CHAPTER II

POLITICAL HISTORY
I- PREHISTORY AND PROTO-HISTORY

(A) Stone Age: -

That Palaeolithic Man inhabited the region of Bundelkhand is now a fact beyond doubt. Profuse evidence, attesting to it, has already been discovered. Regarding the Palaeolithic tool-industries at and around the town of Lalitpur, Dr. H. D. Sankalia says, "The most interesting and instructive area is Lalitpur. Here within a radius of a mile from the railway station several workshops were discovered."¹ About Biśnā Nālā nearby, he says, "The Nālā was found by Early Man to be a suitable site for habitation.... The tools disclose transition from the early Stone Age to middle Stone Age."² No less important are the discoveries in Damoh district where rivers Sonār, Koprā, and Barmā "yielded industries of all the three periods." Deserving of mention here is a thesis by Shri Rameshwar Sing³ who studied Palaeolithic Industries of Bundelkhand, confining himself only to its northern part. Banda district has also been found to be particularly rich in the wealth of Early Stone Age tools.⁴ Shri C. B. Trivedi found some tools in Chhatarpur district also.

Painted rock shelters constitute much more valuable source for studying the prehistory of a region. Of supreme importance for us, therefore, is a momentous discovery of certain rock-paintings by Prof. K. D. Bajpai in the district of Banda datable

¹. Prehistory and Protohistory of India and Pakistan, P. 107.
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⁴. याकैयी सुनामः : उत्तर प्रदेश का साम्राज्यिक इतिहास, प. 8; also I.A.A.R.-1961-62, P. 54.
to about 4000 B.C. To quote his own words on the discovery, "The paintings revealed a civilization older than that of the Indus Valley, but with a highly developed aesthetic sense." 1 Painted rock-shelters as well as a rich palaeolithic site were found by Dr. V.S. Vakankar and Dr. S.K. Pandey in Sagar district. 2 Numerous sites with a wealth of rock-paintings exist in Banda, Sagar, Chhatarpur and Datia districts of Bundelkhand.

Bidding farewell to his Yin-state, the Pre-historic Man of Bundelkhand ushered in the Yin-state of civilizing somewhere around 2000 B.C. because, therefrom, we get solid evidence of Chalco-lithic culture from the only systematically and scientifically excavated site of our area vis. Eran in Sagar district. 3 Arnold Toynbee traces the genesis of civilizations in the response of Man to the challenge of Nature. 4

Difficult it is to say, in our present state of knowledge, whether the original settlers of Bundelkhand left their stagnant existence in consequence of the 'Challenge of Nature' which inspired them to journey towards civilization. In any case, theirs proved to be the 'arrested civilization' for they are still held as primitive tribes and in words of Edward Balfour, "These people have separate names—Pahāris, Kols, Gonds, Bhilas, Colis or Colaris. They seem the remains of some aboriginal people who had occupied the soil perhaps before any of the nations now possessing it." 5 More

clear are observations of Prof. K.D. Bajpai, who says, "Before the
dawn of history several parts of the present Madhya Pradesh were
inhabited by primitive people called Niṣādas, Śabarasa, Pulindasa etc."¹
The Kathāsaritsāgara describes Pulindasa as a people of
the Vindhyā hills.²

(B) The Earliest Inhabitants:

In the foregoing chapter we have seen that
Pulindas were certainly one of the chief tribes that existed in
Bundelkhand from Pre-historic times. The names Śabarasa and Niṣāda
have also been used for tribes that resided in Bundelkhand.

According to Dr. A.M. Shastri, 'The celebrated
Vedic commentator Mahādhara understands Niṣāda as meaning a Bhil.'³
But Dr. V. Jha takes the word for 'aborigines in general.'⁴ Now from
the Jhansi stone inscription of Sallakṣanāsimha,⁵ we learn that
Bhilas resided in Bundelkhand till as late times as that of Bandella
king Kīrtivarman to whose time the inscription belongs. Nay, they
still inhabit the region. It appears that Bhilas were among
pre-Aryan dwellers of Bundelkhand. Dr. V. Jha remarks, "Of the
indigenous peoples met by the Aryan, the first are the Niṣādas,
mentioned as early as the Rudrādhyāya of the Yajus-Samhitās."⁶
Dr. R. P. Chanda takes Niṣādas to be 'Anāryas of the Rgvedic Age.'⁷

---
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As regards Śabaras, they also appear to have been among the earliest dwellers of Bundelkhand. An interesting incident is narrated about their origin. Dr. Jyoti Prasad Jain is of the view that the tribe of Śabaras along with Pundras and Vālñikas originated during the time of king Vena, a renowned monarch in Vedic-Puranic tradition, who is known for having embraced Jainism. The veracity of the view is not our aim to test here, but note may be taken that king Vena belonged to the Ĉedi dynasty and that Ĉedi was an ancient name of Bundelkhand also. Vena is mentioned in at least one inscription viz., Hāthīgumpha inscription of king Khāravela. As for the Śabaras they were residing in the area during the 14th century A.D. They are mentioned in the Ajayagah Rock inscription of king Bhojavarman.

Suffice it to say, therefore, on the basis of literary and epigraphical evidence, presented above, that when Homo Palaeolithicus of Bundelkhand embarked on his exertions towards transforming his personality into Homo Mechanicus and further into Homo Sapiens, Pulindas, Niśādas and Śabaras were inhabiting the region.
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(C) The Vedic-Epic Times:

The Pre-Mauryan political history of Bundelkhand is finely preserved in tales and traditions of ancient Aryan literature of India. We have noted already that Čedi was the earliest name of Bundelkhand. The word Čedi originated from the name of king Čedi who was the grandson of king Vidarbha. In the early Vedic Age the Čedi king must have been very powerful inasmuch as he is described in the Rgveda as making a gift of 10 kings as slaves to a priest who officiated at one of his sacrifices.¹ The Čedi monarch Kasu must have been a commanding personality in Rgvedic times, as it appears that he brought many kings under his sway.² Kasu Čaidhya of Rgveda is identified with king Vasu of Mahâbhârata.³ And king Upâcara of Četiya-Jâtaka is also taken to be king Vasu.⁴ The Hāthigumpha inscription of Khâravela⁵ contains the name of king Vasu who belonged to Čedi dynasty. Thus king Vasu should be taken as the first Aryan king of Bundelkhand. Shri Gorelal Tiwari holds an identical opinion.⁶

Erhadratha, the eldest son of Vasu is known to have ruled over Magadha and is credited with having founded a dynasty of Bāhradatha kings. The name of Vîrabâhu, another Čedi king, is known from the Nalopaśyānaparva.⁷

¹ Law, B.C. : Ibid. P.313.
² Ibid.
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Śīśupāla occupies an important place among the Epic Age rulers of Bundelkhand. He was slain by Lord Kṛṣṇa on the soil of the present Datia district, as an interesting account of their relations is preserved in the local traditions of that district.\(^1\) Shri Gorelal Tiwari locates the capital of Śīśupāla at Čandeli in Guna district of M.P.\(^2\) Yudhiṣṭhira is supposed to have installed his son in the sovereignty of the Čedis.\(^3\) Čhrṣṭaketu and Śrāvaka were successors of Śīśupāla. Among other rulers of the Epic age, names of Sudharmā, Hiranyavarmā, Kṣatradeva and Čitrāṅgada merit mention.\(^4\)

II- The Mauryan Period

Čandragupta, the first Mauryan emperor, is credited with having conquered and administered a vast empire and Bundelkhand may have formed a part of it. It was certainly included in the dominions of his grandson Aśoka. Supporting the above assumption is an epigraph of immense importance found engraved at village Gujarra in Datia district.\(^5\) It is yet another version of his Minor Rock-Edict I. Its importance lies in the fact that it is the second inscription of the emperor to contain his personal name Aśoka, the first being that of Maksi. Another inscription\(^6\) which has been assigned to Aśoka's time on grounds of palaeography has been discovered at Deogarh. As regards its content, nothing can be said. Shri Tiwari

---
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opines that during the Mauryan period, Bundelkhand was under a provincial governor, posted at Ujjain.¹

Numismatic evidence discovered during the excavations at Eran (Dist. Sagar) also throws some light on the political history of the region during the Mauryan and Post-Mauryan Periods. The excavations were conducted by the Deptt. of A.I.H.C. & archaeology, University of Saugar, under the direction of Prof. K.D. Bajpai who places the punch-marked coins of Eran in the period "from about the beginning of 3rd century B.C. to the end of 3rd century A.D."² The biggest hoard of coins was found in an earthen jar which contained 3,268 coins mostly of copper but a few of them with silver coating. The coins bear numerous religious symbols.

About a century ago, Cunningham found at Eran a coin of king Dharmapāla which he assigned to the end of 3rd century B.C. or early 2nd century B.C. on grounds of Palaeography.³

The other king of this period, besides Dharmapāla, is Indragupta whose name is known from a circular lead-piece written in characters of Mauryan Brāhmī. This lead-piece was discovered during excavations at the site. "The association of the punch-marked coins with this inscribed lead-piece is quite important and has enabled us to assign the associated coins to about 200 B.C." says Prof. K.D. Bajpai.⁴ It appears, therefore, that the area around Eran became independent under above mentioned kings after Asoka.

3. Ibid., p.6.
4. Ibid., p.7.
III- THE INTERIM PERIOD

Only numismatic evidence is available to us for this period and that too, only for the area around Eran. So, it is difficult to reconstruct the history of Bundelkhand during this period. The find of a baked clay sealing at Eran, bearing the legend Erikiña (the ancient name of Eran) is taken to indicate that like Mādhyamikā, Tripuri and Ujjājini, Eran must also have been the capital of a republican state.\(^1\) Mention may be made here that Cunningham\(^2\) also found some die-struck coins at Eran bearing in Svāhāśmi characters of 2nd century B.C. the name Brakana. He explained the semi circle symbol on these coins as indicating the shape of the old town and river symbol standing for the river Bina on which the town was situated. Shri Goralal Tiwari also speaks of 17 coins from Eran attesting to the existence of a republican state there after the Śuṅgas.\(^3\)

Plenty of coins, belonging to the Nāga\(^4\) and Śaka rulers, found from Eran, reveal that the period witnessed their rule over the area around Eran. Nothing more can be said about them with exactness. Names of a few Śaka rulers with their dates in Śaka era can, however, be made out. Of importance in this connection is a clay sealing discovered during the excavations at Eran. It bears the name of Simhasena, son of Śaka king Śrīvaramitra. That Śakas ruled in the region prior to the advent of the Guptas is indicated by another important and independent evidence.

---

Eran stone pillar inscription of Saka King Śrīdhara-varman, who was perhaps at first a feudatory of the Abhiras, testifies to the rule of Saka at Eran.1

IV- THE GUPTA PERIOD

That Śrīdhara-varman was contemporary of Samudragupta admits of no doubt. His Kanakhera stone inscription, in which he is described as the son of Śakananda, is dated in the year 351-52 A.D. According to Dr. V. V. Mirashi, "The Saka king who submitted to Samudragupta must, therefore, be identified with Śrīdhara-varman." 2 As we possess one of his inscriptions at Eran, he must be ruling over some parts of Bundelkhand, particularly the region around Eran.

Samudragupta, at first, confirmed the Saka chief in his possessions but later on, some time after 365 A.D., 3 on some provocation, appears to have attacked the Saka king's territory and obtained a decisive victory in the battle of Erīkīna 4 making Eran his 'pleasure city.' Eran stone inscription of Samudragupta, 5 though a fragmentary document, does prove that the dominions of Śrīdhara-varman were annexed by Samudragupta. According to Cunningham the inscription belonged to "the temple with a colossal figure of Viṣṇu." 6 It goes without saying that almost all Gupta emperors were devoted to the cult of Viṣṇu for which we possess profuse numismatic as well as inscriptive

3. Ibid., P. XXXIX (Introduction).
7. Ibid., P. 20.
evidence. The Śaka chief Śrīdharavarman, on the other hand, worshipped Śvāmī Mahāsena or Skanda.¹

The historicity of the next Gupta ruler Rāmagupta, long doubted as well as denied by the scholars, has ultimately been proved by the coins found at Eran bearing his name. Prof. K.D. Bajpai, who champions the theory, says, "on Gupta coins from Chandragupta II, we notice figure of Garuda holding snake, a feature so common on several coins of Rāmagupta."² Further the depiction of three-headed Garuda on certain coins of Rāmagupta reminds us of the multi-headed figure of Śiva and Kārttikeya found on Kuśāṇa and certain tribal coins of India. Such three-headed Garuda can be seen on the coins of Kumāragupta I also. The Brāhmī legend on the coins is in early Gupta characters and the coins were issued about the close of the C.400 A.D.³

Of utmost significance, again, is the discovery of three inscribed images of Jain Tīrthaṅkaras bearing the name 'Mahārājādhirāja Śrī Rāmagupta.' On grounds of palaeography, the inscriptions are assignable to C.400 A.D.⁴ As all the evidence attesting to the historicity of Rāmagupta has been discovered in the Eran-Vidisha region, his place in the history of Bundelkhand is important. Like his father Samudragupta, he was a patron of Bhāgavatism.

Chandragupta II, the successor of Rāmagupta, is credited with having uprooted the Śakas from western India, thereby extending the frontiers of the Gupta empire to the Gujjrat and Saurāstra. From the Udayagiri cave inscription, we learn that he came in person to the area and made Eran-Vidisha territory his base of operations.

3. Ibid., P.121.
4. Ibid., P.122.
His son and successor, Kumāragupta I is known for having maintained intact the vast dominions, though towards the end of his reign, Mūnas had begun their incursions, threatening to break the empire. Note should be taken here that Eran-Tumain territory, during the time of Kumāragupta I was placed under Ghatotkaśagupta, member of the imperial family.¹

Skandagupta, the next emperor, fought bravely against the Mūnas and stemmed the tide temporarily, averting thus the break-up of his empire, but his was a very short reign. He died in C. 467 A.D.

The History of Bundelkhand, after his death, enters a new phase. The Gupta rule does not cease here altogether, but we have positive evidence to show that parts of Bundelkhand were governed by several dynasties that owed no allegiance to the Gupta monarchs.

Of utmost significance in this regard are Nachme-ki-talai stone inscriptions of Vyaghradeva² who, according to Prof. V.V. Mirashi, was a king of the Jécnakalpa dynasty and was a feudatory to the Vākāṭaka Mahārājā Prthiviśeṇa II as is evident from the inscription. Vyaghradeva has been placed in the period A.D. 470 to 490. It appears that the Gupta empire having become weak, the Vākāṭakas extended their influence in Bundelkhand.

The Parivrājaka Mahārājās, so called because they were descended from a royal ascetic (Parivrājaka), ruled in Bundelkhand.³ Mahārāja Hastin (A.D. 475-517) of the family

issued land-grants without mentioning Budhagupta making only a general reference to the Gupta sovereignty. Note may be taken, that the principality of the Udchakalpa rulers was contiguous to the Parivrajaka kingdom. The Bhumarā stone pillar inscription of Mahārājas Hastin and Sarvanatha of C.E.189 (A.D.508-9) testifies to the fact that the Parivrajaka Mahārājas and the Udchakalpa rulers really belonged to this part of the country and their kingdom certainly included some parts of eastern Bundelkhand.

Yet another dynasty was ruling the region around Kālañjar, during the last quarter of the 5th century A.D. Kālañjar stone inscription of king Udayana of the Somavamśi or Pāṇḍava dynasty shows that the district of Banda was independent. King Udayana of this record is to be identified with the king of the same name whose great-grandson Tivaradeva founded a Principality in south Kosal.

We are justified in concluding that the weak successors of Skandagupta failed to check the disintegration of the empire and in some parts of Bundelkhand local rulers proclaimed their independence.

Nevertheless, positive evidence is not lacking attesting to the fact that a large area of Bundelkhand remained in the Gupta empire till the death of Budhagupta. Erān stone pillar inscription of this ruler tells us clearly that his governor

2. Ibid., No. 24.
Suraśmitaṇḍra was governing the region between the Kālindī and the Narmada, in the year A.D. 494–85 A.D. Dr. B.P. Sinha credits Budhagupta with having maintained almost the whole of Gupta empire intact except Surāśtra which became practically independent under Bhattārka.

The last known date of Budhagupta is C.E. 175 (A.D. 494–95). So his reign must have ended in 496 A.D. or thereabout. Now it is extremely doubtful if he could maintain his hold on Bundelkhand till his last days. The Eran stone Boar inscription of the Hūna king Tormāṇa must not be far removed in date from the inscription of Budhagupta, mentioned above. Of utmost importance for us, in this regard, is the fact that Mahārāja Mātṛviṣṇu of the Eran stone pillar inscription of Budhagupta is dead before the date of Tormāṇa's inscription and his younger brother Dhanyaviṣṇu specifically refers to his death and to honour the wish of his deceased brother, he causes the erection of a temple of Nārāyaṇa. The very fact that both the inscriptions belong to one generation leads us to believe that the territory was conquered by the Hūṇas either before the death of Budhagupta or just after it. In any case, we are certain that in the closing years of the 5th century A.D., Eran had passed under the Hūna rule.

A period of confusion now commences in the history of Bundelkhand for which nothing can be said with absolute certainty, owing largely to the want of evidence. Whether the Hūṇas continued to rule the Eran territory or the Guptas tried to

1. The Decline of the kingdom of Magadha, P.71.
2. Ibid., P.71.
recapture it are questions that are yet to be satisfactorily answered. About Narasimhagupta, a successor of Budhagupta, Dr. B. P. Sinha says, "As we possess none of his silver coins..., this suggests that he did not control the western province and most of central India." A mighty battle, indeed, was fought at Ban in A.D. 510-11 between a Gupta prince Bhānugupta and probably the Hūṇas as recorded in the Ban Posthumous Stone Pillar inscription of Goparāja. But unfortunately the document is silent as regards the exact outcome of the battle. Difficult it is to tell therefore, which party won the war. With regard to the status of Bhānugupta of this record, Dr. R. C. Majumdar remarks that he remains "a shadowy figure" in history.

Mihirakula, the successor of Tormāna is supposed to have ascended the throne about A.D. 515, and we possess an inscription of this ruler at Gwalior dated in the 15th year of his reign. Gwalior being close to the boundary of Bundelkhand, it is not improbable that he had sway over some parts of Bundelkhand.

According to Dr. R. C. Majumdar, Mihirakula met his doom at the hands of two Indian rulers, viz. Narasimhagupta and Yaśodharman. The last of these two belonged to Malwa and rose and fell like a meteor between A.D. 530 and 540. He claims in his Mandasar stone pillar inscription to have compelled Mihirakula to do homage to him. As he claims to have conquered and ruled the whole of Northern India, and as we have no cause for questioning the veracity of his statement, it is certain that Bundelkhand was

3. C.A., P. 34.
included in his vast dominions. With his death Bundelkhand seems to have been broken up into various principalities governed by local rulers.

V- THE EARLY MEDIEVAL PERIOD (FROM C.550 A.D. TO C.900 A.D.)

The latter half of the 6th century A.D. constitutes a dark period in the history of Bundelkhand. No evidence, literary or inscriptive, we possess that can throw some light on the events during this half-century. Consequently, we are compelled to indulge in surmises or conjectures on the basis of indirect evidence or reference.

Kālañjar must have remained under the rule of SomavamŚi dynasty as we have seen above that a king of this family was governing it in the beginning of 6th century A.D. The extent of his kingdom and the names of rulers who succeeded him can not be ascertained.

Likewise, the Parivrājaka MahārājŚas and the rulers of Ucchakalpa dynasty must have extended their dominions occupying parts of Bundelkhand. The Gupta power having declined, the Hūnas having been subjugated and Yaśodharmarman being dead, there was vacuum in Bundelkhand of which these dynasties must have taken full advantage.

In Khob copper plate inscription of the Mahārāja Samāksobha of the year 209 (A.D.528-29)\(^1\) Mahārāja Hastin is spoken of as governing the kingdom of Dañhāla or Dañhāla that had come to him by inheritance together with all the country included in the 18 forest kingdoms. Fleet\(^2\) takes Dañhāla for Bundelkhand of

---

2. Ibid., p.114.
modern times. We know that the whole of Bundelkhand was not included in his dominions, but his successors must have enlarged the kingdom after A.D. 550. On the whole, the picture of political condition of the region, that emerges thus, is devoid of details. For the time of Harsha, we possess two most valuable and dependable sources in Banabhaṭṭa's Harṣa-ācarita and the account left by the Chinese pilgrim Huen Tsang who travelled all over India from A.D. 630 to 644. And yet our picture improves but little, owing largely to the keen controversy that rages round the question of the extent of Harsha's empire. Ettinghausen and Panikkar¹ regard him as sovereign of the whole of Northern India. But according to Dr. R.C. Majumdar, Harsha's kingdom comprised merely the territories of the old states of Thāneśvara and Kanauj, though he probably added some small principalities to the north and west. It may be said to have comprised the Eastern Panjab and Uttar Pradesh.² Hence it is difficult to decide whether Bundelkhand was included in his dominions or remained independent under some local ruler.

Huen Tsang describes three states to the east of Malwa corresponding roughly to Eastern Malwa, Bundelkhand and Gwalior as being ruled by Brāhmaṇa kings.³ From this Dr. R.C. Majumdar concludes that Harsha's suzerainty did not extend much to the south of the Yamunā. But if the Yamunā is regarded as the southern boundary of his kingdom, his war with Pulakesin, a monarch ruling across Narmadā, can not be explained. More reasonable, therefore, appears to be the view of Dr. B.N. Sharma about the extent of Harsha's

¹ C.A., P.112.
² Ibid., P.113.
³ Ibid., Pp.112-113.
empire. To quote him, "Harsha certainly governed a vast empire which consisted of many kingdoms where kings were allowed to rule with certain amount of autonomy.... we can say that Harsha followed the policy of Samudragupta and felt satisfied with the loyal subservience of many of his contemporary kings whom he allowed a tremendous amount of autonomy. Harsha was certainly the paramount ruler of the entire north who ruled over the greatest empire of his times."¹ Thus even if we say, relying on Huen Tsang that Bundelkhand was governed by a Brāhmaṇa king, we shall have to agree that he acknowledged the suzerainty of Harsha. We, however, know nothing about the name or dynasty of this Brāhmaṇa ruler.

The post-Harshana period ending with the advent of the Čandella rulers in Bundelkhand is marked by the rule of different dynasties for whom we possess very little direct and reliable evidence. This paucity of direct evidence is compensated by a wealth of indirect evidence.

Immediately after Harsha, the territory around Kālānjjar appears to have been occupied by the Kaladuris. Prof. V.V. Mirashi is of the view that they conquered the whole of Bundelkhand and Baghelkhand.² Basing his conclusions on the evidence of the Saugor stone inscription of Śaṅkaragaṇa ³ he regards Vāmarāja to be the founder of the northern Kalacuri power. The name of this ruler is mentioned in the inscription. Śaṅkaragaṇa is said to have meditated at his feet. Vāmarāja is supposed to have overran Bundelkhand and Baghelkhand after Harsha, capturing Kālānjjar and establishing himself there.⁴ as Bundelkhand

3. Ibid. No.35.
4. Ibid., P.LXX.
was known as Čedi in ancient times, the Kalāḍuris came to be known as Čaidyas or lords of the Čedi country from the time of Vāmarāja, the founder of their line. The Saugor stone inscription of Śaṅkaragana is placed in the middle of the 8th century A.D. and Vāmarāja is said to have flourished from about 675 to 700 A.D. 1

In the last decade of the 7th century, we find Yaśovarman occupying the throne of Kanauj and hailed as the 'Lord of the North or whole of Uttarāpatha' in the inscriptions of Čalukya king Vijayāditya. 2 The exact extent of his kingdom is yet to be established beyond doubt, but if he ruled over considerable part of northern India, the Kalāḍuri rulers of Būndelkhand must have been his vassals. His reign is placed between A.D.700 and 740.

That Kalāḍuris continued to rule the region of our study is testified to by the Saugor stone inscription of Śaṅkaragana who is placed between A.D. 725 to 750. 3 Note needs to be taken here of the fact that Vāmarāja is not taken as the earliest ruler of the dynasty by some scholars. To quote Dr. H.C. Ray, 4 "The first historical name in the genealogy of the Kalāḍuris of Šahuḷa is that of Kokkalla." Identical is the opinion of Prof. D.C. Ganguly 5 who places him in the 9th century A.D. But as these scholars have not discussed the contents of Saugor stone inscription, referred to above, and as Prof. Hirashi has proved the association of early Kalāḍuri kings with Kālañjar, we should have no hesitation in accepting his views.

---

1. Ibid., P.XIX.
2. C.A., P. 130.
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During the first or second quarter of the 8th century A.D., a ruler of Saila dynasty also carved out a principality for himself in Bundelkhand. From the Ragnoli Plate of Jayavardhana II, we come to know that his grandfather Jayavardhana I established himself in Vindhyā region after killing the local king. The date of this king as well as the exact extent of his kingdom cannot be ascertained till more evidence is discovered. Dr. B.N. Puri holds him to be contemporary of Nāgabhaṭā I, the Gurjara-Pratihāra ruler, whose probable date he fixes as A.D. 730. His son and successor was Śrīvardhana II followed by Jayavardhana II who was held the lord of Vindhyā country. It appears that rulers of this dynasty governed over some parts of Bundelkhand in the 8th century A.D.

The last quarter of this century witnessed the beginning of a triangular struggle between the Gurjaras, the Pālas and the Rāṣṭrakūṭas for supremacy in Northern India, which proved an important factor in Indian politics for more than a century. As regards the history of Bundelkhand, we should know that in each of their invasions, the Rāṣṭrakūṭa rulers passed through it affecting the political conditions of the region a great deal. Significant, in this connection, is the fact that a Rāṣṭrakūṭa family ruled in Bundelkhand in the 9th century A.D. of which we shall speak more hereafter. As a matter of fact, till the rise of the Čandellas Bundelkhand being the heart of India could not get political stability owing to this continuous rivalry among the three powers. It is against this background that we have to view the events of the period.
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The Gurjara-Pratiharas of Avanti came into prominence from the time of Nāgabhaṭa I, who ruled from A.D.730 to 756. But neither he nor his successors Kakkuka and Devarāja are important for us, as they remained confined to Eastern Rajputana and Malwa.

Vatsarāja, the next ruler came to the throne before A.D.783. He was first among the Gurjara-Pratihāra rulers to enter into the contest for supremacy in Northern India. The city of Kanauj had been raised to the position of imperial dignity by Harsna Varhamana. Indrāyudha, a king of the Śhanḍī clan was ruling there as we learn from the Swallor inscription of Bhova that he forcibly wrested the empire from the famous Śhanḍī clan. The Rāṣṭrakūṭa records credit Vatsarāja with having defeated the Lord of Gauda, probably Dharmapāla. According to Dr. R.C. Majumdar Vatsarāja must have established his supremacy over a large part of Northern India and laid the foundations of a mighty empire. So it is not beyond realms of possibility that the local rulers of Būndelkhand acknowledged his suzerainty. But his imperial dreams were rudely shattered by the Rāṣṭrakūṭa king Dhrūva. Of importance for us is the fact that the battle between the forces of Vatsarāja and Dhrūva took place in Būndelkhand near Jhansi in which the Gurjara-Pratihāra ruler was defeated. Proceeding further, Dhrūva defeated Dharmapāla also on the outskirts of Doab which event must have taken place in Jalaun district of Būndelkhand. The date of this battle is difficult to determine.

4. Ibid., P. 5.
Vatsarāja vanishes from our view after his defeat at the hands of Dhruvā. No more we hear of him or his kingdom. Nāgabhaṭa II, his son and successor, however re-established the glory and majesty of the Pratihāras. The Gwalior inscription of his grandson credits him with conquering many kings. Spectacular, indeed, were his victories over the rulers of Kanauj and Bengal. Dethroning Indrāyudha, the vassal of Vatsarāja, Dharmapāla had placed his own nominee Čakrāyudha on the throne of Kanauj. Nāgabhaṭa II defeated Čakrāyudha as well as Dharmapāla and became a paramount ruler of the north. But his success was not destined to be more permanent than that of his father.

Once more the hereditary enemies from the south thwarted his imperial dreams. Nāgabhaṭa II had already come into conflict with the Rāṣṭrakūṭas in the early part of his reign and Govinda III was compelled to adopt a defensive policy at that time owing to other troubles. Having consolidated his position, he now directed his attention to the North where Nāgabhaṭa II ruled supreme. Like his father Dhruvā, he achieved phenomenal success.

Elaborate preparations were made. A number of detachments were kept in central India to keep the local rulers in check. He marched to Northern India via Bhopal and Jhansi to Kanauj which was his main objective. DR. R.C. Majumdar says, "The two armies probably met in Āundelkhand."

Of profound significance for us, in this regard is the Paṭhārī Pillar inscription of Prabala.\(^1\) Note may be taken here that Paṭhārī is so close to the boundary of Sagar district that it should be deemed as part of Bundelkhand. The inscription refers to the hasty retreat and 'devastated home' of Nāgāvaloka who has been identified by Kielhern with Nāgabhāṭa II. Karkkā to whom the credit is given for this achievement, probably accompanied the Rāṣṭrakūṭa king Govinda III.

The inscription tells us, further, that Parabala son of Karkkā, now rules the land. As the inscription is dated in V.S.317 (A.D.961) we can safely conclude that this Rāṣṭrakūṭa victory led to the establishment of a kingdom in Bundelkhand ruled by a branch of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa royal family, and its rule continued throughout the century. We can not say anything with regard to the extent of Parabala's kingdom.

He had very cordial relations with the Pālas. The name of king Parabala finds mention in the Pāla records.\(^2\) Besides, Dharmapāla is known to have married Raṃādevī, the daughter of Parabala. But the date of Paṭhārī stone inscription being 961 A.D., it is doubtful that Parabala was the father-in-law of Dharmapāla who must have died more than half-a-century before this date. But Dr. R.C. Majumdar regards that the marriage as true and says, "It is not, of course, beyond the range of possibility that out of political considerations Dharmapāla married at a fairly

\(^{1}\) E.I., Vol.IX, PP.248-256.
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advanced age a young lady of the Kāśtrakūṭa royal family. The
issue of this marriage was Devapāla who succeeded his father
about A.D. 810.\(^1\)

To return to Nāgabhaṭa II, we are fortunate
in possessing a positive evidence attesting to the fact that at
least Kālañjara territory of Būndelkhand was included in his
dominions. From the Barah copper Plate\(^2\) we learn that the grant
of Valakagraha in Kālañjara mañḍala had been sanctioned by
Nāgabhaṭa II, but the grant remained in abeyance till the time of
Bhoja who renewed it. Thus the rule of Gurgara-Pratināraśas in a
part of Būndelkhand is proved by the inscription.

No less important is the fact that some local
rulers of the region were his feudatories. Among these, mention
needs to be made of Čundellas who ruled over a small principality
round about Nāhäuserā. According to Dr. H.C. Ray, Nannuka was a
feudatory of Nāgabhaṭa II.\(^3\) So were some of his successors. It
is reasonable to assume that Būndelkhand passed under Gurgara-
Pratināra rule from the time of Nāgabhaṭa II.

His son and successor was Rāṃbhadra who had a
very short and inglorious reign of probably three years.

Añnapadeva, the next ruler, has been held as the
greatest emperor of Northern India in the early medieval period
and is known to history by several names used as his virudas.

---

1. A.I.K., P.50.
Gwalior inscriptions call him Śrīmadādivarāha and Parameśvara Śrī Rhojadeva whereas in the Sāgartala Pūrṇāti he has been hailed as Mihira. The etymology of the virudas, does not in any way indicate the personal religion of the ruler. The two Virudas Ādivarāha and Mihira, if interpreted literally, might signify that he was a devotee of Viṣṇu and of the Sun, but unlike his father Rāmaśrīvada who was a votary of Sun or his great-grandfather who was a devotee of Viṣṇu, this king was a Śākta attached to Bhagavatī.

As regards the inclusion of Bundelkhand in Sṛhada’s empire, we have important evidence establishing the fact. In Deogarh Jain Pillar inscription of V.S.319 mention is made of Mahāśāmanta Viṣṇurāma who was his feudatory. The significance of Barah Copper Plate inscription of Sṛhada has already been noted above which testifies to his sway over the territory around Kalanjar. The Čandella rulers Jayaśakti and Viṣṇuśakti have been regarded by scholars as feudatories of Sṛhada. To quote Dr. B.N. Puri, "The hold of the Gurjara-Pratināra ruler over Bundelkhand seems to be an established fact."

Sṛhada reigned from A.D. 836 to 882 when he was succeeded by his son Mahendraśrī I, who is known to have maintained the empire intact inherited by him. He is also known as Nirbhaya-narendra or Nirbhayarāja. His guru Rājaśekhara is a famous personality in Indian literature.

2. Ibid., Vol.XVIII, P.109.
3. Ibid., Vol.IV, PP.303-10.
VII THE LATE MEDIEVAL PERIOD (From C.900 A.D. to C.1200 A.D.)

Bundelkhand remained in the dominions of the Gurjara-Pratihāras during the first few decades of the 10th century A.D. An epigraphic record of utmost importance for us, testifies to this fact containing names of as many as four Gurjara-Pratihāra rulers. The consolidated Siyādoni stone inscription¹ recording a number of donations, mostly by private persons in favour of various Brahmical deities, and ranging in date from V.S.960 to V.S.1025 constitutes an important document for us, as it contains names of Bhoja, Mahendrapāla and their successors.

Records dated in V.S. 960 and 964 belong to the reign of Mahendrapāladeva and so his last known date is taken to be A.D.907-8. And he probably died not long afterwards.

The succession to the throne after him is a matter of dispute as the available data lend themselves to various interpretations. The Siyādoni inscription contains names of Kṣitipāla and Devapāla ruling in or around A.D.917 and 948 respectively.

A fragmentary stone inscription from Khajuraho² mentions that the Candella king Harsha placed the illustrious prince Kṣitipāladeva 'again' on the throne. Kielhorn³ takes him to be the same ruler who is mentioned as the immediate predecessor of prince Devapala in line 28 of the Siyādoni stone inscription. He is of the view that Harṣadeva first defeated Kṣitipāladeva

---

2. Ibid., PP.121-122.
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and subsequently reinstated his overlord in the government of his dominions. As regards Devapāla we should remember that according to Siyādoni inscription, he was ruling at Kanauj in V.S. 1005.

In Khajuraho stone inscription of the year V.S. 1011 we find mention of a king named Devapāla, with the epithet Hayapati (lord of horses), son of Herambapāla, and this Devapāla is held by some to be identical with his name-sake mentioned in Siyādoni stone inscription.

Confusion is worse confounded, when we find the Čandellas taking credit for defeating the Gurjaras, and forcibly wreasting the famous fort of Kalanjar from them. A king named Vināyakapāla is mentioned at the end of the record as protecting the earth. He has been taken by some to be the Pratihara ruler of Kanauj to whom the Čandellas still paid at least nominal allegiance.

The Rākheta stone inscription, found near Čanderī, records the constructions of some kind of waterworks by Vināyakapāladeva. The document is dated in the year V.S. 999 or 1000. The name of Vināyakapāla is known also from the Bengal Asiatic Society's Copper Plate dated in the year A.D. 931.

From the Asni inscription we learn the name of Mahipāla ruling round the year A.D. 917. Yet another Pratihāra king Mahendrapāla, second of that name, is mentioned in Partabgarh inscription dated in the year A.D. 946.

2. A.P.R., 1924-25, p. 163.
Lastly, a king named Vijayapāla ruling about the year 960 A.D. is known from the Rajorgarh inscription.¹

Thus we find that epigraphic data on the subject is copious, and yet, the chronology and exact identity of the rulers has not been established beyond dispute.

According to Dr. B.N. Puri,² Mahendrapāla died about 910 A.D. and Mahipāla ascended the throne as his heir-apparent. But Kalaūri king Kokkaladeva with the Rāṣṭrakūṭa ruler Indra III marched against Kanauj and placed Sboja II on the throne. Mahipāla was compelled to seek shelter with his Čandella feudatory Darsha who restored him to his original position. The Cambay Plates of Govinda IV³ mention Indra III as invading Malwa, capturing Ujjain, crossing the Jumna, devastating Kanauj and ultimately compelling Manipāla to flee before his general.

Manipāla was a patron of Rājaśekhara as well as Kṣemīśvara.⁴ The latter wrote a play entitled Čandakaúsikam in which evidence on the contemporary events is available. Thus on the basis of Cambay Plates and the drama of Kṣemīśvara, we may take the clash between Manipāla and the Karpṭatūs (Rāṣṭrakūṭas) as certain.

Dr. R.C. Majumdar, who holds identical opinion on the subject, advances the view that Manipāla, Kṣitipāla, and Herambapāla of the inscriptions, noted above, were same as Vināyakapāla whom he takes as son of Mahendrapāla I.

² Puri, B.N.: Ibid., P. 81.
⁴ Puri, B.N.: Ibid., P. 85.
⁵ m.I.K., P. 34.
Manipāla alias Vināyakāpāla ruled till the year A.D. 942, and was succeeded by his son Mahendrapāla II whose known date is A.D. 945-6 as we learn from Partabgarh inscription. After him, again, we are in confusion. As a matter of fact, the period between A.D. 945 and 960 is crowded with names of no less than 4 kings for whom we possess epigraphic evidence. They are:

1. Devapāla, son of Kaṣitipāla (A.D. 948-9) of the Siyādona stone inscription.
2. Vināyakāpāla II (A.D. 953-4) of the Khajurāho stone inscription of Yaśovarman and Bengal Asiatic Society's Copper Plate grant.
3. Mahipāla II (A.D. 955) of Bayāna inscription.
4. Vijayapāla (A.D. 960) of Majorgarh inscription.

Such is the uncertainty surrounding the succession to the imperial throne after Mahendrapāla II that it is difficult to say whether all these were distinct rulers or two or more of them were identical.

According to Dr. B.N. Puri, the Gurjara-Pratihāra contemporaries of Yaśovarman were Vināyakāpāladeva of the Bengal Asiatic Society Copper Plate, Devapāla of the Siyādona inscription and Mahendrapāladeva II of the Partabgarh inscription. This much is certain that the rulers mentioned in Siyādona record were those associated with Kanauj and not with Siyādona, where a certain Mahārājādhirāja Niśkalaṅka was ruling, probably as a feudatory, from the V.S. 1005 to V.S. 1025. Earlier the town of Siyādona was held by the illustrious Dhurabhaṭṭa in the year V.S. 969.

Till some more evidence is discovered nothing
can be said conclusively on the chronology as well as identity of
the successors of Mahendrapāla II.

The Gurjara-Pratīñāra rulers were not devoted to
any particular cult deity as were the Gupta emperors. The eclectic
spirit of the royal family is proved by the fact that for four
generations beginning from Devarāja, Pratīñāra kings were devotees
respectively of Viṣṇu, Śiva, Bhagavatī and Śūrya.

It should be quite clear from what has been said
above that the Čandellas had acquired considerable power and
prestige by the middle of the 10th century A.D. The origin of
their dynasty is one of the puzzles of Indian history to which no
satisfactory solution has yet been found. According to Dr. N.S. Bose,
"The Čandellas may have shared both Bhar and Gond blood and we
may add Ganaṃāra as well."\(^1\) With a view to hiding their aboriginal
origin, they trace their descent from the Moon\(^2\) or mythical
sage Čandrātreya\(^3\) in their epigraphical records. Their social
status, however, has been regarded as equal to that of the Čāhamānas.
The bards mention them as one of the thirty six Hajput clans.\(^4\)

Nannuka, the first known ruler of the dynasty is
supposed to have flourished in the first quarter of the 9th century
A.D. and we have mentioned above, that he was a feudatory to the
Gurjara Pratīñāra ruler Nāgabhaṭa II. Epigraphic records connect
the early kings of the family with Kharjūravāhaka, the modern

\(^1\) Bose, N.S.: Ibid. P.9.
\(^3\) Ibid., P.122-125.
\(^4\) A.I.K., P.82.
Khajurāho. We have noted that Kālāṅjar was included in the dominions of Nāgbhaṭa II and at Deogarh an inscription of his successor Bhoja has been found testifying to the inclusion of Deogarh in Pratihāra empire. As Khajurāho lied between Kālāṅjar and Deogarh, we have no objection to accepting the view that the early Čandella rulers were vassals of the Pratihāras.

Nannuka was succeeded by Vakpati who had two sons Jayaśakti and Vijayaśakti. The former who succeeded his father was also known as Jejjāka or Jejā after whom the country of Bundelkhand came to be named as Jejākānubkti.1 He gave his daughter Naṭṭa to the Kalaćuri Kokkala I. Vijayaśakti, the next ruler was succeeded by Rahilya. A village named Rahilya, about two miles south-west of Mahoba contains a tank and a temple both of which are ascribed to him. The temple is dedicated to Sun.

The Early Čandella rulers were feudatories to the Gurjara-Pratihāras as we have seen above. From the time of Harsha, the next ruler, however, they started playing a decisive role in North Indian politics. We have mentioned, that it was be who restored his overlord Kṣitipāladeva to the throne of Kanauj, when the latter had been dispossessed of his dominions by the combined forces of the Kalaćuris and the Rāṣṭrakūṭas.

Somewhat identical situation arose during the time of his son and successor Yāśovarman also when in 940 A.D. the Rāṣṭrakūṭas under Krisṇa III undertook another campaign against

1. E.I., Vol.I, V.10 :—

"के जा रघुव नवसितः स जाजेयुरिक्सः ।
प्रपन्नसिः वतः पुर्वप्रिष्ठिवसिसं ॥"
the Pratihāra empire. Manipūla, the Gurjara-Pratihāra ruler, was worsted and so parts of central India including the important cities of Kālañjar and Čitrakūṭa fell into Nāśṭrakūṭa hands as we read in one of their records. As of yore, the Čandella ruler came to the help of his overlord and the Pratihāra ruler recovered his lost territories from the Kalaçuri ally of the Nāśṭrakūṭas with the help of Yaśovarman, but at the cost of Kālañjar and Čitrakūṭa which Yaśovarman kept in his own possession instead of handing them over to the Pratināras. The disintegration of the Pratihāra empire had begun and neither Mahendrapāla II nor Devapāla were able to check it. Availing himself of the opportunity, Yaśovarman enlarged his dominions upto the Yamunā. Successfully he fought with the Kalaçuri king Yuvrañja I and his Paramāra contemporary Siyaka II extending the Čandella kingdom in south also. Barring these successes, his Khajurāho stone inscription credits him with having equalled the forces of the Khasas and defeated Kasmiris and Kurus. Doubtless, the account in the inscription being highly eulogistic and exaggerated, is, a vain panegyric of the poet.

The identity of the ruler Devapāla, son of Herambapāla, mentioned in the inscription is a matter of dispute among the scholars. Yaśovarman is said to have obtained an image of Vaikuṇṭha from him, to enshrine which, he erected a magnificent temple at Khajurāho, which is now identified with the Laksmana temple standing there.

According to Dr. B.N. Puri, this Devapāla might have been a Gurjara-Pratihāra feudatory who had a clash with the

---

Čandellas and the reference to the Gurjaras in the inscription refers to the feudatory family. 1 Identical is the opinion of Dr. N. S. Bose who holds that Herambapāla and his son Devapāla belonged to one of the minor dynasties of Northern India. 2 Dr. H. C. Ray remarks, "It is, of course, not absolutely impossible that these two princes were separate from the Gurjara princes bearing the same names." 3

The opposite view taking these princes to be Gurjara-Pratihāra rulers appears to be more acceptable. We possess unimpeachable evidence that Yaśovarman continued to acknowledge nominal sway of his Gurjara-Pratihāra overlord throughout his reign. A king named Vināyakapāla is mentioned at the end of his Khajurāho stone inscription. 4 The record mentions Vināyakapāla, "as protectin the earth." No body has satisfactorily explained the identity of this ruler. Dr. N. S. Bose 5 was inclined to identify him with Dhaṅga for the simple reason that all Čandella kings except him had Sanskritic names. In no other inscription we come across this Sanskritic name of Dhaṅga and hence we disagree with the view of Dr. Bose. The inscription describes Yaśovarman as scorching fire to the Gurjaras but the expression is poetic and should not be taken literally. The fact that he kept Čitrakūṭa and Kalanjvar for himself while recovering the dominions of his overlord speaks volumes for his relations with the Pratihāras. We have independent evidence attesting to the fact that Devapāla and Vināyakapāla were Gurjara-Pratihāra rulers. Hence we have no objection to accepting

2. Bose, N. S.: Ibid., p. 34.
the view of Prof. D.C. Ganguly who regards Devapāla as well as Vināyskapāla of Khajurāho record to be the overlord of Yaśovarman. From Devapāla he received an image of Viṣṇu. Belonging to an imperial dynasty, his father was in a position to obtain it from Sāhi, the king of Kīrā, who received it from the Lord of Tibet. Had he been hailing from a minor dynasty, as is the view of some scholars quoted above, Herambapāla could not have got it at all. Moreover, none of these scholars has said even a word more about them than merely hinting at their separate identity from their Pratihāra name-sakes.

Dhaṅgadeva, the son and successor of Yaśovarman, must have come to the throne sometime before A.D. 934, the date of his Khajurāho stone inscription. Verse 43 of this record gives an idea of the extent of Candella kingdom during Dhaṅgadeva's time.

"The kingdom extended from the river Yamunā in the north to the frontiers of the Čedi kingdom in the south and from Kālaṇjar in the east or north-east to Gopādri (the modern Gwalior) in the northwest." He obviously inherited this kingdom from his father Yaśovarman whose conquest of Kālaṇjar constitutes an important landmark in the Candella history, for we find Dhaṅga and his successors taking pride in calling themselves the lords of Kālaṇjar in their inscriptions.

The court-poet of Dhaṅga credits him with having subdued a number of enemies: the Gauḍa, the Khāsa, the Kosala, the Kāšmiri, the Mitrilīla, the Kālava, the Čedi, the Kuru and the Gurjara (Gujarat). He is said to have conquered the governors of

1. A.I.K., P.84.
3. N.L.S., Vol. I, Nos. XIX(IV), XXV(II), XXXVIII.
Kratha, Siáhala, Kuntala and kings of Káñcó, Ándhra, Rádha and Ańga. Needless to add that few of these claims would bear scrutiny. They are panegyric in nature.

Dhāńga could not retain hold on Gwalior for long as Vajradáman of Kačchhapagháta family conquered it in A.D. 977. Barring this event, Dhāńga had a successful career. So weal had become his Pratihára overlord, that he proclaimed his independence and assumed the title of Mahárájádhirája indicating it.

A Jain inscription from Deogarh mentions the name of a king Ujaraváta. As the record is dated in V.S 1051, it belongs to Dhāńga's time. The ruler, who is otherwise unknown, may have been a feudatory to him.

According to Firishta, the confederacy of the Hindu chiefs that fought against Subuktgin in A.D. 989 included the Rájá of Kálañjár. He must have been Dhāńga and Prof. D.C. Ganguly accepts the report of Firishta as historical.

The last known inscription of Dhāńga is dated in 1002 A.D. He shortly died thereafter. He had ruled for more than half a century. He was devout worshipper of Śíva contrary to his father who was a Vaiśñava. A number of temples are known to have been erected during his time.

2. A.I.K., P.85.
5. Ibid.
Ganḍa, his son, is known to have ruled till 1018 A.D. when he was succeeded by his son Vidyādhara. The defeat of Rajyapāla Pratihāra of Kanauj at the hands of Muslim invaders from Ghazni so infuriated Vidyādhara that he directed his ally Kacchapaghāta ruler Arjuna to attack him. This fact stands adequately attested to by the Dubkund inscription. ¹

Consequently, confrontation with the Muslims became a certainty. Mahmūd of Ghazni came upto Gwalior in 1019 A.D. and second time in A.D. 1022, he besieged Kalanjar itself but a decisive victory eluded him both the times. Significant, therefore, is the fact that Vidyādhara has been hailed 'the most powerful of the Indian rulers of the time' by even Muslim chroniclers. ² Vidyādhara fought successfully with his Farmāra and Kalaburi neighbours.

His successor Vijayapāla won a victory over Kalaburi Gāngeyadeva. Around 1050 A.D. Devavarman was occupying the Čandella throne. As he died without leaving a lineal successor, the throne passed laterally to his younger brother Kīrtivarman before 1073 A.D.

Kalaburi monarch Karṇa happened to be one of the powerful Indian rulers ruling at the time. So in the Čedi-Čandella contest that ensued now, the Čandellas were worsted and lost much territory which was eventually retrieved by Kīrtivarman. ³ An interesting controversy rages round the role played by Gopāla in rescuing the Čandella kingdom at this critical hour.

² Mitra, S.K.; The Early Rulers of Khajuraho, P.36.
³ S.E., P.58.
Cunningham took the word 'Gopāla' as another name of Viṣṇu and believed that Kirtivarman freed the Čandellas from the subjection of Karṇadeva by the favour of Viṣṇu. 

Ajayagārh rock inscription² of Viravarman credits Kirtivarman with having created a new kingdom. In Deogarh rock inscription³ he has been compared to 'a new Viṣṇu without his club' and tributes have been paid to his prowess. But in the drama Prabodha-candrodaya of Śrīkṛṣṇa Miśra, full credit has been given to Gopāla for having revived the Čandella kingdom.⁴ Prof. D.C. Ganguly⁵ also subscribes to this view. As the play is known to have been staged in the presence of Kirtivarman himself, it appears that Gopāla did play an important role in recovering the lost dominions.

Vatsarāja, a minister of Kirtivarman, wrested from a general of Karṇa the Mandala of Hita mountain and built the fort of Kirtigiri there (identified with Deogarh, in district Lalitpur) where an inscription of Kirtivarman has been found engraved on a rock.

Besides being a general, Kirtivarman was a builder as well as a patron of arts and letters. Prabodha-candrodaya, an allegorical play, composed by Śrīkṛṣṇa Miśra with a view to eulogising and emphasizing the importance of devotion to Viṣṇu (Viṣṇubhakti) was staged in his presence.

---

4. Bose, N.S., Ibid., P.76.
5. S.E. P.58.
Sallakṣaṇāvarman who ascended the throne after him, won victories over the Parmāra Naravarman of Mālwā and Čedi neighbour in the south. To him succeeded Jayavarman of whose reign we know little. He abdicated the throne in favour of his uncle Prthvīvarman.

Around 1129 A.D. Madanavarman came to the throne and remained in power till his death in 1163 A.D. Defeating Parmāra Yādovarman he annexed Bhilsā and successfully measured swords with his Čedi contemporary Gayākarna.

A fragmentary stone inscription found at Dudnahi in the script of 12th century A.D. contains in line 5 words 'Rājā Čandra' and 'Kuśasthalapuri' or Kanauj in line 8. One would thus feel tempted to ascribe the inscription to the Gahaḍavālas of Kanauj. Perhaps the 'Čandellas lost hold of this part of the country about the time of the inscription. Significant, again, is the fact, noted by Dr. N.S. Bose, that in the preface to the drama Rambhāmañjarīnātikā by Nayaśandrasūri, Jayačandra is referred to as a new incarnation of Rama whose mighty arm is like a pillar to tether the elephant of fortune of king Madanvarmadeva.

A Jain record from Deogarh dated in V.3.1210 contains the name of a ruler Manāsāmanta Udayapāladeva. As he is unknown otherwise, it can not be said with certainty whether he was feudatory to Madanavarman.

2. Ibid., P.88.
Jayasimha Siddharāja, the Čalukya ruler of Gujarat, invaded Manoba during Madanavarman's time. Mention to this effect in Kṛtikāumudi¹ and the discovery of two coins of Siddharāja at Pandwana² in Jhansi district indicates that the contest did take place between the two. Prof. D.C. Ganguly³ is of the view that Madanavarman successfully defended his capital, though, he had to surrender Bhilsā to the invader. On the other hand a stone inscription from Kālaṅjar⁴ records that Madanavarman in an instant defeated the king of Gurjara, as Kṛṣṇa in former times defeated Kamsa. So it appears that the conflict proved indecisive with neither side gaining victory over the other.

After a short reign of Yasovarman II, Parmārdideva, the grandson of Madanavarman ascended the throne in about 1165 A.D. and ruled till 1202 A.D. Madanavarman's dominions extended upto the Yamunā in the north, the Betwā in the south-west Rewa in the east, and the Narmadā in the south according to Dr. N.S. Bose.⁵ And his grandson succeeded in maintaining his paternal kingdom intact for a very long time. The fact that he assumed the title of "Lord of Daśārṇa" indicates that he was able to recover Bhilsā from the Čalukyas some time after A.D. 1173 up to which date it is known to have formed part of that kingdom.⁶

2. Ibid.
3. S.E., P.59.
In or before A.D. 1182 the Čahamāna Prthvīrāja III defeated Parmārdi and overran Jejakabhukti Mandala. Two short inscriptions from Madanpur bear testimony to it. In A.D. 1202 Qutb-ud-din invested Kālañjar and just when Parmārdi was on the point of concluding a humiliating peace with the enemy, he was assassinated by his minister Aj Deo and the fight was resumed. Shortage of water in the fort, however, compelled the inmates of the fort to surrender.

King Parmārdi was a devout worshipper of Śiva and one of his titles was Parama-mahēśvara. He is known to have composed an eulogy in honour of God Śiva that was found inscribed by Cunningham on a stone slab in the temple of Nīlakanṭha at Kālañjar.

Trailokyavarman, the next ruler, retrieved the lost dominions including Kālañjar by inflicting defeat on the Muslims. Vīravarman who succeeded him in A.D. 1241 is known to have ruled till 1285 A.D.

Bhojavarman, Hammīravarman and Vīravarman II are the last known rulers of the dynasty. About A.D. 1309 Alauddin Khilji wrested the district of Damoh from Hammīravarman. Gone for ever were the glamour and glory of the Čandella Moon.
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