', was feudatory of Candella Hammiravarman. Both these Sati records being dated in V.S. 1365 indicates that Hammiravarman had a fairly long reign of at least about 20 years from V.S. 1346 to V.S. 1365. Another Sati record has been found from a village named Salaiyā, 3 miles from Bāmhni.
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in Y.S. 1366 (A.D. 1309), which mentions 'Alayadina Sultāna' (Sultan Alauddin) as the reigning king. Thus with the occupation of Bundelkhand by Alauddin the history of the independent Candella dynasty came to an end by 1309 A.D. Vestiges of the Candella power may have lingered after this date in some small fortified areas, but the glories of the Candellas became a part of ancient legend, which could not be revived under the imperial sway of the Muslim rulers.