Chapter IV.

The Rise of the Candellas: Yasovarman.

Yasovarman was practically the first independent ruler of the Candella dynasty, who may be regarded to have laid the foundations of the greatness of the family. The Candellas, as has already been shown, became feudatories of the Gurjara-Pratihāras. But the imperial power had to fight the Rastrakūtas of the Deccan repeatedly. This must have heavily told on their resources, compelling them to seek the aid of their feudatories, the Gahilots and the Candellas. The feudatories felt that their help was of paramount importance in maintaining the Pratihāra overlordship and would naturally seek the earliest opportunity to shake off their allegiance.

The Candellas by their successful interference in the affairs of Kanauj had earned for themselves a distinction in North-Indian politics and carried themselves one step forward. Such was the position of the Candellas when Yasovarman came to the throne, succeeding his father, Harsa. The Rastrakūtas had in the meantime been enfeebled by disruptive dynastic quarrels which made it difficult for them to play a decisive role in Northern India. The dismemberment of two great Imperial dynasties of India almost simultaneously in the middle of the 10th cent. A.D. offered a golden opportunity to subsidiary powers to take the best advantage of the resulting situation.

Yaśovarman, the Candella ruler, did not miss this chance of increasing his family's power and prestige; he began to engage himself in military operations with a view to extending his territorial possessions, while not refusing formal allegiance to the Pratihāras.

Early life. - Information regarding his early life is however scanty. One inscription says that his mother, Kāñchukā of the Cāhāṇa family, having given birth to a beautiful and robust child, became an object of pride for the family. As she has been raised to the status of Devaki, the mother of Lord Krishna, the conqueror of the demon Madhu, it may be imagined that even in his early days he achieved certain exploits, though not specified, which were remarkable for his age. As to the date of Yaśovarman's accession to the Candella throne no precise information is available. The Khajurāho Stone Inscription of V.S. 1011 (953-54 A.D.) records the erection of a temple of Viṣṇu under the name of Vaikunṭha by Yaśovarman. But the inscription appears to have been engraved after the death of Yaśovana, when the throne was occupied by his son and successor, Dhanḍa, who is introduced in V. 44 of the record. All that can be safely inferred is that Yaśovarman ruled prior to the date of the record, i.e., 953-54 A.D.

Occupation of Kālaṇjar. - The occupation of Kālaṇjar Mt. (Kālaṇjarāḍri) was a significant achievement for Yaśovarman, which enhanced the prestige of the family, and the
Candellas came to be recognised as a political power. V. 31 of the inscription tells us that Yasovarman conquered Kālanjār with ease. (Jagrāha kṛdaya ..... Kālanjārādriṃ). This conquest must have happened sometime before 953-54 A.D. But from whom did Yasovarman conquer the Kālanjār hill? The records of the Pratiharas reveal that Kālanjāra-mandala was under their possession in 836 A.D. It is however well known that soon after 915 A.D. the Haṭrakūṭa onslaught on Northern India developed into serious proportions, and the city of Mahodaya, which is greatly renowned among men by the name Kuśasthala had been completely uprooted by Indra III. But after the death of Indra III the Gurjara-Pratiharas recovered much of their dominions with the help of their feudatories including the Candellas. As Asiatic Society's Plate, dated 931 A.D. which records a grant of land included in the Vārānasi visaya and other territories, testify to the continuing greatness of the family, it is generally presumed that the dominions of the Pratiharas during this time included Kālanjāra mandala. Consequently it has been suggested that this territory must have been conquered from the Pratiharas.

With the revival of Haṭrakūṭa attacks, as recorded in the Deoli and Karhād Plates the recovery of Pratiharā power was checked, and it hastened the dismemberment of the empire. V. 30 of the Karhād Plates of Krishna III says that, 'on hearing of the conquest of all the strongholds in the

southern region simply by means of his angry glance the hope about Kālañjara and Citrakūṭa vanished from the heart of the Gurjara'. Krishna III must have attacked the Gurjara dominions from the south-west and the south-east (before the middle of the 10th Cent. A.D.), and succeeded in capturing the famous forts of Citrakūṭa (Chitor), and Kālañjara from the Gurjara Pratihāras. The Jura Inscription of the same king also shows that his claim to have captured Kālañjara may not be baseless. Most of the victories of Kṛṣṇa III had been achieved during the lifetime of his father, i.e., sometime before 940 A.D. Dr. Ray thinks that, 'it is not unlikely that Yaśovarman may have captured the famous hill-fort not from the Gurjara Pratihāras, as was so long believed, but from the Rāṣṭrakūṭas'. As Yaśovarman is thus supposed to have conquered Kālañjara from the Rāṣṭrakūṭas, and not from the Gurjara Pratihāras, it will explain why even after this conquest he continued to regard the Pratihāra ruler as his overlord. It must be noted however that there is no positive evidence showing that the Candellas conquered Kālañjara from the Rāṣṭrakūṭas.

The inscriptions of the Kālañjuris and the Candellas throw light on their mutual relations at different stages of their history. In the Khajuraho inscription of Candella Yaśovarman dated V.S. 1011 mention is made of a severe defeat inflicted by him on the Kālañjuris. Verse 28 of the inscription

says that the Cedi king, whose forces were countless, was conquered by Yasovarman (sūkhye-balaṃ vyajēṣṭha gatabhīryaṃ Cedirājam hathat). In another place of the same inscription also (verse 23), where other expeditions of Yasovarman are mentioned, there is an allusion to his victory over the Cedis. No doubt the same episode has thus been referred to in these different parts of the record. It is in verse 23 that we come across the phrase 'aḍat sāvadya Cedih' in connection with the Candella expedition against the Cedis. The intrinsic significance of the term 'sāvadya', which means 'one liable to condemnation', as applied to the Cedi king, has not been explained in the inscription itself. But with the help of other contemporary inscriptions, which refer to the history of the Kālacuris, an attempt may be made to explain why this epithet has been used in a record of the victorious Candella ruler, Yasovarman against the defeated Cedi king.

The attitude of the Candellas towards the Kālacuris in the time of Yasovarman, as shown by the use of this expression, was strikingly different from what it had been in the earlier period. It may be remembered that Yasovarman's father, Hārṣa had been granted freedom from fear by the Kālacuri king Kōkkalla (c. 875-925 A.D.) as recorded in the Benares Grant of Karna.\(^{13}\)

---

13. ibid., II., P. 306, V. 7.; The identification of Hārṣa the 'lord of Citrakūṭa' with Candella Hārṣa is not accepted in I.H.Q., XIII., Pp. 482 ff.
It implies that the two powers were in a sort of friendly political alliance, which had most probably been cemented by the marriage of Kokkalla with a Caudella princess, Nattā or Nāttākhyadēvi. The Kalacūris equated this union with the divine couples of Śacī and Indra, Kamālā and Upendra, and Umā and Candramālī. Although there is no reference to the early relations of the Caudellas with the Kalacūris in the records of the former prior to the time of Yaśovarman, it seems highly probable in view of the evidence of Kalacūri epigraphy, that such relations were not unfriendly. But when in a record of Yaśovarman's reign the Kalacūris are spoken of with evident contempt, as in the inscription already referred to, it definitely means that not only the Caudellas were now hostile to the latter, but that there were some special reasons for their being provoked against the Kalacūris.

The Caudellas were no doubt emboldened to proceed against the Kalacūris during the time of Yaśovarman, relying on their increased power due to the effective part they played in securing the throne for Kṣitipāla, to their matrimonial alliance with the Cāhamanās, and to some conquests which must have already been achieved by the Caudellas as the Khajurāho inscription mentions.

The aggressive policy in this new situation can be well understood. But the question is: why did they use the term 'aūvadya' while mentioning their enemy, the Kalacūris?

15. Ibid., I., P. 122, L. 10.
16. Ibid., P. 126, V. 21.
The policy of friendship pursued by the Kalacuris, as shown in a verse of the Benares Grant, already alluded to, and in another verse in the Bilhari inscription,17 was subsequently changed. They became more and more definitely attached to the Rästrakūtas, thus allying themselves with a power which had aggressive intentions in the north.

There was a series of political marriages between the Rästrakūtas and the Kalacuris:-

(i) Kṛṣṇa II married the younger sister of Saṅkuka (Saṅkaragāna), a daughter of Kokkalla I.18

(ii) Jagattuṅgadeva, son of Kṛṣṇa II, married Lākṣmī and Govindāmbā, both daughters of Saṅkaragāna, son of Kokkalla.

(iii) Indra III married Vijāmbā, grand-daughter of Arjuna, another son of Kokkalla.19

It will appear from the above that in every case the bride came from the Kalacuri family. This may suggest admission of an inferior status by the Kalacuris in their relations with the Rästrakūtas. This policy of courting favour

---

17. B.I., I., P. 256.; V. 17.
20. ibid., P. 265.
of the Rastrakutas could not have been liked by the North Indian powers. It was definitely against their interests, as strategically the Kalacuri dominion might be used as a springboard of Rastrakuta attacks against them. They also lowered themselves in the estimation of those powers whose interests were linked up with the political fortunes of Northern India, particularly the Candellas.

The Rastrakuta invasions of the early 10th century A.D. dealt a severe blow to the Gurjara Pratihara power. In some of their campaigns the Rastrakutas seem to have received actual help from the Kalacuris, who are mentioned in the Anodā Plate, as having carried on plunderous raids on a number of territories including that of the Gurjaras.

The Candellas themselves could not but regard their attachment to the Rastrakutas as hostile to their own interest. The establishment of Rastrakuta authority in Kālañjara, however temporary it might be, was possibly facilitated by this alliance. The subsequent occupation of Kālañjara by Yasovarman marked the turning point of the fortunes of the family. If Kālañjara was conquered from the Rastrakutas the Candellas must have regarded them as their enemy. Association with their enemy on the part of the Kalacuris must have caused irritation to the Candellas particularly, because the Kalacuris, compared with the Rastrakutas, were a weaker power, and as such might have appeared as depending on the patronage of the Rastrakutas. In the circumstances it was quite natural for the Candellas to have described the Kalacuris as *sāvadya*.

23. H.I., XIX., pp. 75, 76.

24. A similar attitude was expressed by Nāgabhāta II against Cakrāyudha for his 'lowly demeanour' in acting as a protégé of the Pāla king, Dharmapāla. H.I., XVIII., p. 99.
It is necessary to consider the question of the identification of the Cedi ruler so impetuously defeated by Yasovarman. The history of the Kalacuri dynasty shows that after Mughdhatunga, the son of Kokkalla I, three rulers occupied the Cedi throne in quick succession (viz., Bāla-Harṣa, Yuvarāja and Laksmanarāja), and all of them appear to have been contemporaries of Yasovarman. It is therefore difficult to say who among these three was defeated at Yasovarman's hand. As Bāla-Harṣa, the eldest son of Mughdhatunga had a very short reign, and is not prominently mentioned, it was most probably he, whose career may have been cut short by Yasovarman. This may also explain the omission of his name from some of the records of his successors. The identification of the Cedi king defeated by Yasovarman with either Laksmanarāja or his predecessor, Yuvarāja I, is less probable as on the evidence of the Bihari Record, definite improvement in the position of the Cedi power may have taken place during their reign.27

Eulogies about Yasovarman's exploits. - With regard to the achievements of Yasovarman, we notice that the Candella records, like the Khajurāho Inscription of V.S. 1051,28 another of V.S. 1059,29 and the Nanyaura Plate 'A' of Dhanyadeva of V.S. 1056,30 are all eloquent about them. Thus V. 26 of the

---
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Khajurāho Inscription of V.S. 1011 in a conventional manner reads, - "When dust rose on the expeditions of his forces the river of Heaven had its current diverted mid-way by the embankments formed in it; the sun having its lustre covered was pleasant like a mirror; seeing the sky covered with clouds the elephants of the Lord of the gods became delighted and the swans eagerly looked upwards, and a thousand eyes of averted enemies became closed". As the Praśasti does not give any specific details there is no historical value in it. In another verse Yasovarman is stated to have surpassed Pārtha (i.e., Arjuna) in military prowess (sa śurah Pārthopi prathitamahi-mānāḥ). It is also said that "in battle the impetuous massive arms of that ocean of regal splendour (ksatra tejombūrāseḥ) engaged in conquering the earth, did not cease to itch even though the enemies had clearly disappeared nobody knew whither". Amongst this mass of exaggerated statements we come to find a somewhat practical suggestion in verse 23 which reads thus -

Gauda-kriḍālatāsis-tulita Khaśabalāh Kośalāh kośalēnām Nāsyat Kaśmiravīraḥ sithīlita Mithilāh kālavan Mālavānām Sīdat sāvadya Cediḥ Kurutarusumarut saṃjvaro Gurjjarānām Tasmat tasyāṃ sa yajña nṛpakuṭilakah Śrī Yaśovarmanājah//

(Trans.)- "Who was a sword to (cut down) the Gaudas, as if they were mere pleasure-creepers; equalled the forces of the Khaṣas

33. ibid., Pp. 128, 133., V. 36.
34. ibid., Pp. 126, 132.
and carried off the treasures of the Kosalas; before whom perished the Kashmiri warriors; who weakened the Mithilas, and as it were a God of Death to the Malavas; who brought distress to the shameful Cedis; who was to the Kurus what a storm is to the trees, and a scorching fire to the Gurjaras.

This verse claims that Yalovarman undertook a number of campaigns over a vast area in Northern India, from the Himalayas to Malava and from Kashmir to Bengal. There must be an element of exaggeration in this account, but the consensus of opinion among scholars is that Yalovarman must be credited with military successes in some regions, at least Bihar and Bengal.

Yalovarman's Expedition to Bengal. - It is to be particularly noted that the military power of the Gaudas in the opinion of the purastikāra was so insignificant that it could be subdued as easily as a pleasure-creeper is cut down with the help of a sword. If this statement is to be believed, the military weakness of the Gauda rulers must have been one of the main factors responsible for their defeat. The decline of the Pāla power at this stage (prior to 953-54 A.D.) is a well-known fact and is borne out by independent data.

The Khajurāho Inscription, by referring to the Gaudas, undoubtedly meant the Pālas. The Candella invasion took place before 954 A.D. This was the time when Rājyopāla (c. 906-40 A.D.) and after him Gopāla II (c. 946-60 A.D.) occupied the

35. I.H.Q., XXII., P. 213.
Pāla throne. They were admittedly weak rulers and were unable to retrieve the lost fortunes of their family, whose decline started shortly after Devapāla's reign.

As the history of the Pālas show, there were different successful attempts made by these rulers to recover their lost power in the 10th and 11th centuries. The recuperative power of the Pālas could not be overlooked by the Candellas, who regarded them as their potential enemy. This explains the reason why Yaśovarman led his expedition against Gauda. In fact he was only following a line of action which is demanded by the recognition of a danger inherent in a political situation which had menacing potentialities. The Pālas were the 'prakṛtyamitra' of the Candellas as described in the Arthaśāstra of Kautilya.

The reference in the Khajurāho inscription to Yaśovarman's attack on Gauda does not imply that any attempt was made by him to incorporate the dominion of the defeated Gauda king in his realm. But it may be assumed that his expedition made the Pāla power still weaker and less able to resist any attack. The confusion which the Gauda invasion created gave an opportunity to the Kāmbojas to capture north and western Bengal and to found a separate kingdom.

38. H.B., I., Chap. VI., App. II (The chronology of the Pala kings), Pp. 176-77.
40. There is a sharp difference of opinion among scholars regarding the origin and identity of the Kāmboja rulers. H.B., I., Pp. 190-91.
The Dinajpur Raj Palace Pillar Inscription refers to a Gauda king of Kamboja lineage (Kambojanvayaja-Gaudapati), and the Irda Copper Plate Grant mentions a line of Kamboja rulers (Kambojavaméasilakah) dominating considerable portions of West Bengal. The scholars are generally of the opinion that the Kamboja rule began from about the middle of the 10th century A.D. The establishment of the Kamboja power seems to have been preceded by the invasion of Gauda by Yasovarman. Thus it appears that although the Candellas did not occupy Gauda, their invasion created a situation in which it was possible for another family to occupy the territory.

The Bāngad Grant of Mahipāla, who re-occupied Gauda, says that those under whose possession this territory had remained had no real title to it, and were merely usurpers. The expression 'vilupta' used in this connection clearly shows the complete loss of power of the Pālas in this area. There is no indication in this passage to show that this loss was the culmination of any serious fight put up by the Pālas against their enemy. The enemies' victory seems to have been simply a case of usurpation (anadhikrta viluptam). The Pālas with their army greatly impaired (as shown by the Khajurāho Record of Y.S. 1011), had been so much weakened by the Candellas, that they had no means of efficiently resisting this usurpation.

42. E.I., XXII., Pp. 150-59; ibid., XXIV., P. 43.
43. ibid., XIV., P. 324; G.L.M., P. 91.
Invasion of Mithilā. - The other state of the same region mentioned in the Khajurāho record is Mithilā, which received a shake-up at the hands of Candella Yaśovarman. Mithilā or North Bihar, therefore, seems to have been outside the political jurisdiction of the Pālas at the time of Yaśovarman’s invasion. It may be remembered that Mahendrapāla of the Gurjara-Pratihāra family succeeded in establishing his control over Bihar and N. Bengal during the reign of the Pāla ruler Narāyaṇapāla. Even it is suggested by some scholars that the Candras of East Bengal, who trace their origin from Rohitagiri (identifiable with Rohtasgarh), were original residents of N. Bihar, but most probably they migrated eastwards due to the pressure of the army of Mahendrapāla. Thus it appears that Mithilā was the seat of a tributary ruler, or, in any case, it enjoyed some amount of autonomy or separate political entity.

The Uddāndapur Image Inscription of the 54th year of Narāyaṇapāla testifies to the restoration of authority in portions of E. Bihar, which has led scholars like Dr. Ray to presume that Mithilā also was then restored to the Pālas.

44. H.B., I., P. 129; D.H.N.I., I., Pp. 302-03; ibid., II., P. 676, f.m. 1.
45. I.B., III., P. 3. There is a controversy about the correct reading of the term as well as its location. Bhattasali identifies it with modern Lālmāi hills near Comilla.
47. I.A., XVII., P. 110.
and as such, separate mention of Mithilā in the Khajurāho record was of no historical value. But it may be pointed out that no direct reference to the region north of the Ganges is found in any of the Pāla records so far. It is only during the reign period of Mahipāla I that we come to find some evidence regarding the recovery of N. Bihar by him (Imādpar image inscriptions of the 48th year of Mahipāla). It may not therefore be impossible that Mithilā was an autonomous political unit, the 'de jure' authority of which might have rested either with the Pratiharas or with the Pālas. If that is accepted, then, of course, it may be suggested that Candella king, Yadvaman might have fought this small power, practically at the entrance of the Pāla dominion. But in the absence of more definite data we cannot be sure on the point.

Relation with the Malavās. - In the south-western region, the Khajurāho record refers to the Malavā country. It is claimed in the verse that Yadvaman was like the Lord of Death to the Malavās (kālavan Kālavanām). The claim is, however, rejected on the ground of Mālwa being still under the Gurjara rulers of Kannauj. It is well known however that the Raṣṭrakūta hold over Mālwa continued till about the first quarter of the 10th century A.D., when taking advantage of some dynastic struggles among the successors of Indra III, the Pratiharas asserted their supremacy and established their control over this region once again. The Parmārās, who were

practically agents of the Rāstrakūtās in running the administration of Mālwa were now driven out to Gujarat. The Paramāra king, who met this tragic fate has been identified with Vairisimha II (c. 918-46 A.D.), and it is believed that this incident came about towards the latter part of his reign. But Dr. D. C. Ganguly, while admitting Vairisimha II's exile in Lāṭamāṇḍala, observes on the evidence of the Udaipur Praśasti that before his death Vairisimha II re-established the Paramāra hold in Mālwa, presumably with the help of the Rāstrakūtās. He was succeeded by his son, Siyaka II, alias Harṣa, who, it is generally held was a contemporary of Candella Yaśovarman. Siyaka II, who came to the throne after 949 A.D., claims to have defeated the Hūna chief to the north-west of Mālwa and probably had plans of further expansion of his territories. But his progress must have been retarded by Candella Yaśovarman. As there is no direct reference to any open conflict between the two in the records of either dynasty, we can possibly take the expression used in the Khajurāho record, 'kālavan Mālavānām' to denote only the menacing potentiality of the Candellas poised against the Mālavas, i.e., the Paramāras. The real significance of it was that both the former feudatories of the Imperial Pratihāras now gathered sufficient strength in the absence of the suzerain power to provide a check to each other against further consolidation.

52. H.P., Ganguly, P. 36.
Invasion of Kosala. - The record also refers to the Kosala country, whose treasures were carried away by the Candalia king (kośalah Kośalānām). Scholars have taken this to be an expression of poet's skill in the use of figurative language only, because, it is held that the Kosala country was within the limits of the Pratihāra empire. Evidently Uttara-Kosala, modern Oudh was meant but in fact during this period the state of Kosala naturally indicated the region of the upper Mahanadi valley, which was known as Daksīṇa Kosala, Mahā Kosala or Kosala. The epigraphic records of this region reveal that a line of rulers claiming to belong to Pāṇḍuvaṁśa ruled there. They used the title, 'Kośalādhipati' (lord of Kosala). Palaeographically their records are assigned to about the 6th and 7th centuries A.D. As most of their inscriptions were issued from Srīpura (modern Sirpur, Raipur Dist.), they are commonly designated as Srīpura line of kings. They are believed to be connected with the 'Kośalaendra-Somavamsi' kings of Sambalpur (Orissa) whose records are placed between the 10th and 12th centuries A.D. on palaeographic considerations.

The Bilhari inscription of the Cedi rulers eulogised Mugdantunga, son of Kalaśuri Kokkalla as having 'conquered the line of country by the shore of the eastern sea, and wrested Pāli from the Lord of Kosala'. 'Pāli' has been located by

55. I.H.Q., XX., P. 80.
56. E.I., XI., P. 186.
57. ibid., I., Pp. 256, 265.
scholars at the village of the same name (12 miles to the north-east of Ratnapur in the Bilaspur Dist.), and Śivagupta of the Orissan branch, has been identified as the 'Kośālendra' of the Bilhari record, defeated by the Cedi king, Śivagupta is generally placed round about 950 A.D. The Kalacuris gradually ousted the Somavāṃśi rulers from their possessions in Chatisgarh and restricted their power in western Orissa. Therefore it is not unlikely that in spite of high-sounding titles and designations that the Somavāṃśi rulers might have been using in their own records, they were most probably under the influence of the Cedi rulers, if not their feudatories. The idea is further strengthened by the adoption of the Gajalakṣmi symbol by the Somavāṃśis of Orissa on their seals and inscriptions, a feature particularly associated with the Kalacuris.

A Kalacuri record (Ratnapur Stone inscription of Jajalladeva) shows that of the 18 sons of Kokkalla, the eldest one succeeded to the throne while others became 'mandalādhī- patis' or feudatory chiefs, including one Kalihgaraja, the founder of the Tummana branch. Similar family ties between the Kośālendras and the Kalacuris may not be unlikely. But there is no direct evidence to pursue the point further.

Remembering the Cedi-Candella hostilities, already referred to, it may not be impossible that the political ties between the Somavāṃśis and the Kalacuris were responsible for the irritation of the Candella ruler, Yaśovarman, who might
have raided the kingdom of the Kośalas of the south during the reign of Śivagupta (c. 950 A.D.). The expression, 'kośalak Kośalānām' is also indicative of a snap raid than any pitched battle or a long-drawn war.

The verse (V. 23) in the Khajurāho record (V.S. 1011) also refers to the northern regions of the country. With regard to the claim of Yaśovarman to have vanquished the forces of Kāśmir (mañyat Kāśmiravirah), it may at once seem absurd and nothing but poetic exaggeration. From the practical point of view, as also from the standpoint of sound politics, taking out of an expedition to such a far off region by a rising power, however virile, is well nigh impossible. The history of Kāśmir during this period, i.e., the middle of 10th century A.D., however reveals a sorry state of affairs. Dynastic conflicts and palace intrigues vitiated the political atmosphere of Kāśmir since the death of Yaśasakara of the Utpala dynasty in 948 A.D., in the midst of which the child king Saagramadeva was murdered by one of the ministers, named Parvagupta, who seated himself on the throne in 949 A.D. Such a time is undoubtedly highly suitable for an enterprising neighbour, who may, in the words of Kautilya, be a 'vījīgisu rāja', to deal an effective blow and cripple it for some time at least. But the situation of the Candella territory and the political condition in northern India during the period can hardly make us believe in the claim put forward in the Khajurāho record. Rather it is clear from Kalhana's Rājatarangini and other extant inscriptions.

of Kashmir dynasties that all its strength and weakness were due to internal factors with no extraneous elements having any hand in it.

In the same way we may examine the claim of Yaśovarman having reduced the Khasa forces to a position of contempt (tulita Khaṣabelah). The term 'tulita' was interpreted by Kielhorn as 'equalled', but Dr. Majumdar has shown that the term has also uses in Sanskrit texts to denote 'treated with contempt', which is more appropriate in the context of the complete statement here. The Khasas, it may be mentioned, were the masters of the Lohara country on the borders of the Kashmir state. It seems that the composer of the record had a fair knowledge of the geography of the country, and in establishing the claims of his patron he utilised it wisely.

Invasion of the Kuru country: Clash with the Pratihāras.

Another state which finds mention in the record is that of Kuru, which suffered the storm of the Candella invasion (Kuru-taruṣu marat). The Kuru country was in the Delhi region, and as such, it was definitely included in the Pratihāra dominion. So this claim of Yaśovarman is highly doubtful, particularly in view of the fact he used an expression of allegiance to the Imperial power at the end of the Khajurāho record of Y.S. 1011. But at the same time it cannot be denied that simply by the occupation of the fortress of Kālañjhar

61. B.I., I., P. 132.
Yaśovarman earned an unique status for his family, and that together with some military expeditions in spheres originally held by the Pratihāras, the Candellas have already grown to be a serious menace to the Imperial power. The show of allegiance in official documents was nothing but a mere formality. On the other hand verse 23 clearly stated that Yaśovarman became 'asājvaro Gurjarānām'. This was the expression of the real feeling between the effete Imperial power and an almost liberated feudatory ruler. In the very next generation, when Dhana, the son of Yaśovarman was on the Candella throne, he claims to have defeated a Kanauj prince (nikhila nṛpaṁ yām Kānya-kubja-narendra samara bhuvivi vijityah' - Mau Stone Insc. of Madanavarma). Therefore it may be quite likely that since the occupation of Kālaśjēr occasional clashes of interest between the Pratihāras and the Candellas were not uncommon, and such an incident might have come about in the Kuru country, which has been alluded to in the vague expression, 'Kurutarusu-marut'.

It is, however, quite clear that Yaśovarman was a successful military leader who did not fail to take the best advantage of the decay of the Imperial power in North India and truly laid the foundation of the Candella state which wielded a strong influence in Indian politics from the middle of the 10th century A.D.

Extent of the kingdom. - The Khajurāho Record of V.S. 1011, it has already been shown, endows Yaśovarman with an unchallenged authority over the whole of Northern India from Kāśmir to Bengal, and from the Kuru country to Dakṣiṇa
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Kosala. But from the analysis of the account, as has been attempted in the previous pages, it appears that barring the exaggerated portions of the statement, Yasovarman may be credited to have gained some successes against the Cedis to the south-west of his dominion, and against Bengal and Bihar to the east. But it is quite clear that none of these areas were incorporated into his dominion, nor even any attempt was made to establish authority over the regions concerned.

The only positive evidence that is available from the Khajuraho inscription is the reference to Yasovarman's conquest of the Kālāmjar fort, and naturally occupation of the adjoining area. The findspot of the inscription and its evidence of the erection of the temple dedicated to Vaikunțha at Khajuraho undoubtedly indicate inclusion of the area within the ambit of his direct administration. That is to say, Yasovarman was the ruler of Bundelkhand proper.

Verse 39 of the Khajuraho inscription further describes how Yasovarman, alias Lakṣavarman, in course of his expeditions turned the Yamuna and the Gaṅga into his pleasure-lakes (keli-saras) and their waters became muddy by the bathing of his furious mighty elephants (majjamatta karīndra pakhila jalom Sri Lakṣavarmaḥbhidhāsacakre Śakrasamah Kalindatanayam Jahnohsutam ca kramāt//). This verse indicates that Yasovarman
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was able to establish his authority over the Ganges-Jumna valley, i.e., the area roundabout Allahabad. In consideration of the proximity of the area to the Candella territory, and in view of the possibility of clashes with the Imperial Pratihāra power, who must have been holding the region till at least 931 A.D. (the date of the Asiatic Society's Plate, donating lands in the Vārānasi viśaya), the occupation of this area by Yaśovarman does not seem impossible. Rather the reference to his son Dhanga's voluntary death at the confluence of the Ganges and the Jumna, near Allahabad, as recorded in the Khajurāho inscription of V.S. 1059, makes it all the more probable.

The Dudāhi inscription, found in a village in the southern portion of the Lalitpur district, records the existence of a prince named Devalabāhi, claiming to be a grandson of Yaśovarman through Krishnapa and Asarva (Mahārāja-dhirāja Śrī Yaśovarmanapṭr Śrī Kṛṣṇapasaṭa mātri Śrī Asarva udarabhava Candellānvaya Śrī Devalabāhiyaṁ). Evidently this Krishnapa was another son of Yaśovarman who did not succeed to the throne. From the findspot of the inscription it appears that Krishnapa must have been placed by Yaśovarman on the Mālava–Candella frontier, like the Warden of the Marches. Thus it becomes clear that to the south-west the Candella territory touched the borders of the Mālavadesa, or
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the kingdom of the Malava people, to whom the Candellas were like the "Lord of Death" (kālavan Mālavanām).

His family. - The Khajuraho inscription no. 4 of V.S. 1059 introduces us to the queen of Yaśovarman, named Puppadēvi. In describing her, verse 40 says:

Mahāvamśā satampannā prasannā dhāritāvanti
Narmādevā bhavād-devā Puppa tasya mahīpatē/

It is stated in the verse that Puppadēvi hailed from a reputed family (the name of the family is however not mentioned herein) and that she was as pious as the holy Narmadā. In the following verse (V. 41) she has been equated to Sācī, the wife of Indra, the lord of the gods (Sā devā naru Devādeva devādhipateḥ Sācīva saccaritam), and it may be presumed that their domestic life was quite happy and peaceful. Puppadēvi was the mother of the renowned son Ḍhangadeva, who succeeded Yaśovarman on the Candella throne. Krishnapapa was most probably another son of Yaśovarman, as mentioned in the Dudahi inscriptions. But nothing else is known about him.

Estimate. - The career of Candella Yaśovarman, it will thus appear, was marked with significant political developments. From the position of a petty subordinate ruler of Central India under the Pratihāras, Yaśovarman not only liberated himself and laid the foundations of the independent Candella kingdom, but by his forceful and vigorous military measures, he made his influence acutely felt by the Imperial power as well as other contemporary powers of the north and central India in the second quarter of the 10th century A.D.
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Naturally with the weakening of the Pratihāras, the Candellas under Yasovarman came to play more and more important roles in the politics of north India. This by itself is no mean achievement for any sovereign.

Yasovarman was not only a military genius, as is proved by his successes in the political field, but he must have also taken adequate measures for the well-governance of his realm, without which he could hardly have found it possible to undertake these military expeditions. Materials are however scanty for a detailed study of the measures adopted by him, but from whatever material that is available for his reign it may not be wrong to believe that he introduced in his own kingdom the system of administrative bureaucracy that was current generally in North India during this period.

His records do not mention the name of any of his ministers, but we find reference to one of the important functionaries of the state, viz., the writer of legal documents (karanika) Jaddha the Gauda, who was well versed in Sanskrit language.1 The name of the court-poet, who composed the lengthy Khajuraho record, is Poet Madhava, son of Dedda the grammarian.2

As for other public works undertaken by Yasovarman the Khajurāho Inscription no. 4 refers to the construction of a big tank (taḍāgārṇavān).3 Another inscription (no. 2) from the

---
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same place records the erection of a magnificent temple dedicated to Viṣṇu. The golden pinnacles of the temple illuminated the sky and became, it is said, the object of attraction for even the inhabitants of the heaven. This temple has been identified by Cunningham with the Vaiṣṇava temple at Khajurāho, also known as the Caturbhujā temple. The image that was installed in the temple was also a very valuable one. It was, as stated in the record, 'obtained by the Lord of Bhūtanātha (Tibot) from Kailasa, and from him, Sāhi the king of the Kīras (near Kashmir) received it as a token of friendship, and from him afterwards Herambapāla obtained it for a force of elephants and horses, and Yaśovarman himself received it from Hayapati Devapāla, the son of Herambapāla. The text of the inscription however reveals that king Yaśovarman was above petty jealousies of sectarian worshippers and even while founding a temple for Viṣṇu showed respects to Śiva and his consort as well as to Śaṅkara, the Sun God.'
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76. ibid., pp. 124-25, 129, vv. 1-4 and the opening expression "Om Nama Bhagavato Vasudevaya" as well as the last sentence "Namo Bhagavato Vasudevaya// Namo Savitro//"