Chapter V.

The Growth of the Caudella power: Dhaṅga.

Yaśovarman was succeeded on the Caudella throne by his son, Dhaṅga, sometime before V.S. 1011 (953-54 A.D.), as is evident from the fact that the Khajurāho Inscription no. 2, which had been composed during the lifetime of Yaśovarman was set up after his death, when Dhaṅga was on the throne. Presumably Dhaṅga had an undisputed succession. Dudāhi Inscriptions, as it has already been mentioned before, refer to another son of Yaśovarman, named Kṛṣṇapa, whose son, Devalabdhī, was most probably guarding the Mālava frontier during Dhaṅga’s time. It may not be unreasonable to presume that this important function was most probably entrusted in the first instance to Kṛṣṇapa, the father of Devalabdhī by Yaśovarman, who it may be remembered, claimed to be as fierce as the ‘Lord of death to the Mālavas’. Evidently Kṛṣṇapa does not appear to have contested the claim of his brother, Dhaṅga to the throne.

Yaśovarman, we have seen, laid the foundations of the greatness of the family, and Dhaṅga, it must be admitted, ably and steadfastly followed the footsteps of his father and by his own achievements established the claim of the Caudellas to be ranked among the leading contemporary powers of Northern India.

1. JS.I., I., P. 129, V. 44.
It was during the reign of Dhahga that we meet with for the first time a definite demarcation of the limits of the Candella kingdom, as indicated in the Khajuraho inscription of V.S. 1011, V. 45 of which reads as follows:-

Ā-Kālañjaram ā-ca Mālavanādi tirasthite Bhāsvatāḥ
Kālindī saritas taṭādita itopya Gāḍidersāvadheḥ/
Ā-tasmādāpi vīsamayaika nilayaḥ Gopābhidhānamagireryaḥ
sasti kṣëtimayatorjjita bhuja vyāpāra līlārjitaḥ//

(Trans.) — He playfully acquired by the action of his long and strong arms, as far as Kālañjara, and as far as Bhāsvat situated on the banks of the river of Mālava, from here also to the bank of the river Kālindī, and from here also to the frontiers of the Cedi country, and even as far as that mountain called, Gopa.

Thus it appears from the verse that the Candella kingdom during the reign of Dhahga included two strategic fortresses of Northern India, viz., Kālañjara and Gwalior. The territory thus brought under the control of Dhahga took the shape of almost a triangle with Gwalior fort forming the vertical point and an irregular line drawn from Bhāsvat, identified with Bhāllasvāmin (modern Bhilsā) on the Betwā river or Mālavanādī, to the confluence of the Ganges and the Jumna (Kālindī), forming the base of the triangle. This, when compared to the area held directly by Yaśovarman, reveals the achievements of Dhahga.

Conquest of Gwalior; Relation with the Kacchapaghātas.

Just as the occupation of Kalanjar fort by Tasovarman earned for the Candellas a distinctive status among the contemporary powers, so the conquest of Gwalior fort (28° N. Lat. and 78° E. Long.) situated on the principal route to reach the Central Indian valley, in the reign of Dhahga, was his principal achievement. This, in fact, enabled Dhahga to declare himself as an independent ruler, as in none of the subsequent records do we find any indication of acknowledgment of Pratihāra overlordship by the Candella rulers.

The Sās Bahu Temple Inscription of Mahipāladeva of V.S. 1150 reveals the existence of a Kacchapaghāta family in possession of the Gwalior fort and its environs in the 10th and 11th centuries A.D. Vajradāman, the second in descent from the founder of the family, has been credited with the capture and occupation of the 'Gopādridurga' from the 'Gadhinagarādhīśa', who has generally been identified with a ruler of the Imperial Gurjara-Pratihāra dynasty of Kanauj. The record however, does not mention the name of the Gurjara Pratihāra ruler, who is thus claimed to have been defeated. The evidence of a Jain fragmentary image inscription at Suhaniya, dated Samvat 1034 (977 A.D.) mentions Śrī Vajrādāma who has been identified with Vajradāman of the Sās Bahu record. Thus the conquest of Gwalior must have been accomplished earlier than 977 A.D. The question naturally arises, who was the 'Gadhinagarādhīśa', referred to in the inscription?

The records of the Gurjara Pratiharas would undoubtedly show that the Gwalior region including the strategic fort was in the possession of the Imperial rulers till at least 942-43 A.D., as evidenced by the Rakhetra Stone Inscription of Vinayakapāla, dated V.S. 999-1000. In the circumstances it may be held that the Gurjara Pratiharas must have lost the fort of Gwalior to the Kacchapaghātas sometime between 944 and 977 A.D. Contemporary history shows that great confusion prevailed amongst the Gurjara Pratiharas due to internal dissensions and fresh Rāṣṭrakūṭa attacks. It was during this period of turmoil that the fortress of Gwalior slipped out of their hands.

But as indicated in verse 45 of the Khajurāho Inscription of V.S. 1011, the conquest of the Gwalior fort by Dhaṅga cannot also be doubted. Moreover Dhaṅga claims to have inflicted a crushing defeat on a Kanauj prince. It is not impossible that this defeat of the Gurjara Pratihāra Chief resulted in the further expansion of the Candella territory including the Gopādri durga. Like the Sās Bahu Record, the Man Inscription also does not furnish the name of the 'Kanyakubja-narendra', who was defeated by Dhaṅga.

We have thus the evidence of the conquest of Gwalior by the Kacchapaghāta Vajradāman and again by the Candella Dhaṅga.

10. E.I., I., Pp. 197, 203., v. 3.

'Kīkhila nṛpam yah Kanyakubja narendram samara bhuvī vijitya prāpa sāmrājyauccaih/*
This has given rise to a complicated issue. Dr. H. O. Ray suggests that the Kacchapaghātās were at first feudatories to the Imperial Gurjara Pratiharas till they gained mastery of the Gwalior Fort by defeating the ruler of Kanauj, whom he identifies with Vijayapāla (960 A.D.). The sovereignty that they thus acquired, according to the same scholar, was short-lived, as they had very soon to yield to the rising power of the Candellas and acknowledge their hegemony.

But as we have already shown, 'the mountain called Gopāgiri' came to be included within the Candella State as early as 954 A.D. If the Candellas conquered it before 954 A.D., how could Vajradāman conquer it from the Pratiharas? There is no evidence to show that the Candellas lost the Gwalior Fort to the Gurjara-Pratiharas between 954 and 977 A.D., so that it might have been possible for Vajradāman to conquer it again from the latter. Hence it must be concluded that the Candella episode and the Kacchapaghātā episode connected with the conquest of Gopāpāli are not separate stories, but that they refer to a single even in which the Candellas and the Kacchapaghātās were closely associated together. In short, the Fort was occupied by Vajradāman for the Candellas.

The Śaṅgh Bahu Temple Inscription is dated in Y.S. 1150 (A.D. 1093) during the time of Mahipāla, eighth in descent from Lakṣmana, the founder of the family. Counting backwards for six generations, from Mahipāla to Vajradāman, taking 25 years as an average, we arrive at 940 A.D. for Vajradāman.


One of the members, Padmapāla, is mentioned to have died young. In view of the possible uncertain element in this calculation, we may hold that Vajradāman's career began in about 950 A.D., and ended in about 980 A.D. ¹⁴

Now with regard to the theory that the Kacchapaghatas were feudatories to the Gurjara Pratiharas, it may be observed that first, there is no history of any contact between the Gurjara Pratiharas and the Kacchapaghatas earlier than the incident resulting in the loss of Gopādri. Hence it will not be safe to conclude that they were originally feudatories to the Gurjara Pratiharas. In fact, there is nothing on record to show that they ruled over any territory before their conquest of Gwālior.

Regarding the position and status of the Kacchapaghatas subsequent to their occupation of the Gwālior Fort, it is generally assumed that they were under the Candella hegemony. ¹⁵ The occupation of the Fort, which was achieved for the Candellas, must have laid the foundation of their vassalage.


'yuvaiva daiva pratikulabhavat Sahkrandan-āṅk-āsana-bhāg babhūva'.

14. Dr. H.C.Roy assigns to Vajradāman a reign-period of 20 years from c. 975-995 A.D. (D.H.N.I., II., P. 835), and Dr. D.C.Ganguly from c. 977-999 A.D. (H.P., P. 106., f.n. 1). But as has already been shown on the evidence of V. 45 of the Khajurāho Insc. of V.S. 1011, the Fort was under the Candellas during this period.

Extent of kingdom. - In describing the boundaries of the kingdom under Dhāṅga, we find it to have extended up to the Cedi country (Gedidesavadheh) on one side and Dhaillesvāmin or Bhilsā on the other, beyond which was the Mālavadosā. Therefore in that region Dhāṅga could hardly improve upon the achievements of his father, Yasovarman. But there can be no doubt about the fact that he maintained a firm grip over the prevailing political situation of the time. Further the bitterness of feeling of the Candellas against the Mālavas as well as the Cedis due to the subservience of both the latter powers to the Rāstrakūtās, had by this time been reversed. This must have resulted in the abatement of tension between them to some extent.

To the east, Dhāṅga retained his hold on the Ganges-Jumna doab, at the confluence of the two rivers, where he ended his life voluntarily by forsaking his mortal coil at the sacred waters of the 'Saṅgama'. That Benares was included in Dhāṅga's dominions is indicated by the Nanyaura Plate of V.S. 1055 (A.D. 998) which was issued by Pp. Mṇ. P., Kālaṅjarādhipati Dhāṅgadēva from Kaḍikā, recording the grant of a village to an immigrant Brāhmaṇa Bhatṭa Yasodhara, on the auspicious occasion of a lunar eclipse.7

Dhāṅga, like his father, undertook expeditions over a wide range in different parts of India beyond the limits of the territory actually held by the Candellas. His achievements in this respect are mentioned in verses 45 and 46 of the

---

Those verses refer to Dhahga's possible invasions on some portions of the Peninsular India, beyond the Vindhyas, as well as on some of the states of Eastern India, viz., Kosala, Kratha, Kuntala, Sinhala, Andhra, Anqa and Radha. In this case too, like that of his predecessor in verse 23 of the Khajuraho inscription of V.S. 1011, there are some obvious exaggerations. But in spite of that it is generally admitted that Dhahga's military potentiality helped him to rise to an important position in the history of Northern India.

Dhahga's Invasion on Bengal. - We have already referred to Yasovaman's successful military operations in Bengal towards the middle of the 10th century A.D., resulting in the crippling of the Pala power and the abrupt rise of the Kambojas in North Bengal. Some scholars think that they were the Kamboja-Palas, and not Kambojas, and that there was a division of the Pala dominion.

18. S.I., I., p. 145.
The attention of the Candellas towards Bengal affairs was however not withdrawn after that incident. When the Kāmboja-Pālas consolidated their position and began to assume Imperial titles like 'Paramesvara, Paramabhaṭṭaraka and Mahārājādhirāja', the Candellas most probably thought it necessary to be alert, so that the new power might not grow to be a source of danger to them in future. This policy is presumed to have culminated in Bhaṭṭa leading an expedition against West Bengal (Radha) as implied in V. 46 of the Khajurāho Inscription of V.S. 1059, corresponding to 1002 A.D.

The expedition indicated in the verse against Radha took place before 1000 A.D., i.e., sometime between 954 and 1002 A.D. The Kāmbojas were ruling in West Bengal (Varādhamābhukti, Dandabhukti mandala - Irīḍa Grant) during this time. Hence if the Candellas actually invaded Radha under Bhaṭṭa, they must have come into contact with the Kāmbojas. It is noteworthy however that this inscription does not refer to Gauda. The Kāmbojas, on the other hand, actually ruled in Gauda, as the Binajpur Inscription read with the Bangad Grant of Mahipāla I would definitely show. But the Candellas might have contented themselves merely with an invasion on Radha, which must have been an important centre of their power.

20. ibid., Ll. 20-21.
Dhaṅga, like his predecessor Yasōvarman, did not take any step to annex Raḍha to his dominion. The object of such invasions seems to have been merely to weaken the ruling power, so that no attempt could be made by it to extend itself beyond certain limits. With the weakening of the Kāmbojas as a result of Dhaṅga's invasion, the Pālas found an opportunity to reassert themselves and re-conquer their lost territory, as indicated in the Pāgaś Inscription. When Rājendra Cola's army invaded Bengal in about 1023 A.D., Uttara-Raḍha appears to have been included under Mahīpāla's dominion. It is quite likely that this part of West Bengal came into the possession of Mahīpāla after the Candella raid on West Bengal by Dhaṅga. Another part of West Bengal, Dakṣina-Raḍha (South western part of Bengal, between the Ajay and Dāmodar rivers), according to the Tīrumalai Inscription, was at this time under the rule of a Sura king, Ranaśura, and Dāndabhukti (Tandabutti of the Tīrumalai Record) - modern Dānton in Mīnapur District, was held by one Dharmaśala. Some scholars think that he belonged to the Kāmboja-Pala lineage of the Īrda Grant.

The reference to Dhaṅga's imprisoning of the wife of the King of Agra, as distinguished from the King of Raḍha, is also not without significance. As the inscriptions of the Pāla rulers since the days of Nārāyaṇapāla to Mahīpāla I, have continuously been found in South Bihar, it may be regarded to have been in the continuous possession of the
Pālas, particularly since the recovery of the region from the hands of Mahendrapāla of the Pratihāra dynasty. Evidently the Pāla king was meant by the term 'Aṅgandra'; if, of course, it did not allude to a feudatory of them. As such the Pāla dominion also was not free from Dhaṅga's raids. But it could not undermine the recuperative power of the Pālas which soon became manifest in Mahīpāla's achievements.

Southern Expedition. - It is hardly possible to believe that Dhaṅga became so powerful as to make his weight felt on the whole of the peninsular India, and even beyond, on the island-state of Ceylon (Siṁhala), as is claimed in the Khajurāho Record. Undoubtedly it is a case of poetic exaggeration. Dhaṅga might have, however, raided some of the territories in the Deccan, just to the south of the Vindhyas, viz., Kratha and Kośala.

We have already seen that Yaśovarman claims to have carried off the treasures of the Kośalas (Kośalā Kośalānām). There might have been a recurrence of a similar expedition by Dhaṅga on Daksīṇa Kośala, when its ruler was compelled to accept the suzerainty of the Candella ruler. Śivagupta (c. 950 A.D.) was succeeded by his son, Mahābhavagupta Janamejaya. The charters issued by Mahābhavagupta contain very little information about the political incidents of the reign of Mahābhavagupta, but it becomes quite evident that he was the ruler of Orissa proper only, though high-sounding

paramount titles might have been used in his records. Dhāṅga's possible invasion of Kośala and the latter's submission to the Candellas however temporary, may have brought them into conflict with the Cedis, who under Lakṣaṇapārāja, son of Yuvarāja I, claims to have inflicted a severe defeat on the Lord of Kośala (Kośala-nātha), who may be identified either with Mahābhāvagupta, as suggested by Dr. Ray, or with some of his successors.

Kratha is generally located in the Yeotmal district in North Berar, and according to tradition, Kratha is the name of an indigenous tribe inhabiting the particular region of Berar (Vidarbhā). The Kaha Grant of Kalacuri Soḍhaśeṣa dated V.S. 1134 (1077 A.D.) seems to suggest that the Krathas were in possession of Kalaṇjara prior to its occupation by the elder brother of Kalacuri Lakṣaṇapārāja. This incident must have happened long before the Pratihāra occupation of the Kalaṇjara mandala, in the 9th century A.D., of which we have epigraphic evidence. The Krathas, on being ousted from Kalaṇjara might have settled in Berar, and Dhāṅga on his way to Kośala must have come upon them, whereupon they had to

29. B.I., VII., P. 89., V. 5.
accept his suzerainty, which has been alluded to in the Khajurāho Record of V.S. 1059 (V. 45).

But Dhāṅga's claim to have imprisoned the wives of the kings of Kāñcī and Āndhra (V. 45), and to have compelled the ruler of Kuntala to obey his commands like a disciple (V. 46), as mentioned in the same record, can only be taken as mere praśasti. Towards the end of the 10th cent. A.D., the Rāṣṭrakūṭa power was fast declining, which relieved the North Indian rulers immensely from their constant apprehension of invasions from the South. But the revival of the Western Calukyas under Tailapa II Ahavamalla (973-97 A.D.), who dealt the final blow to the last king of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa lineage,31 and that of the Colas under Parantaka (907-53 A.D.) and Rājarāja the Great (985-1016 A.D.), and the rise of the Eastern Calukyas of Vengi preclude all possibilities of the Candella ruler having undertaken successful invasions on their territories, far less to speak of Śiṁhala (Ceylon).

So these references in the Candella records were in all probability incorporated by the court poet, who it must be admitted was quite conversant with the political condition of the time, viz., the eclipse of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas, the traditional enemy of the Northern powers, and the rest was mainly a fanciful expression of his pious wish.

Invasion of the Turks: The Role of Dhāṅga. - A fragmentary inscription discovered at Mahobā throw an interesting light on the achievements of Dhāṅga. Verse 17 of the record

reads as follows:-

"Nirmittavairibhahagah Sft Dhangah ityavani-mangalaavirasisit/
Sareqa yah svabhujayor-bhuvanabhihram Hamvira-am-apatibalam
tulisah cakara/".

"Dhanga, who caused destruction of his enemies, and who, by
the strength of his arms equaled even the powerful Hamvira,
who had proved a heavy burden for the earth". 32

The term 'Hamvira' is generally taken by scholars to be
derived from the Arabic word, 'Amir', meaning 'Commander'.
Later it came to acquire the use as a title for a Muhammadan
prince. The word Hamvira has variants like Hammira, and Hamira.
But they stray reference in the abovementioned Mahoba record
does not enable us to identify accurately the particular
Muslim prince mentioned therein. It is, however, generally
held that as the Yaminis Sultans themselves used the honorific
'Amir', Hamvira must refer either to Sabuktigin or his
illustrious son, Mahmud of Ghazna. Hultsch identifies
Hamvira of the Mahoba Record with Sabuktigin. 33 Mahmud, it is
well known, played the most significant role in almost all
the major expeditions of the Yaminis on Indian territories.
Even during the lifetime of Sabuktigin, Mahmud was associated
with his father in the latter's invasion on India. It is
recorded in the Tabakat i Akbari 34 that Amir Muhammad, the son
of Amir Nasiruddin showed much courage and great heroism in
the battle against Jayapala, and it was practically Mahmud's

32. E.I., I., P. 221.
34. T.A., P. 3.
strategy that compelled Jayapala to sue for peace on payment of some 50 elephants and much treasure. Then again, on ascending the throne of Ghazna in A.D. 999, Mahmud took a vow of taking out a 'holy' expedition to India every year; and this vow was not an empty boast. His iconoclastic zeal became almost a nightmare to the Indian princes, which has been very aptly expressed in the Mahobu record by the term 'bhuvanātibhārem', - his weight appeared unbearable to the Mother Earth. So to equate Dhang with Hamvira (Mahmud) in prowess and military achievements must have appeared to the praśastikāra as deserving of the highest reward.

But the question arises, why should the praśastikāra be so modest as to equate his hero (tulayām cakara) with another and not claim to have surpassed him? tul has the use of expression of 'treating with contempt', as has already been shown, in a verse in the Khajuraho Record of V.S. 1011. But the circumstances do not permit us to draw that meaning here. The available sources do not indicate that there was any direct fight between the Candella ruler and Sultan Mahmud. That Dhang was not defeated nor his kingdom was invaded by Mahmud might have been construed by a later court-poet in taking pride that the predecessor of his master was an equal to the Sultan.

A study of the political condition of the time (towards the end of the 10th cent. A.D.) reveals that Jayapala, the Sahi ruler of the Punjab, anticipating the magnitude of the

35. Dr. Nazim disagrees with this interpretation.
S.M.G., P. 86, f.n. 3.

impact of the impending Turki invasion under Sabuktigin, organised a very strong army. The Muslim sources are almost unanimous about the fact that Jayapāla put into the field no less than 100,000 cavalry, many elephants and an innumerable host of foot. Utbi records that the Hindu army appeared like the boundless ocean, and in numbers like the ants and locusts of the wilderness. Dr. Nazim rather inappropriately refers to the formation of a league of the Hindu Rājas, of which we have no direct evidence. It cannot be denied however that Jayapāla made a supreme effort to protect his kingdom, but it is highly doubtful as to whether it was possible for him to arouse a feeling of national danger among the North Indian rulers and galvanise them into a confederacy.

Nizāmuddin and Firishta make only a veiled reference to the assistance in the shape of men and money received by the Sahi ruler from the different Indian states, a list of which, viz., Delhi, Ajmer, Kālīnjār and Kanauj, has been furnished by Firishta only. The latter source, being a much later work, is always susceptible to minor inaccuracies here and there. But there is no doubt about the fact that the 'Rāja of Kālīnjār' referred to herein was Dhanga of the Cāndella dynasty, who along with the ruler of Kanauj of the Pratihāra family, might have sent some contingents of army only in

38. S.M.G., P. 30.
40. T.F., I., P. 18.
response to the call of Jayapāla. The defeat of the army of Jayapāla in 977 A.D., as a result of which the territory to the west of the Indus including Lamghan and Peshawar passed over to the Sultan, had had no repercussion on other North Indian States.

Then again in 1006-07 A.D., when Sultan Mahmud in course of his invasion on Multān tried to pass through the territories of Ānandapāla, the successor of Jayapāla, the latter, apprehending a crisis for the whole of India, appealed to the neighbouring Rājas for help. The Rājas of Ujain, Gwālīor, Kāliṣjar, Kānauj, Delhi and Ajmer, according to Firishta,\(^{41}\) readily responded to the appeal and despatched their contingents to swell the Sahi army. Evidently there is some amount of exaggeration in the statement, but that there was an organised movement is also understood from the account of Utbi. Victory again lay with the Yāmini Sultan, who pursued the fugitives upto the fort of Nagarkot in 1009 A.D., but as on previous occasion, it did not matter very much with those allies of Ānandapāla, including the Candellas just then, as they did not participate directly in the battle and their main source of power remained in tact.

Mahmud too did not belittle the potentialities of these rulers, and he took out almost annual expeditions to India and dealt with the states separately,\(^{42}\) thereby consolidating his Indian Empire. The Candellas, it must be admitted, had

\(^{41}\) T.F., I., P. 46.
not had to face the Turki onslaught till 1019 A.D., when Vidyādhara, a grandson of Dhāgha was on the Candella throne. This justifies the claim of the prāṃśātikāra in comparing Dhāgha with Hemavīra as an equal in the Mahoba Record, whose reign was not marred by defeat at the hands of the Sultān.

Dhāgha thus stands out in the contemporary political set-up of Northern India as an important figure, who not only consolidated his own kingdom but also exercised an abiding influence on other neighbouring powers. It may not be an exaggeration to say that Dhāgha by his military exploits usurped much of the glory of the Imperial Pratiharas, who were then a decadent power. In internal administration it may be noticed that Dhāgha continued the same organisation as prevailing in the time of his father, Yasovarman. It appears from the study of the Mānyaūra Plate 'A1', which refers to a gift of a village to an immigrant Brahmin named Bhaṭṭa Yāsodhara, who is generally identified with Yāsodhara of the Khajurāho Record of V.S. 1059, that Dhāgha tried to induce learned brahmans to settle within the Gandella state by granting revenue-free lands to them and utilise their services in dealing out even-handed justice to his subjects. The Khajurāho Record, alluded to, states that the Purohita of Dhāgha, Śrīmad Yāsodhara acted as the Dharmaśākhāra or the Chief Magistrate, who followed the principles of law enunciated in the legal texts of ancient India.43

44. E.I., I., P. 146, V, 56.
The Mañ Stone Inscription of Madanavarman gives us the name of the Chief Minister of Dhañga. He was a brahmin named Prabhāsa of the lineage of Āgīrṣa and Gauṭama Aḵṣapāda. He is described as an experienced administrator and a skillful diplomat as well. He was appointed after he had been tested on the lines indicated in the Arthaśāstra of Kautilya. Besides we get references to two other classes of official viz., Karanika and Kāyastha, the writer of legal documents and the official scribe. All these go to show that there was a perfect bureaucratic machinery functioning in the Candella state which enabled Dhañga to focus all his energy and resources in military pursuits.

As for the personal religion of Dhañga it may be noted that he was a devout worshipper of Śiva, as it is mentioned in the Khajurāho Inscription, that he had forsaken his life at the sacred confluence of the Ganges and the Yamunā at Prayāga, while concentrating on Rudra. He had a very long life of over one hundred years, as recorded therein, and voluntarily retired from the world. Such cases of voluntary termination of life are of course not rare in Indian history. Besides it is also observed that he installed a precious idol of Śivalinga, made of emerald (Maraśetvara), and his
inscriptions generally begin and end with adoration to Siva. Still he had no parochialism in him. He was imbued with the same spirit of toleration to other religious sects as his father, Yasovarman. It is interesting to note that it was he who completed the construction of the temple of Vaikuntha begun by his father. The liberal outlook of Dhāṅga is noticeable in bolder relief when we study an unofficial document of the time relating to the gift of some gardens in favour of a temple of Jīnendrā by Pahilla, who it is claimed was held in high esteem by Dhāṅga.

Throughout his career, glimpses of which are available in the Candella records, we find that Dhāṅga was a man of charitable disposition and he made several gifts and endowments for the maintenance of temples as well as brahmana families. He is credited with having performed the Tulapurusa gift, one of the most luxurious of ceremonies. The Nānyaura-plaques records that he used to make gifts also on occasions like the Solar eclipse &c., with the belief that it would be meritorious for himself as well as for his departed parents (vṛddhaye punyayāsas-or-matāpitorathātmah).

The records do not furnish us with the name of his queen or any other matter concerning his family life. But in both the Mau and Mahoba inscriptions we find the name of his son, Gandadeva, who succeeded him on the throne.

50. ibid., Pp. 135-36.
51. ibid., P. 146, V. 52.
52. I.A., XVI., P. 203, L. 11.
53. I.A., I., P. 197, V. 4; P. 222, V. 17.