Chapter VI.

Struggles with the Muslims: Ganda and Vidyadhara.

"Ganda." - Dhaṅga, as has already been mentioned, had a very long life extending to more than a hundred years, and evidently he had a long reign from about 950 A.D. to at least 1002-03 A.D., of which we have epigraphic evidence. But some scholars are of opinion that it is not unlikely for Dhaṅga to have lived up to 1008 A.D., which saw the downfall of the Hindu Śahi dynasty. If it is admitted then Dhaṅga must have been the ruler of Kālīṅjar, who is stated to have cooperated with Anandaśāla against the Turuṣka Sultan. But scholars are not unanimous on the matter, and according to V. Smith, the Kālīṅjar prince, referred to in the Muslim records, was Ganda, the son and successor of Dhaṅga. Though the possibility of Dhaṅga continuing on the Candella throne up to 1008 A.D., cannot be ruled out, still in the absence of positive evidence it is indeed difficult to be definite on the point.

Dhaṅga was succeeded by Ganda. For the latter's reign we have no epigraphic record or any other contemporary account. He has only been mentioned in rather vague conventional phrases in some late records, issued not less than
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one hundred years after his demise. Those records are—

(i) A fragmentary inscription from Mahoba composed after the reign of Kirtivarman (c. 1098 A.D.), grandson of Ganda

(ii) Mau stone inscription of Madanavarman, grandson of Kirtivarman and, (iii) A rock inscription of the time of Bhojavarman. These too do not provide us with any information of historical importance. He has been described as an unrivalled hero (ekavirah), and an expert in annihilating enemies whose massive arms were terrible through the itching of pride (Depe-kandugra-dorddandadvisat khandana panditah). But there is no mention of any specific occasion when Gaudadeva might have shown his military skill, so eloquently described by the praahastikara. An examination of the extent of the kingdom and the position of the Candella ruler during the time of his successor, Vidyadhara, reveals that it did not suffer any diminution at the hands of Gaudadeva. Evidently Gauda was able to preserve his territory without being too much aggressive like his father and grandfather.

The black cloud of the Gaznavid invasions looming large on the north-western horizon of India since the days of Dhananga, gradually assumed greater and more menacing proportions. The victory of Sultan Mahmud against the Shi ruler in 1008 A.D., opened up the road to India beyond the Sutlej to the Turki depredations, which from now on were almost
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regularly carried out year after year till they appeared in Kanauj in 409 A.H., i.e., 1018 A.D. It was probably Rājyapāla who was ruling in Kanauj at the time. According to the evidence of Utbi, Rājyapāla was almost deserted by his allies, and finding the situation deteriorating almost beyond his control, he retreated from the field of battle leaving the city and its fortifications to be captured by the Sultan in a single day. Encouraged by repeated successes, Mahmud visited again next year in 410 A.H. (1019 A.D.), but according to Firishta, Nizamuddin and others, Mahmud now came on the plea of punishing 'Nandā' of Khajurāho, who had killed the Pratihāra Rājyapāla for his surrender to Mahmud during the latter's invasion in the previous year (409 A.H.). Cunningham took Nandā as a misreading for Ganda, which was accepted by Hultzsch, Smith and others. This would take the length of the reign of Ganda beyond 1018-19 A.D.

But the Dubkund Inscription of the Kacchaphāṭa Vikramasiṃha dated V.S. 1145 (1188 A.D.) tells us that his great-grandfather, Arjuna, an ally or feudatory to Vidyādhara-deva, killed Rājyapāla in battle. This complicates the issue. V. Smith explains the discrepancy by supposing that Arjuna joined in a confederacy with Vidyādhara, who was then a crown-prince only. This theory does not hold good after.
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the discovery of the Mahobā inscription, in which the credit for victory over the 'Kanyakubjanarendra' was given to Vidyādharā. Ibn-ul-Athir in his Al-Tarikh al-Kamil also recorded that after Mahmud's return to Ghazna, "Bida, the accursed, who was the greatest of the rulers of India in territory and had the largest army, and whose territory was named, Kajurāhā, sent messengers to the Rāy of Kanauj, who was named, 'Bajaypāl' rebuking him for his flight and surrender of his territories to the Mussalmans. A long quarrel ensued between them, which resulted in hostilities; and as each of them prepared to fight the other, they marched out and met and fought, and Bajaypāl was killed". 'Bidā' of Ibn ul Athir is undoubtedly a corruption for Vidyādharā, and 'Mandā' of Utbi, Nizamuddin and Firishta was nothing but a misreading for 'Bidā' (Vidyādharā), and not for 'Gaṇḍā', as has been shown by Dr. Ray. Therefore Gaṇḍā must have ceased to rule before 1018 A.D.

As for the internal condition of the state during the reign-period of Gaṇḍā, we come to know that Prabhāsa, the Chief Minister (Mantrimukhya) of Dhanga continued to be at the helm of affairs. His son, Siwānāga, it appears served Vidyādharā, the successor of Gaṇḍā, as minister. This again supports the contention that Gaṇḍā did not enjoy a long reign.

It has already been noticed that the Candella rulers encouraged learned brahmins to settle within their territory so that their services may be utilised in the administration of the kingdom. But in the bureaucratic administrative set-up the function of the Karanikas and the Kāyasthas can hardly be overstated. In recognition of this fact most probably Gānda granted a village, Dugauda by name, to Thakkura Jājuka of the Vāstava race of the Kāyasthas, who held a position of trust under him.  

Vidyādhara.— Gānda's successor on the Candella throne was Vidyādhara, one of the greatest rulers of the Candella family. His claim to greatness did not rest on conquests or invasions, but on the gallant part he played in the defence of the country against the Ghaznavid marauders, which could not but be recognised even by the Muslim historians.

It has already been seen that Gānda, during his short tenure, could not play an aggressive role in the face of steadily deteriorating political condition of Northern India due to the repeated incursions of the Turks, which culminated in the flight and surrender of the effete Imperial ruler, Rājyapāla of Kanauj in 1018 A.D. The city of 'Mahodayārāh' was laid open to plunder and desecration. But its significance however was much greater. It broke the morale of the Indian rulers, as in spite of all weaknesses, the halo of imperial status still surrounded the head of the
Pratihāra ruler. So the fall of the Pratihāras was considered to be symbolic of the final collapse of Indian resistance. One after another, chiefs of fortresses and rulers of smaller states to the north of the Chambal surrendered to Sultan Mahmud almost without any opposition. This had brought about a situation surcharged with grave consequences. The realisation of it must have prompted Vidyādhara, on whom now devolved the responsibility of resisting foreign inroads, to take drastic steps, as recorded by Ibn ul Athir?

We are told in the Kamil that Biḍā, equivalent for Vidyā in the Arabic phonetics, after a long quarrel, had fought and killed Bājaypāl, the ruler of Kanauj for his flight and surrender of his territories to the Mussalmans. This finds eloquent corroboration in the Dubkund Inscription, in which Arjun of the Kacchapaghāta family, a devoted ally of Vidyādhara, is mentioned to have killed Bājaypāla in a great battle, "Śrī Vidyādhradeva-kāryanirataḥ Śrī Bājaypālāṁ haṭṭat kṣaṭparti-cohidanaka vāna-nivairhatvā mahatyāhāvetaṁ.⁵ Arjuna, who was under the employ of Śrī Vidyādhradeva killed Śrī Bājaypāla in a great battle by piercing his neck-bone with a shower of arrows). Evidently Arjuna was in close alliance with Vidyādhradeva and probably he was only carrying out the directions of the Gandella ruler, who now assumed leadership in the North Indian politics.

This bold and courageous stand of Vidyâdhara further enhanced his prestige in the estimation of other rulers of Central India. It was most probably at his instance that Trilocanapâla, referred to in the Jhaui Grant, was installed on the Pratihâra throne after Râjyapâla's assassination. Thus it may be claimed, Vidyâdharadeva has now given full effect to the policy of Yaôvarman and Dhaâga, and justified the assumption of Imperial titles like, Paramâsâvara Paramabhättâraka Mahârajâdhirâja &c., (Manvaura Plate 'B' of Devavarman V.S. 1107).\(^6\) A fragmentary Mahobâ Inscription in this connection describes that Bhojadeva together with Kalacuri-candra (the moon of the Kalacuris), worshipped full of fear like a pupil, the master of warfare, who had caused destruction of the King of Kânyakubja (Vihiita Kânyakubja-bhûpâla bhaâgum/Smaragurum-upasta praudhabhissetalpabhûjam sâha Kalacuri-candrah sisyavad Bhojadevah/). Bhojadeva of this record has generally been identified with Bhoja of the Paramâra dynasty and Kalacuri-candra with Kokkalla II. It cannot be denied that both the Paramâras and the Kalacuris were so long hostile to the Candellas, as all of them were contesting for the supremacy in North India. But circumstances took such a turn that for the time being they had to accept the superiority of the Candella ruler, Vidyâdhara. So rightly has it been claimed in a Candella record that king Vidyâdhara

---
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gathered the flowers of the fame of his enemies. (Tasmaddasau ripuyaasah kusumahrobhud Vidyadharo narapatirapati ... v. 21).

The Mau Stone inscription of Madanavarman also equaled Vidyadhara to Indra, the lord of Gods (Vasava), whose lotus feet took rest on diadems of all kings without exception (Tasmaddaseena narapati-maulisu vijaranta kannat padakamalaah Sri Vidyadharaadevah). This also agrees with the account of him as recorded by the Muslim chroniclers. Ibn ul Athir describes Vidyadhara as the most powerful Indian prince of the time, possessing an army of 56,000 cavalry, 184,000 infantry and 746 elephants (Nizamuddin - 36000 cavalry, 145000 infantry & 390 elephants; Firishta - 45000 infantry (evidently a mistake for 145000); Kitab-Zainul Akhbar - 640 elephants). In spite of possible inaccuracies in matters of detail, it is to be admitted that Vidyadhara created for him an unique position in the political set-up of North India, which made Sultan Mahmud of Ghazni no less concerned.

Vidyadhara did not rest content with inflicting punishment on the Pratihara ruler for his faults of omission and commission. He fully realised that matters would not stop there, and further clashes with the Turukkas were inevitable. So he formed, what may be called an alliance of the rulers of
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India ready to meet fresh onslaughts from the Ghaznavids. Sven, according to Ibn ul Athir and Kitab Zaimul Akhbar, Paru Jaypal or Taru Jaypal (equivalent to Trilocanapala of the Sahi dynasty) sought the protection of Bidä, who promised to restore to him his country and to protect him. 

In the words of the author of the Kamil, "when the news reached Yaminuddaulah, he was disturbed and prepared for fight". Thus it becomes evident that the cause of Mahmud's taking out another expedition to India in A.H. 410 (1019 A.D.), was not merely ambition and love of plunder, but necessitated by the fact that the Cendella prince had been reorganising the scattered energies of the Indian chiefs with an object to recover the lost territories.

So Mahmud turned again towards 'Hind' with his bold warriors in 410 A.H., and according to Abdul Rahim, when he reached the river Jun (Jumna), Naro Jaipal, who had several times fled before his armies, encamped in front of it now, in order to help and assist Nanda (i.e., Bidā). The mention of the Jun is rather confusing, as the Jumna could by no means become the battle ground between Mahmud and Naro Jaipal, identified with Trilocanapala of the Sahi dynasty. Utbi however more accurately records the name of the river as the Kāhib or the Kām-Ganga. Dr. Nazim inferred from the evidence of Farukhi that the Sultan crossed the river Ganges somewhere near Hardwar and pursued Trilocanapala up to the bank of the
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river Rāhut or Rām-Ganga, where a crushing defeat was inflict-
ted upon him. But according to Utbi and Ibn al-Athir, Triloca-
napāla determinedly resisted the passage of the Sultan across the river. A detachment of Mahmud's followers somehow or other crossed the river and effected a landing on the other side in the teeth of bitter opposition. Then the Sultan himself with the remainder of his army also crossed over, whereupon a fierce battle was fought between them, resulting in serious losses to Trilocanapāla's army. The latter now sought for peace, which however was turned down by Mahmud. Thus frustrated, Sāhi Trilocanapāla tried to make good his escape with an idea of joining his ally, Bīdā. But unfortunately, he was surprised and killed on the way by some unknown Hindus. The identity of these Hindus, who slew Trilocanapāla, cannot be established, for, nowhere have they been mentioned by name nor could any other information be gathered.

After this incident Sultan Mahmud proceeded towards Bāri, the new seat of the Pratihāra kingdom under Trilocanapāla, possibly a nominee of Candella Vidyādhara. Trilocanapāla, according to the author of Kitab Zainul Akhbar, hearing the news of the approach of the Ghaznavid hordes, fled from his kingdom, leaving it to be ravaged by the Turuskas.

Then Mahmud prepared himself for the final battle and started in pursuit of Bīdā. Bīdā was met commanding an immense army on the banks of a river, which filled the heart of the

Turushka chief with nervousness. The Tabakat i Akbari records that, when the Sultan encamped in front of Nanda's army, he first sent an envoy to him and invited him to submit and to accept Islam. Nanda refused to place his neck under the yoke of submission. After that the Sultan went to an elevated spot, so that he might look at and make an estimate of the strength of Nanda's army. Then, when he saw what a vast host it was, he repented for his coming; and placing the forehead in supplication on the ground prayed for victory and conquest from the Giver of all mercies. Other sources also agree with Nizamuddin about the military power of the Candella ruler. The Tabakat goes on to say that "in the night a great fear fell on the heart of Nanda, and he fled with a few special companions leaving the army and all munitions of war behind". That is to say, there was no fight between the two armies, but due to the sudden withdrawal by the Candella chief under cover of night, the Sultan gained, what may be called an easy victory. The chroniclers are not however unanimous on the point. According to Ibn ul Athir, before effecting a direct clash the men of the Sultan diverted the course of the river. Only then was it possible for 'Yaminuddaulah to send a party of his infantry to fight him (Bidā), and the latter also sent out against him a similar number, and both the armies continued reinforcing their soldiers till the two opposing forces increased in numbers and battle became vehement. At last the night overtook them and parted them.

As suggested by Dr. Ray, on account of the diversion of the stream, the strategic importance of the field chosen by Vidyādhara to resist Mahmud must have considerably diminished, and Vidyādhara evaded an unnecessary showdown by staging a planned retreat without giving the Sultan an opportunity to force a decision. The amount of frustration of the Sultan at this highly strategic move of the Candella king is evident from the account of Gardizi in Zainul Akhbar. It is stated therein that the following morning Sultan Mahmud despatched his ambassador to Gaṅḍa (i.e., Bīḍā), but he returned to report that the enemy’s camp was deserted. Gaṅḍa (Bīḍā) unaccountably stricken with panic had fled from the field under cover of night. The Sultan thanked God for this unexpected good luck, and making sure that no ambush has been laid, he gave orders for the plundering of the camp of the enemy.

As regards the booty obtained by the Sultan in this raid, the Muslim chroniclers generally give an exaggerated report. The Tabakat i Akbari states that the army of Islam procured immense quantities of booty including 580 elephants. A similar account is also found in the Kamil. This shows that the Candella ruler had surrendered completely to the Sultan. This is hardly consistent with the power and prestige of Candella Vidyādhara, even after the defeat at the hands of the Sultan, and it may be noted in this connection that realising this Mahmud had to launch an all-out offensive in about 3 years’ time. The net result therefore might have been that by the

tactical move of Bida the Sultan had to return to Ghazni achieving a partial victory only. He did not think it prudent to pursue his enemy further at the moment.

"In 413 A.H. (1022 A.D.) he (Mahmud) again invaded the kingdom of Nandā", says Nizamuddin. Firishta also records an identical account. But the date, as given in Briggs' translation, is 414 A.H., which is evidently a mistake for 413 A.H., as pointed out by Dr. Ray on the evidence of the Lucknow text.

Firishta, in indicating the purpose of this renewed invasion, states that "the war-like disposition of Mahmud could not long remain at peace". That is to say, the memory of the indecisive campaign of 410 A.H. was too galling for the Sultan, who must have wanted to force a conclusion this time.

As to the incidents of this campaign we find mention firstly of the siege of the fortress of Gwalior, built on a stupendous rock, and reputed to be impregnable. It was included within the Candella dominions and was under the rulers of the Kacchapaghata dynasty, who were under the Candella hegemony since the occupation of the fortress from the Pratiharas by Vajradāman of the same family. The evidence of Nizamuddin as found in his account of the invasion of the Candella dominions by Sultan Mahmud of Ghazni, shows that the
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Gwalior fort was included within the kingdom of the Candella Vidyādāra, and that it was under a 'hakim', i.e., a governor or a ruler of feudatory status. This 'hakim' was surely a Kacchhapagḥaṭa, and may be identified with Kīrttirāja of the Sas Bahu record. Had he enjoyed the status of an independent ruler, the Muslim historian would certainly not have referred to him only as a 'hakim'. Dr. Nazim most probably confused the Kacchwāḥa ruler of the fort with Arjuna of the Dabkund Record.

In spite of strenuous efforts of Mahmud the fortress of Gwalior could not be stormed. "At the end of 4 days the Commandant of the fort sent envoys and offering a tribute of 35 elephants, prayed for protection". The siege was raised and the Sultan proceeded towards Kālaṃjār. An account of the interview of the Sultan's ambassador with the 'Rājā' of the Gwalior fort, as recorded in the Syriac Chronicle, translated extracts of which have been included in the Appendix of Dr. Nazim's work on 'Sultan Mahmud', seems to be imaginary.

32. 'Commandant of the Fort' according to the translator of the Tabakat. F. Johnson's Dictionary, Persian-Arabic-English (P. 461) mentions that a hakim may be 'a commander, a governor, a judge, a magistrate or a name of God'. But A.N.Wollaston's volume of A Complete English-Persian Dictionary (P.492) clearly states that hakim denoted the 'Governor of a city' and not simply of the Fort, the term for which is 'Qalah-dar'. (See I.H.Q., P.91, f.n.16, March, 1983).
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The Kālānjar fort, situated on the lofty crag of a precipitous rock of hard stone on an outlying branch of the Vindhyas, was deemed impregnable. This fortress now came under the siege of Mahmud's forces. According to Nizamuddin, "the siege lasted for a considerable time, when Nandā, the ruler of the fort offered 300 elephants as a tribute and begged for safety". Evidently like the Gwalior fort, the Kālānjar also could not be stormed by Mahmud in spite of his all-out efforts. It may be remembered that Mahmud set out on this expedition with a specific object of punishing Vidyādharā, but as is evident from the statements of Muslim historians, this was hardly achieved. Both the strongholds of Gwalior and Kālānjar remained unconquered and on both occasions the Sultan raised the siege on receipt of a formal submission followed by exchange of gifts and presents, which in the hands of the Muslim chroniclers of a later period came to be depicted as 'tribute'. The mode of presentation would also reveal that there was an element of challenge in it. In the words of Firishta, "the Baja (i.e., Vidyādharā) in order to put the bravery of the Sultan's troops to the test, intoxicated the elephants with drugs, and let them loose without riders, into the camp. Mahmud seeing the animals advance, and perceiving their condition, by the wildness of their manner, ordered a party of his best horse to seize or kill them, or to drive them from the camp. Some of the Tartars, emulous of displaying the bravery in the presence of their king, fearlessly approached and mounted some of the elephants and drove the

rest into an adjacent wood, where they were all soon reduced to obedience. The troops in the fort were astonished at this spectacle, and felt much awe for the prowess of the Turks. Nandā then sent to him a panegyric in the Indian or Hindu tongue (Lughat i Hindūi), in praise of the Sultan and the bravery of his troops. The Sultan felt much elated at the compliments which were very highly spoken of by the men of Hindustan and other poets of Arabia and Persia, who were in attendance on him. In return Mahmūd also sent his congratulations to Vidyādhara and conferred on him the government of 15 fortresses and other presents before returning to Ghazna "with victory and triumph", according to Tabakat i Akbari. The Zainul Akhbar even goes the length of recording payment of 'Jiziya' by Nandā as one of the conditions for peace. But, as has been mentioned earlier, these statements are to be taken with a grain of salt, as the expedition could by no means be regarded as successful as Mahmūd's earlier invasions. Though there was a formal submission by the Candella ruler, the real fact was that both sides retired with honours even.

Browne and Md. Iqbal suggest that this friendship between the ruler of Kālīnjar and the Sultan of Ghazni continued till at least 1029 A.D., when Mahmūd sent a Tartar prince as a prisoner to the fort of Kalanjar in India. Dr. Hay
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rightly feels sceptical about the identification of the fort of Kālaṅjar as has been suggested by Browne and Iqbal. According to him, it seems more likely that it should be identified with the Kāliṅjar of Kalhana or Kāliṅjur of Firishta, situated on the frontiers of Kashmir. 42

Relations with the Paramāras and the Kacchapaghātas. —

Thus we find that Vidyādhara, who came to be regarded as the most powerful ruler of India, devoted himself mainly to the task of resisting the encroachments of Islam in which he proved himself not an unworthy leader. With regard to his achievements in tackling the internal forces, as has already been seen, he is credited with the capture of the last remnants of the Pratihāra power, which practically saddled him on Imperial status. We do not however find any direct mention of his fight with other contemporary powers of North and Central India. But in the Śās Bahu record (v. 10) we are told that the Kacchapaghāta prince Kīrttirāja defeated the countless host of the prince of Mālwa. The Mālwa army received such a terrible shock on the occasion that the spears fell from their hands through fear, and were subsequently collected by the villagers (apparently of Gwalior), and heaped around their houses. The 'Mālava-bhūmipa' has generally been identified with the Paramāra king Bhoja, who was by no means a less important ruler. As such it is rather
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difficult to believe that the Kacehawäha chief accomplished this victory unilaterally, without any help or assistance from Candella Vidyädhara, his overlord. On the other hand, it may be presumed that Bhoja planned an attack on the Candella dominions but was foiled in his attempt by the Kacechapäghäta prince. This is however corroborated by the claim of Candella Vidyädhara that Ehojadeva, together with the Moon of the Kalacuris worshipped full of fear like a pupil this master of warfare, i.e., Vidyädhara, which had probably resulted from the defeat of Bhoja at the hands of the Kacechapäghäta Kirttiräja. This incident must have happened prior to Mahmud's attack on Gwalior fort in A.H. 413 (A.D. 1022).

In this connection it may be observed that Dr. D. C. Ganguly holds that Bhoja undertook two separate invasions of the Candella dominions. The earlier one was defeated at the hands of Vidyädhara, and the latter one by Kirttiräja. Dr. Ganguly also suggests that Kacechapäghäta Abhimanyu, son of Arjuna of the Dubkund Record entered into an alliance with Bhoja on the eve of his northern expedition, as is evident from the same inscription (Ll. 17-18) that the skill of Abhimanyu in his management of horses and chariots and in the use of powerful weapons was highly spoken of by Ehojadeva.
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Vihita Kanyakubja bhupala bhadgami
Samaragurumapasta praaghabhistalpaahajam
Seha-Kalacuricandrañiisyavad Ehojadevañ.

46. E.P., Ganguly., Pp. 103-06.

That is to say, the incident happened at a later period in Vidyādharā's career, as we have already seen that Arjuna was a contemporary of Vidyādharā and a close ally of him.

Dr. H. C. Bay however holds that after Vidyādharā's demise when the Candella throne came to be occupied by rulers of lesser calibre, Bhoja Paramāra, who outlived Vidyādharā, exerted his influence in the northern regions as far as Dubkund, when Abhimanyu, the son of Arjuna, now became subservient to him. 47

Both the theories however have some lacunae. As regards Dr. Ganguly's theory of two separate invasions of the Candella state by the Paramāra rulers, 48 this however not borne out by evidence. The verse in the Mau Inscription does not indicate achievement of any victory over the invading forces of the Paramāras. Rather the Mau record spoke of the net result that was obtained by the victory of the Kacchapaghāṭa Kīrttirāja recorded in the Sān Bahu Inscription. 49

Now with regard to the relationship between Abhimanyu of the Dubkund grant and Bhoja Paramāra again nothing definite can be stated. It is not understood how the statement of the Dubkund grant could be interpreted to mean that "Abhimanyu's assistance was a great asset to the Paramāras in securing the success of their military operations", as done by Dr. D. C. Ganguly. 50 We have also seen that Arjuna was the contemporary of Vidyādharā, and through him the latter
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executed his plan of inflicting the capital punishment on Rajyapāla of the Pratihāra dynasty in 1018 A.D., leading to renewed attacks by Sultan Mahmud. The Sultan besieged the Gwalior fort in 1022 A.D., when Kīrttirāja was in possession of it. It is indeed difficult to believe (i) that between 1018 and 1022 A.D., Arjuna came to be succeeded by Abhimanyu, (ii) that the latter reversed the policy of his father and entered into an alliance with the Paramārās, and (iii) that Bhoja invaded Gwalior region during this crucial period of Indian history when fresh Turuska raids were being apprehended every moment.

Dr. Ray's suggestions, mentioned above, seem to be more plausible, but in the absence of positive data we cannot be sure about it.

Extent of Gandella dominion. - With regard to the limits of the Gandella state during Vidyādhara's regime we are now however in possession of any clear statement as we have for his grandfather, Dhānga. But there is no doubt about the fact that the fortresses of Gopādri and Kāliṇjar were included in it and that there is no evidence of any diminution in territorial possessions since the days of Dhānga. Rather the Dubkund record testifies to some expansion in the north-western region of the Candella state reaching the banks of the Pārvatī river. But the zone of influence of the Candella power during this period was much greater, it covered practically the whole of Northern India from the Chambal to the Narmadā in the south, and to the Ganges-Jumānā
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valley in the east. There was therefore not much exaggeration in the accounts of the Muslim chroniclers that Vidyādhara was 'the most powerful of the Indian rulers of the time'. A number of inscriptions belonging to the time of his successors make eulogistic references to his personal traits with particular reference to his military leadership, which however in the circumstances do not appear to be mere prasasti. As for example, V. 5 of Mau Stone Ins. of Madanawarman compares him with 'Vēsava' the leader of the Gods against the forces of Asuras. V. 21 of the Fragmentary Mahōbā Inscription refers to Vidyādhara having gathered the flowers of the fame of his enemies. (Tasmadasaup ripu-yaśāḥ kusumahāro-bhūd Vidyādharo napatirapatī ....). The next verse (V. 22 of the same record describes him as the Master of warfare (Samara-guru) to whom other contemporary rulers were like disciples (śīyavat) 55.

The Deogadh Rock Inscription of Kṛttivaram V.8. 1154 also showers similar praises on Vidyādhara. His achievements in augmenting the territorial boundaries of the Candella state as well as in establishing it as a strong power of the time were sufficient to earn recognition from posterity. But the supreme effort that he made in defending the country against strong foreign invaders made him deserving of grateful remembrance by his successors.

The Mau Inscription of the time of Madana Varman gives us the name of his Chief Minister, Śivanāga, who belonged to the same family of ministers who served the Candella dynasty.

54. I.I., I., pp. 197, 203.
55. ibid., p. 219.
rather hereditarily. As for Sivanaśa it is said in V. 23-24 that the Saśiva was responsible to a great extent in making other rulers tributary to him. Such expressions suggest that Vidyāśhara's prowess was equally matched with the diplomatic skill of his minister, which enabled him to play such an important role in the history of the time.

57. E.I., I., P. 199.