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PREFACE

As early as in 1837 James Prinsep indicated the necessity of systematically arranging the epigraphical materials for the study of ancient history of India under the name Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum which was also suggested by him. Following this scheme, the work of editing this Volume was entrusted to me by the Director General of Archaeology in his letter of 30th March, 1966.

The volume was planned in the beginning to contain the inscriptions of the time of the Paramāras and the Chandellas; but while preparing materials for my edition of inscriptions of the time of these two royal families, it occurred to me that it was desirable to include in this work the record of some minor dynasties also, which were their contemporaries and reigning in the adjoining region. Thus I have included in this work the records of three other dynasties, namely, the Kachchhapatākās, the Yajñavālās and the one known only from a solitary stone inscription from Itignōda (ancient Ringanapadra) in the Ratlam District of Madhya Pradesh.

A number of inscriptions of the Paramāras have recently been discovered; they all have found place in the Volume. In the course of my study of these records I found that some of the inferences previously drawn had to be supplemented and some others to be modified. By way of examples, I may mention inscription No. 31, below, which shows for the first time the last regnal year of Udayāditya, No. 21 which tends to show that his son Lakshmadēva probably did not reign as an emperor, and No. 42, which throws a flood of light on the history of the Mahākumāra period. All these records have been edited here for the first time, as also most of those belonging to the time of the Junior branches of the Paramāras.

The procedure usually followed by me in editing the inscriptions is to prepare the texts from ink-impressions and in case they were not available, to take help of photographs or previously published facsimiles. In a number of instances I have also compared my reading from the originals. Some of the originals, again, are lost or untraceable, and they were not illustrated by my predecessors who edited or noticed these records; and in such cases I had no other course except to give their actual reading accompanied by my notes.

Most of the impressions (or photographs) were supplied by the Chief Epigraphist; and some by the Museums at Lucknow, Nagpur and Ajmer, the Bhabha Bahwan of the Hindu University, Varanasi, and the museum attached to the Vikram University, Ujjain. Inked impressions were also received from some other quarters; and though they were helpful in their own way, they are not worth reproducing here. With my acknowledgement to them all for this kind help, it may be remarked here that very few of the impressions besides those provided by the Chief Epigraphist enabled me to edit the records critically and give authentic readings of the texts; and I find it impossible to over-estimate the help rendered to me by him and his office, not only in picking up the required estampages from the extensive heap but also in preparing and supplying some of them. By way of an apt example, I may cite the case of our No. 89 which is incised on the pedestal of an image of Hanumān and was not only besmeared with red lead but the lower part of which containing the date had also some time later been plastered with cement. The cemented portion was broken up and a fresh impression was supplied to me by the efforts of an official of his staff.

This apart, my work was beset with another difficulty. A few of the inscriptions were found partly or wholly hidden behind some later constructions, for example, Nos. 180 and 92, below respectively. In all such cases, I had to satisfy myself by reproducing only their transcripts prepared by my predecessors.
The Introduction to this work gives the political history of the dynasties whose inscriptions are included here; and this Section is followed by an account of the administrative, religious, economic and social conditions of the time, as gleaned mainly from the inscriptions.

The Section on administration has been supplemented by two appendices, the first of which enlists the territorial divisions and the second the place-names mentioned in the inscriptions, alphabetically.

In all these Sections I have placed my attention more on the inscriptions and it is only occasionally that I have given references from the contemporary literature. We have extensive literature on varied subjects composed under the liberal patronage of the Paramātras; and to compress it all in a limited space would hardly do justice to the subject. Time and health permitting, I may be able to deal with it, separately, in future.

It has been rightly said that "history without chronology is a grand-mother's tale". Following this maxim, in my narration of the political history of all the branches of the Paramātras and the other dynasties, I have made a tentative attempt to suggest the reigning period of each of the kings. It is all purely hypothetical, as the attempt is made here for the first time.

The texts of inscriptions are all given here in the Nāgari characters and I have not translated them for fear of increasing the bulk. For I felt that whatever important could be had from the translation is all incorporated either in the editions of the inscriptions or in foot-notes appended to them. The equivalents of the dates occurring in the records had not in many cases been determined previously; and in this task and also in the case of new ones, I have throughout used S.K. Pillai's *Indian Ephemeris*. For identifying place-names I had to obtain maps from various sources, e.g., the Survey, Census and the Revenue departments of the States. While denoting or identifying a place, I have given the tehsil and district in which it is included at present and in several cases, the approach-road also. This no doubt entailed much labour, particularly with the changes of the tehsils and the districts in modern times.

A few words must be said about putting diacritical marks on geographical names occurring throughout this work. It is generally believed that they are not necessary in the case of modern well-known place-names such as Delhi, Bombay and Allahabad; but I find no uniformity in this respect. For example, Fleet in his Corpus of the Gupta inscriptions has used these marks on Allahābād (p.302), Bhōpāl (p.305) and Gwālior (p. 316); and D.C. Sircar in his *Select Inscriptions* has used them on Bhōpāl (p.74), Delhi (p.55), Poonta (p.411) and Allahābād (p.509). I have put these marks in most of these instances, of course leaving the cases of well-known place-names, feeling all the while that they would facilitate reading by foreign scholars. Occasionally I have also used them on names which have been officially recognised, e.g., in the case of Vīdīshā (so spelt) but not in that of Madhya Pradesh or Uttar Pradesh. Geographical names have all been spelt as they are popular in the locality and also as found in maps, e.g. Mārwād, Ajayagadh, etc.

With my advanced age (I am 72 now) and from a recurring eye-disease, it has become somewhat difficult for me to verify the reference, particularly those which I had noted at distant places possessing good libraries and utilising them after returning to my residence where I would resume work. Thus it is likely that some slips may have escaped attention in a work which bristles with references and which resembles, as rightly said, "the mowing of a whole field and not gleaning only a few straws". For all these slips, I crave the indulgence of scholars, in consideration of the maxim *gachchhataḥ skhalanāni kva api bhavatyeva pramādanah*. Their suggestions, however, will be thankfully acknowledged and I would reap their benefit in my future work.
PREFACE

As I conclude this preface, I cannot help expressing how exciting and exacting, how educative and rewarding, my experience has been for about a decade, during which this work has been my exclusive passion, and jealous taskmaster. It has given me the thrills of “a watcher of the skies when a new planet swims into his ken”. Dame Fame (the last infirmity of the noble mind) has been spurring me all the time “to scorn delight and live labourious days” despite advancing age and indifferent health. The intense imaginative sympathy with the “mute inglorious” writers of these epigraphs has awakened me to a vivid realisation of that glorious past in which our traditional cultural anchorages still lie deep. Although the child of our imagination may be a changeling by the time it comes from the nurse, I do sincerely hope that some discerning scholar will notice this labour of love and be inspired to make further advances into this veritable gold-mine.

What remains is the pleasant duty of acknowledging my obligations to others. I must first mention the veteran scholars J. Fleet, E.Hultsch and M.M. Mirashi whose Corpus on inscriptions were the models I set before me. From the last-named scholar and from some others, notable among whom are D.C. Sircar, K. Deva and L.O. Joshi, I derived valuable help. Dr. G.S. Gai, K. Deva and P.R. Srinivasan were kind to go through some of the portions of the work and offer their constructive criticism and also encouraged me to complete the work soon. To all these scholars I owe a deep sense of gratitude. I am also thankful to the authorities of the various Museums, the Vikram University, The Oriental Library, Baroda, and last but not the least the Archaeological Survey of India, for giving me facilities for consulting the libraries in their charge. I cannot adequately express my obligation to Shri M.N. Deshpande, Director General of Archaeology (since retired), and to two of his predecessors for their kind consideration and help in various ways. I am particularly indebted to Shri Deshpande who facilitated my travel to distant and remote places for the study of some of the inscriptions in situ and who was constantly eager to encourage me in my work when it was in progress.

Indore

Akshaya Tritiya, V.S. 2031
(25-4-1974)

H.V. TRIVEDI
POST SCRIPT

The printing of this volume consisting of three parts was delayed due to various reasons. The proof of part I was corrected at various stages by Dr. Subramonia Iyer and Dr. A. Ramulu, Deputy Superintending Epigraphists working in my office. Besides, Dr. Subramonia Iyer has single-handedly supervised the printing work in all its aspects for which he deserves special thanks. The index to the volume was prepared by Sarva shri T.S. Ravishankar and Jai Prakash, Senior Epigraphical Assistants, Office of the Deputy Superintending Epigraphist, Northern Zone, Jhansi.

I would like to express my thanks to all the gentlemen mentioned above for their help in the printing of this part and Shri J.C. Gupta, Production Officer, Archaeological Survey of India, New Delhi for getting the part printed through the press and M/s. S. Narayan and Sons, New Delhi for printing the part neatly.

Mysore.
22.11.1991

K.V. Ramesh
Director (Epigraphy)
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<td>Nāṅţ Stone Inscription of the Time of Sōmasirīṇa: (Vikrama) Year 1290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>266</td>
<td>LXXXI-A</td>
<td>Devkēthār Stone Inscription of the Time of Sōmasirīṇa: (Vikrama) Year 1293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>267</td>
<td>(No Plate)</td>
<td>Kāḷājārā Stone Inscription of the Time of Āḷhaṇadēva: (Vikrama) Year 1300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>269</td>
<td>LXXXI-B</td>
<td>Bhūḷā Stone Inscription: (Vikrama) Year 1321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>270</td>
<td>LXXXII</td>
<td>Girvaḍ Stone Inscription of the Time of Pratāpasilīṇa: (Vikrama) Year 1344</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Inscriptions of the Paramāras of Vāgada

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>278</td>
<td>LXXXIII</td>
<td>Pāṇāhēḷī Stone Inscription of Maṇḍalika: (Vikrama) Year 1116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>286</td>
<td>LXXXIV</td>
<td>Arthūṇā Stone Inscription of Chāṃḍūḍarāja: (Vikrama) Year 1136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>296</td>
<td>LXXXV</td>
<td>Arthūṇā Stone Inscription of the Time of Chāṃḍūḍarāja: (Vikrama) Year 1137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>LXXXVII-A</td>
<td>Arthūṇā Stone Inscription of the Time of Chāṃḍūḍarāja: (Vikrama) Year 1159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302</td>
<td>LXXXVII-B</td>
<td>Arthūṇā Stone Inscription of the Time of Chāṃḍūḍarāja: (Vikrama) Year 1159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>305</td>
<td>LXXXVIII-A</td>
<td>Arthūṇā Stone Inscription of the Time of Chāṃḍūḍarāja: (Year probably lost)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>309</td>
<td>LXXXVIII-B</td>
<td>Arthūṇā Stone Inscription of the Time of Vijayarāja: (Vikrama) Year 1165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>312</td>
<td>LXXXIX</td>
<td>Arthūṇā Image Inscription of the Time of Vijayarāja: (Vikrama) Year 1166</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Inscriptions of the Paramāras of Bhimāḷ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>318</td>
<td>(No Plate)</td>
<td>Rōpī Plate Inscription of Ďēvarāja: (Vikrama) Year 1059 (?)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>(No Plate) Bhinnmál Stone Inscription of the Time of Krishnarāja: (Vikrama) Year 1117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>(No Plate) Bhinnmál Stone Inscription of the Time of Krishnarāja: (Vikrama) Year 1123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>XC Kirādī Stone Inscription of Sūmēśvara : (Vikrama) Year 1218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>XCI Bhinnmál Stone Inscription of the Time of Jayatsimha : (Vikrama) Year 1239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>XCII An Inscription of the Paramāras of Jālōr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jālōr Stone Inscription of the Time of Visala : (Vikrama) Year 1174</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PART 3

**Inscriptions of the Chandellas of Jējakabhukti**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>XCIII Khajurāhō Stone Inscription of [Harshadēva] ? : (Fragmentary)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>XCIV Khajurāhō Stone Inscription of Yasōvarman : (Vikrama) Year 1011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>XCV-A Khajurāhō Jaina Temple Inscription of the Time of Dhaṅgadēva : (Vikrama) Year 1011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>XCV-B Nanyaurā Copper-Plate Inscription of Dhaṅgadēva : (Vikrama) Year 1055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101-06</td>
<td>XCVI-XCIX Six Dudāhī Stone Inscriptions of Devalabdhi : (Undated)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>C-A Nanyaurā Copper-Plate Inscription of Dēvavarman : (Vikrama) Year 1107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>C-B Charkhāri Copper-Plate Inscription of Dēvavarman : (Vikrama) Year 1108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>CI Darbat Sāntinātha Image Inscription of the Time of Kirttivaran : (Vikrama) Year 1132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>CII Kālañjara Stone Inscription of the Time of Kirttivaran : (Vikrama) Year 1147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>CIII Dēogadh Rock Inscription of the Time of Kirttivaran : (Vikrama) Year 1154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>CIV Ajayaagadh Rock Inscription of the Time of Kirttivaran : (Undated)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>CV Fragmentary Mahōbā Inscription ending with the Name of Kirttivaran : (Date Lost ?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>CVI Khajurāhō Stone Inscription of Dhaṅgadēva of the Year 1059; Renewed by Jayavarmanadēva in the Year 1173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>CVII Kālañjara Pillar Inscription of the Time of Madanavarman : (Vikrama) Year 1186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>CONTENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>CVIII-A  Kālañjār Pillar Inscription of the Time of Madanavarman: (Vikrama) Year 1187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>CVIII-B  Kālañjār Rock Inscription of the Time of Madanavarman: (Vikrama) Year 1188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>CIX      Augāśi Copper-Plate Inscription of Madanavarman: (Vikrama) Year 1190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>CX       Bhārat Kāla Bhavan Plate Inscription of Madanavarman: (Vikrama) Year 1192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>CXI-A    Kālañjār Rock Inscription of the Time of Madanavarman: (Vikrama) Year 1192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>CXI-B    Ajayagadh Stone Inscription of the Time of Madanavarman: (Vikrama) Year 1208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>(No Plate) Horniman Museum Image Inscription of the Time of Madanavarman: (Vikrama) Year 1208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>CXI-C    Mahōbōa Image Inscription of the Time of Madanavarman: (Vikrama) Year 1211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>CXII     Khajurāhō Stone Image Inscription of the Time of Madanavarman: (Vikrama) Year 1215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>(No Plate) Man Stone Inscription of the Time of Madanavarman: (Fragmentary)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>CXIII    Sēmrā Copper-Plate Grant of Paramardidēva: (Vikrama) Year 1223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>CXIV     Mahōbōa Stone Inscription of the Time of Paramardidēva: (Vikrama) Year 1224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>CXV      Ajayagadh Stone Inscription of the Time of Paramardidēva: (Vikrama) Year 1227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>CXVI     Ichchāṭvar Copper-Plate Inscription of Paramardidēva: (Vikrama) Year 1228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>CXVII    Mahōbōa Copper-Plate Inscription of Paramardidēva: (Vikrama) Year 1230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>CXVIII   Pachhār Copper-Plate Inscription of Paramardidēva: (Vikrama) Year 1233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>CXIX     Charkhāri Copper-Plate Inscription of Paramardidēva: (Vikrama) Year 1236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>CXX      Aḥār Statue Inscription of the Time of Paramardidēva: (Vikrama) Year 1237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>CXXI     Bhārat Kāla Bhavan Copper-Plate Inscription of Paramardidēva: (Vikrama) Year 1239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>CXXII    Kālañjār Rock Inscription of the Time of Paramardidēva: (Vikrama) Year 1240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>CXXIII   Fragmentary Mahōbōa Stone Inscription of the Time of Paramardidēva: (Vikrama) Year 1240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>CXXIV    Ajayagadh Stone Inscription of the Time of Paramardin: (Vikrama) Year 1243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>CXXV     Bhārat Kāla Bhavan Plate of Paramardidēva: (Vikrama) Year 1247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>CONTENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>CXXVI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>CXXVII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>CXXVIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>CXXIX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>CXXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>CXXXI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>CXXXII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>CXXXIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>CXXXIV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>CXXXV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>CXXXVI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>CXXXVII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
<td>CXXXVIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152</td>
<td>CXXXIX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td>CXXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154</td>
<td>CXXXI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>CXXXII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>CXXXIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157</td>
<td>CXXXIV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158</td>
<td>CXXXV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159</td>
<td>CXXXVI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>CXXXVII</td>
<td>A Yajnapala Stone Inscription from Narwar: (Undated and Incomplete)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161</td>
<td>CXXXVIII</td>
<td>Bṛdṛti Stone Inscription of the Time of Gopāladeva: (Vikrama) Year 1336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162-74</td>
<td>CXXXXIX</td>
<td>Bangāl Stone Pillar Inscriptions of the Time of Gopāladeva: (Vikrama) Year 1337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
<td>CL</td>
<td>Narwar Stone Inscription of the Time of Gopāladeva: (Vikrama) Year 1339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176</td>
<td>CLI</td>
<td>Surwāyā Stone Inscription of the Time of Gopāladeva: (Vikrama) Year 1341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177</td>
<td>CLII</td>
<td>Śēsai Pillar Inscription of the Time of Gopāladeva: (Vikrama) Year 1341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178</td>
<td>CLIII</td>
<td>Surwāyā Stone Inscription of the Time of Gaṇapati: (Vikrama) Year 1350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179</td>
<td>CLIV</td>
<td>Narwar Stone Inscription of the Time of Gaṇapatidēva: (Vikrama) Year 1355</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Supplementary-Inscriptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>CLV</td>
<td>Halayudha-Stotra in the Amarāvara Temple at Māṇḍhāta: (Vikrama) Year 1120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181</td>
<td>CLVI</td>
<td>Udaipur Stone Inscription of the Time of Udayāditya: (Undated)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>182</td>
<td>CLVII</td>
<td>Dabhōka Stone Inscription of the Time of Naravarman: (Undated)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183</td>
<td>CLVIII</td>
<td>Hoshangābd Stone Inscription of Mahākumāra Harīchandra: (Vikrama) Year 1243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>184</td>
<td>CLIX</td>
<td>A Fragmentary Stone Inscription From Ujjain: (Date Lost ?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185</td>
<td>CLX</td>
<td>A Fragmentary Inscription From Māṇḍu: B (Date Probably Lost)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>186</td>
<td>CLXI</td>
<td>A Fragmentary Stone Inscription From Māṇḍu: A (Date Lost ?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>186</td>
<td>CLXII</td>
<td>Udaipur Stone Inscription of Jayasimha IV: (Vikrama) Year 1366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>186</td>
<td>CLXIII</td>
<td>Girvadh Stone Inscription: (Vikrama) Year 1181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>186</td>
<td>CLXIV</td>
<td>A Paramārā Stone Inscription From Chitrī: (Vikrama) Year 1314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>186</td>
<td>CLXV</td>
<td>Varmān Stone Inscription of the Time of Vikramasimha: (Vikrama) Year 1356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187</td>
<td>CLXVI</td>
<td>Dhubēl Museum Stone Inscription of the Time of Madanavarman: (Vikrama) Year 1203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>188</td>
<td>CLXVII</td>
<td>Ajayagadh Stone Inscription of the Time of trailōkyavarman: (Vikrama) Year 1269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>188</td>
<td>CLXVIII</td>
<td>Ajayagadh Stone Inscription of the Time of Viravarman: (Vikrama) Year 1355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>CLXIX</td>
<td>Ajayagadh Rock Inscription (of the Time of Bhōjavarmān): (Vikrama) Year 1344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>194</td>
<td>CLXX</td>
<td>Pannā Stone Pedestal Inscription: (Vikrama) Year 1366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>195</td>
<td>CLXXI</td>
<td>Ajayagadh Rock Inscription (of the Time of Bhōjavarmān): (Vikrama) Year 134x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196</td>
<td>CLXXII</td>
<td>Rāsin Stone Inscription of the Time of Paramārdin: (Vikrama) Year 1466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197</td>
<td>CLXXIII</td>
<td>Makāval Stone Inscription of the Time of Dhārāvarsha: (Vikrama) Year 1276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198</td>
<td>CLXXIV</td>
<td>Rājpur Copper-Plate Charter of the Paramāra Rānadhavaḷa: (Vikrama) Years 1148 and 1127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199</td>
<td>CLXXV</td>
<td>Eulogy of Sun-God From Udaipur: (Incomplete and Undated)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>CLXXVI</td>
<td>Sāwarmāon Stone Inscription of the Time of Jagaddēva: (Undated)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>CLXXVII</td>
<td>Kundēśvara Copper-Plate Inscription of the Time of Vidyādharaḷēva: (Vikrama) Year 1060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>CLXXVIII</td>
<td>Rāmvan Museum Copper-Plate Inscription of Trailōkyaḷvarman: (Vikrama) Year 1283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>CLXXIX</td>
<td>Budhēḷa Pillar Inscription of the Time of Ganaḷpati: (Vikrama) Year 1351; Śaka Year 1216</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<thead>
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<th>Plates</th>
<th>Description</th>
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</tr>
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<tbody>
<tr>
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<td>Kalvan Plate Inscription of the Time of Bhōjadēva: (Undated)</td>
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<td>Bhōjpur fragmentary Stone Inscription of the Time of Bhōjadēva:</td>
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<td>XXIII</td>
<td>Jhālāpātān Stone Inscription of the Time of Udāyāditya: (Vikrama) Year 1143</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXIV</td>
<td>Shērgadh Stone Inscription of Udāyāditya: (Vikrama) Year 11xx</td>
<td>Facing page 74</td>
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<td>Udaipur Stone Inscription of the Paramāṭra Rulers of Mālwa: (Undated) Parts A-B</td>
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<td>XXVIII</td>
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<td>The Dhār Inscription (Sarpabandha): (Undated)</td>
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<td>Ūn Sarpabandha Inscription: (Undated)</td>
<td>Facing page 89</td>
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<tr>
<td>XXXI</td>
<td>Dōngargāon Stone Inscription of the Time of Jagāddēva: Śaka Year 1034</td>
<td>Facing page 92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXXII</td>
<td>Jainād Stone Inscription of the Time of Jagāddēva: (Undated)</td>
<td>Facing page 96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXXIII</td>
<td>Amērā Stone Inscription of the Time of Naravarman: (Vikrama) Year 1151</td>
<td>Facing page 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXXIV-A</td>
<td>Dewās Copper-plate Inscription of Naravarman: (Vikrama) Year 1152</td>
<td>Facing page 104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXXIV-B</td>
<td>Bhōjpur Image Inscription of the Time of Naravarman: (Vikrama) Year 1157</td>
<td>Facing page 104</td>
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<tr>
<td>XXXV</td>
<td>Nagpur Museum Stone Inscription of Naravarman: (Vikrama) Year 1161</td>
<td>Facing page 112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXXVI</td>
<td>Kadambapadraka Grant of Naravarman: (Vikrama) Year 1167</td>
<td>Facing page 118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXXVII</td>
<td>A Jaina Inscription from Shērgadh: (Vikrama) Year 1191</td>
<td>Facing page 119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXXVIII</td>
<td>Vīḍisāṭ Stone Inscription of the Time of Naravarman: (Undated)</td>
<td>Facing page 122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXXIX</td>
<td>Eulogy of Sun-God composed by Chhittapa: (Date lost ?)</td>
<td>Facing page 124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XL-A</td>
<td>Ujjain Copper-plate Inscription of Yaśavarman: (Vikrama) Year 1192</td>
<td>Facing page 128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XL-B</td>
<td>Ujjain Copper-plate Inscription of Jayavarman: (fragmentary)</td>
<td>Facing page 128</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LIST OF PLATES

XLI-A Ujjain Copper-plate Inscription of Lakshmivarman: (Vikrama) Years 1191 and 1200
Facing page 136

XLI-B Bhojpūl Pillar Inscription of the Time of Mahākumāra Lakshmivarman: (Undated)
Facing page 136

XLII Bhojpūl Pillar Inscription of the Time of Mahākumāra Lakshmivarman: (Undated)
Facing page 140

XLIII Vīṣṇū Stone Inscription of Trailōkya varman: (Vikrama) Year 1216
Facing page 144

XLIV Gṛṛaspur Pillar Inscription of Trailōkya varman: (fragmentary)
Facing page 145

XLV Bhojpūl Copper-plate Inscription of Mahākumāra Harīśchandra:
Facing page 150

XLVI-XLVII Bhojpūl Copper-plate Inscription of Mahākumāra Udayavarman: (Vikrama)
Year 1256
Between pages 160 and 161

XLVIII Harsaudā Stone Inscription of the Time of Dēvapāla: (Vikrama) Year 1275
Facing page 174

XLIX-L Māndhātā Copper-plate Inscription of Dēvapāla: (Vikrama) Year 1282
Between pages 182 and 183

LI Udaipur Stone Inscription of the Time of Dēvapāla: (Vikrama) Year 1286
Facing page 186

LII Udaipur Stone Inscription of the Time of Dēvapāla: (Vikrama) Year 128[9]
Facing Page 188

LIII Rāhatgād Stone Inscription of the Time of Jayasimha: (Vikrama) Year 1312
Facing page 192

LIV Atrī Stone Inscription of the Time of Jayasimha: (Vikrama) Year 1314
Facing page 194

LV Mōḍī Stone Inscription of the Time of Jayavarman: (Vikrama) Year 1314
Facing page 198

LVI-LVII Māndhātā Copper-plate Inscription of Jayavarman: (Vikrama) Year 1317
Between pages 204 and 205

LVIII Vīṣṇū Stone Inscription of the Time of Jayavarman II: (Vikrama) Year 1320
Facing page 208

LIX Paṭṭārī Stone Inscription of the Time of Jayasimha II: (Vikrama) Year 1326
Facing page 209

LX-LXI Māndhātā Copper-plate Inscription of the Time of Jayavarman: (Vikrama) year 1326
Between pages 218 and 219

LXII-LXIII Māndhātā Copper-plate Inscription of the Time of Jayavarman: (Vikrama)
Year 1331
Between pages 222 and 223

LXIV Varman Stone Inscription of the Time of Pūrṇapāla: (Vikrama) Year 1099
Facing page 226

LXV Vasantagāth Stone Inscription of the Time of Pūrṇapāla: (Vikrama) Year 1099
Facing page 230

LXVI Bhāḍīlī Stone Inscription of the Time of Pūrṇapāla: (Vikrama) Year 1102
Facing page 236

LXVII Ajñātī Stone Inscription of the Time of Yasōdhāvala: (Vikrama) Year 1202.
Facing page 238

xxi
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plates</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Facing Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LXVIII</td>
<td>Achulagadh Stone Inscription of Yasodhavala: (Vikrama) Year 1207</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LXIX</td>
<td>Bagh Image Inscription of the Time of Yasodhavala: (Vikrama) Year 1210</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LXX</td>
<td>Kāyadrā Stone Inscription of Dhārāvarsha: (Vikrama) Year 1220</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LXXI</td>
<td>Nāṇā Stone Inscription of the Time of Dhārāvarsha: (Vikrama) Year 1237</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LXXII</td>
<td>Ajhārī Stone Inscription of the Time of Dhārāvarsha: (Vikrama) Year 1240</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LXXXI-A</td>
<td>Munthala Stone Inscription of Dhārāvarsha: (Vikrama) Year 1245</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LXXXII-B</td>
<td>Bāmanvārī Stone Inscription of the Time of Dhārāvarsha: (Vikrama) Year 1249</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LXXXIV</td>
<td>Jhālādī Stone Inscription of the Time of Dhārāvarsha: (Vikrama) Year 1255</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LXXV</td>
<td>Butrī Stone Inscription of Dhārāvarsha: (Vikrama) Year 1271</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LXXVI-LXXVII</td>
<td>Kāntal Stone Inscription of the Time of Dhārāvarsha: (Vikrama) Year 1274</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LXXVIII</td>
<td>Rohērā Copper-plate Inscription of the Paramāras of Chandravatī: (Fragmentary)</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LXXIX</td>
<td>Dhānta Image Inscription of the Time of Sōmasiniha: (Vikrama) Year 1277</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LXXX</td>
<td>Nāṇā Stone Inscription of the Time of Sōmasiniha: (Vikrama) Year 1290</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LXXXI-A</td>
<td>Devakhētār Stone Inscription of the Time of Sōmasiniha: (Vikrama) Year 1293</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LXXXI-B</td>
<td>Bhūlā Stone Inscription: (Vikrama) Year 1321</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LXXXII</td>
<td>Girvad Stone Inscription of the Time of Pratāpasinha: (Vikrama) Year 1344</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LXXXIII</td>
<td>Panahēdā Stone Inscription of Manjali: (Vikrama) Year 1116</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LXXXIV-LXXV</td>
<td>Arthūnā Stone Inscription of Chāmunḍarāja: (Vikrama) Year 1136</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LXXXVI</td>
<td>Arthūnā Stone Inscription of Chāmunḍarāja: (Vikrama) Year 1137</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LXXXVII-A</td>
<td>Arthūnā Stone Inscription of the Time of Chāmunḍarāja: (Vikrama) Year 1137</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LXXXVII-B</td>
<td>Arthūnā Image Inscription of the Time of Chāmunḍarāja: (Vikrama) Year 1159</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LXXXVIII-A</td>
<td>Arthūnā Stone Inscription of the Time of Chāmunḍarāja: (Undated)</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LXXXVIII-B</td>
<td>Arthūnā Stone Inscription of the Time of Vijayarāja: (Vikrama) Year 1165</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LXXXIX</td>
<td>Arthūnā Stone Inscription of the Time of Vijayarāja: (Vikrama) Year 1166</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LIST OF PLATES

Plates
XC Kirāgli Stone Inscription of Sōmeśvara:
    (Vikrama) Year 1218
Facing page 328
XCI Bhimāl Stone Inscription of the Time of
    Jayatīrtha; (Vikrama) Year 1239
Facing page 330
XCII Jālār Stone Inscription of the Time of Vīsala:
    (Vikrama) Year 1174
Facing page 334

PART 3
Inscriptions of the Chandellas of Jejakabhukti

XCIII Khajurrāhō Stone Inscription of Harshadēva ?:
    (Fragmentary)
Facing page 336
XCV Khajurrāhō Stone: Inscription of Yaśōwarman:
    (Vikrama) Year 1011
Facing page 342
XCV-A Khajurrāhō Jaina Temple Inscription of the
    Time of Dhangadēva; (Vikrama) Year 1011
Facing page 348
XCV-B Nanyaurā Copper-Plate Inscription of
    Dhangadēva; (Vikrama) Year 1055
Facing page 348
XCVI-XCIX Six Dudhā Stone Inscriptions of Dēvalabdhi:
    (Undated)
Between pages 354 and 355
C-A Nanyaurā Copper-Plate Inscription of Dēvavarman:
    (Vikrama) Year 1107
Facing page 360
C-B Charkhārī Copper-Plate Inscription of Dēvavarman:
    (Vikrama) Year 1108
Facing page 360
Cl Darbat Śāntinītha Image Inscription of the Time
    of Kirttiwarman (Vikrama) year 1132
Facing page 370
CII Kālaṇjar Stone Inscription of the Time of
    Kirttiwarman; (Vikrama) Year 1147
Facing page 372
CIII Deogadh Rock Inscription of the Time of
    Kirttiwarman; (Vikrama) Year 1154
Facing page 372
CIV Ajayagadh Rock Inscription of the Time of
    Kirttiwarman; (Undated)
Facing page 372
CV Fragmentary Mahābha Inscription ending with the
    Name of Kirttiwarman; (Date Lost ?)
Facing page 380
CVI Khajurrāhō Stone Inscription of Dhangadēva
    of the Year 1059; Renewed by
    Jayavarmadeva in the Year 1173
Facing page 386
CVII Kālaṇjar Pillar Inscription of the Time of
    Madanavarman; (Vikrama) Year 1186
Facing page 391
CVIII-A Kālaṇjar Pillar Inscription of the Time of
    Madanavarman; (Vikrama) Year 1187
Facing page 392
CVIII-B Kālaṇjar Rock Inscription of the Time of
    Madanavarman; (Vikrama) Year 1188
Facing page 392
CIX Augāsi Copper-Plate Inscription of
    Madanavarman; (Vikrama) Year 1190
Facing page 398
CX Bharat Kalal Bhavan Plate Inscription of
    Madanavarman; (Vikrama) Year 1192
Facing page 398
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plates</th>
<th>Inscription</th>
<th>(Vikrama) Year</th>
<th>Facing Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CXI-A</td>
<td>Kālañjār Rock Inscription of the Time of</td>
<td>1192</td>
<td>404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Madanavarman:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CXI-B</td>
<td>Ajayagadā Stone Inscription of the Time of</td>
<td>1208</td>
<td>408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Madanavarman:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CXI-C</td>
<td>Mahōba Image Inscription of the Time of</td>
<td>1211</td>
<td>411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Madanavarman:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CXII</td>
<td>Khajurāhō Stone Image Inscription of the Time of</td>
<td>1215</td>
<td>411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Madanavarman:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CXIII</td>
<td>Sēmar Copper-Plate Grant of Paramardīdeva:</td>
<td>1223</td>
<td>428-429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Vikrama) Year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CXIV</td>
<td>Mahōba Stone Inscription of the Time of</td>
<td>1224</td>
<td>436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paramardīdeva:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CXV</td>
<td>Ajayagadā Stone Inscription of the Time of</td>
<td>1227</td>
<td>436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paramardīdeva:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CXVI</td>
<td>Icchhāvār Copper-Plate Inscription of</td>
<td>1228</td>
<td>441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paramardīdeva:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CXVII</td>
<td>Mahōba Copper-Plate Inscription of</td>
<td>1230</td>
<td>446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paramardīdeva:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CXVIII</td>
<td>Pachhār Copper-Plate Inscription of</td>
<td>1233</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paramardīdeva:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CXIX</td>
<td>Charkhārī Copper-Plate Inscription of</td>
<td>1236</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paramardīdeva:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CXX</td>
<td>Ahār Statue Inscription of the Time of</td>
<td>1237</td>
<td>457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paramardīdeva:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CXXI</td>
<td>Bhārat Kāla Bhavan Copper-Plate Inscription of</td>
<td>1239</td>
<td>460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paramardīdeva:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CXXII</td>
<td>Kālañjār Rock Inscription of the Time of</td>
<td>1240</td>
<td>462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paramardīdeva:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CXXIII</td>
<td>Fragmentary Mahōba Stone Inscription of the</td>
<td>1240</td>
<td>462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time of Paramardīdeva:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Vikrama) Year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CXXIV</td>
<td>Ajayagadā Stone Inscription of the Time of</td>
<td>1243</td>
<td>467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paramardin:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CXXV</td>
<td>Bhārat Kāla Bhavan Plate of Paramardīdeva:</td>
<td>1247</td>
<td>467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Vikrama) Year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CXXVI</td>
<td>Baṭēsvāra Stone Inscription of the Time of</td>
<td>1252</td>
<td>472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paramardīdeva:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CXXVII</td>
<td>Kālañjār Stone Inscription of the Time of</td>
<td>1258</td>
<td>478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paramardīdeva:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CXXVII</td>
<td>Kālañjār Stone Inscription of the Time of</td>
<td>1258</td>
<td>478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paramardīdeva:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CXXVIII</td>
<td>Gārrā Copper-Plate Inscription of</td>
<td>1261</td>
<td>485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trailōkāvarman:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CXXIX</td>
<td>Sāgar Copper-Plate Inscription of</td>
<td>1264</td>
<td>490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trailōkāvarman:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CXXX</td>
<td>Dhurēti Copper-Plate Inscription of the Time of</td>
<td>963</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trailōkāyamalla:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Kalachuri)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Facing pages 490 and 91
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plates</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CXXXI</td>
<td>Charkhāri Copper-Plate Inscription of Viravarman: (Vikrama) Year 1311</td>
<td>-Do-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CXXXII</td>
<td>Ajayagadhi Rock Inscription of the Time of Viravarman: (Vikrama) Year 1317</td>
<td>501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CXXXIII</td>
<td>Ajayagadhi Rock Inscription of the Time of Viravarman: (Vikrama) Year 1325</td>
<td>503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CXXXIV</td>
<td>Ajayagadhi Rock Inscription of the Time of Viravarman: (Vikrama) Year 1337</td>
<td>503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CXXXV</td>
<td>Kālañjar Stone Inscription of Viravarman: (Fragmentary)</td>
<td>509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CXXXVI</td>
<td>Ajayagadhi Stone Inscription of the Time of Bhōjavarmar: (Vikrama) Year 1345</td>
<td>513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CXXXVII</td>
<td>Ajayagadhi Stone Inscription of the Time of Bhōjavarmar: (Undated)</td>
<td>520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CXXXVIII</td>
<td>Charkhāri Copper-Plate Inscription of Hammirmiravarman: (Vikrama) Year 1346</td>
<td>524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CXXXIX</td>
<td>Bṛhmni Sati Stone Inscription: (Vikrama) Year 1365</td>
<td>524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CXXXX</td>
<td>Ajayagadhi Sati Stone Inscription of the Time of Hammirmiravarman: (Vikrama) Year 1368</td>
<td>-Do-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CXXXXI</td>
<td>Ḍubkund Stone Inscription of the Time of Vikramasimha: (Vikrama) Year 1145</td>
<td>532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CXXXXII</td>
<td>Gwālior Stone Inscription of Mahipāla: (Vikrama) Year 1150</td>
<td>542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CXXXXIII</td>
<td>Gwālior Stone Inscription of the Time of Mahipāla: (Vikrama) Year 1161</td>
<td>551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CXXXXIV</td>
<td>Narwar Copper-Plate Inscription of Virasinhadhēva: (Vikrama) Year 1177</td>
<td>-Do-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**An Inscription of the Dynasty of Vijayapāla**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plates</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CXXXV</td>
<td>Ḫabodu Stone Inscription of Vijayapālaṇḍēva: (Vikrama) Year 1190</td>
<td>560</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Inscriptions of the Yajvapālas of Narwar**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plates</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CXXXXVI</td>
<td>Bhimpur Stone Inscription of the time of Asalādēva: (Vikrama) Year 1319</td>
<td>566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CXXXXVII</td>
<td>Narwar Stone Inscription of the Time of Asalādēva: (Fragmentary, Undated)</td>
<td>571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CXXXXIII</td>
<td>Bāḍḍī Stone Pillar Inscriptions of the Time of Gōpālādēva: (Vikrama) Year 1336</td>
<td>576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CXXXXIX</td>
<td>Bāḍōḷa Stone Pillar Inscriptions of the Time of Gōpālādēva: (Vikrama) Year 1337</td>
<td>Between pages 580 and 581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL</td>
<td>Narwar Stone Inscription of the Time of Gōpālādēva: (Vikrama) Year 1339</td>
<td>589</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LIST OF PLATES

Plates

CLI Surwāyā Stone Inscription of the Time of Gopāladeva: (Vikrama) Year 1341 Facing page 594
CLII Sēsa Pillar Inscription of the Time of Gopāladeva: (Vikrama) Year 1341 Facing page 595
CLIII Surwāyā Stone Inscription of the Time of Gaṇapati: (Vikrama) Year 1350 Facing page 598
CLIV Narwar Stone Inscription of the Time of Gaṇapatidēva: (Vikrama) Year 1355 Facing page 603

Supplementary-Inscriptions

CLV Halayudha-Stōtra in the Amarēvara Temple at Māṇḍhātā: (Vikrama) Year 1120 Facing page 608
CLVI Udaipur Stone Inscription of the Time of Udayāditya: (Undated) Facing page 612
CLVII Dabhōka Stone Inscription of the Time of Naravarman: (Undated) Facing page 613
CLVIII Hsthangalāṭ Stone Inscription of Mahākumāra Hariśchandra: (Vikrama) Year 1243 Facing page 615

CLIX A Fragmentary Stone Inscription From Ujjain: (Date Lost ?) Facing page 616
CLX A Fragmentary Inscription From Māṇḍu: B (Date Probably Lost) Facing page 618
CLXI A Fragmentary Stone Inscription From Māṇḍu: A (Date Lost ?) -Do-

CLXII Udaipur Stone Inscription of Jayasimha IV: (Vikrama) Year 1366 Facing page 623

CLXIII Girvā Stone Inscription: (Vikrama) Year 1181 Facing page 623

CLXIV A Paramāga Stone Inscription From Chitrī: (Vikrama) Year 1314 Facing page 626

CLXV Varman Stone Inscription of the Time of Vikramasimha: (Vikrama) Year 1356 Facing page 626

CLXVI Dhulea Museum Stone Inscription of the Time of Madanavarman: (Vikrama) Year 1203 -Do-

CLXVII Ajayagadh Stone Inscription of the Time of Trailokyavarman: (Vikrama) Year 1269 -Do-

CLXVIII Ajayagadh Stone Inscription of the Time of Viravarman: (Vikrama) Year 1335 Facing page 632

CLXIX Ajayagadh Rock Inscription of the Time of Bhōjavaranman: (Vikrama) Year 1344 Facing page 632

CLXX Pannā Stone Pedestal Inscription: (Vikrama) Year 1366 Facing page 635
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLXXIII</td>
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INTRODUCTION

POLITICAL HISTORY

THE PARAMĀRAS OF MĀLWA

The Paramāras, who were one of the last Hindu dynasties which reigned in Mālwa or Avanti including parts of Gujarāt and Southern Rājasthān, hold an honourable place in the annals of Indian history. These rulers commenced their political career as feudatories of the imperial Rāṣṭrakūṭa monarchs in about the middle of the tenth century A.C. and in course of time, they succeeded in building a strong kingdom in the heart of the central part of India to the north of the Gōdāvari, and bounded roughly on the east and west by the Bēṭwā and the Chambal rivers respectively. They played a dominant part in the history of the country, with strange vicissitudes, for about four hundred years, till they were conquered and finally overthrown by the Muslims in the opening years of the fourteenth century A.C. Their contribution to the field of literature is not less significant.

It is generally held that the region mentioned above came under the sway of the Paramāras in consequence of the protracted war between the two mighty powers, viz., the Gūjāra-Pratihāras in the north (c. 836-1037 A.C.), and the Rāṣṭrakūṭas in the south (c. 754-973 A.C.), who were both struggling for supremacy in Indian politics. Dantidurga (733-758 A.C.), the founder of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa house of Mālkhēd, succeeded in overthrowing the Chālukyas of Bāḷāṇi and is well known to have defeated Nāgabhadaja, the earliest ruler of the Pratihāra house, and from the Samangad plates dated Śaka 675 (754 A.C.) and the undated Dāśāvatarā Cave inscription at Ellōrā, we know that this Rāṣṭrakūṭa ruler fought on the banks of the Mālī, Mahāndī and Rēvā, and won victories over Kāṇchī, Kalinga, Kōsala, Śrīśaila, Mālava, Līṭa and Taṅka. He is also reported to have performed the śrīmāṇygarbhā-ādiṇa ceremony, at Ujjain, in which “kings such as the Gūjāra lord and others were made door-keepers.” The long, protracted war between the two rising powers continued with intervals, for we know from the Rāṣṭrakūṭa records that at least three of the kings belonging to this dynasty, viz., Dhrūva (c. 780-793 A.C.), his son Gōvinda III (c. 793-814 A.C.) and the latter’s successor, Indra III (c. 915-927 A.C.), carried their victorious arms into the heart of the Pratihāra kingdom. In their campaign in the north, the Rāṣṭrakūṭas always realized the economic and strategic importance of Mālwa and the adjacent areas through which they and their armies passed; and this is why they endeavoured to bring it permanently under their political influence. Verse 24 of the Sahjan plates of Amōghavarsa, dated Śaka 793 (871 A.C.), says that “Gōvinda (III) returned from there (i.e., from his northern expedition), (thinking) that it was the work of the ministerial servants, and following again the bank of the Narmadā, as if (following his own) prowess, and acquiring the Mālava country along with Kōsala, Kalinga,
Vaṅga (Vēṅga), Čahāla and Čdraka, that Vikrama himself made his servants enjoy them.\footnote{Ep. Ind., Vol. XVIII, p. 235.}
On the authority of this verse it has been concluded that “Gōvinda III entrusted the charge of the administration of Mālava to one of his vassals, who is admittedly taken to have been Upendra, the founder of the Paramāra dynasty.\footnote{Ep. Ind., Vol. X, pp. 23-31; Ind. Cult., Vol. XI, pp. 161 ff.; and M.T.A., pp. 322 ff.} From which of the royal dynasties the Rāṣṭrakūṭas captured this part of Mālava and its adjacent territories is a theme of keen controversy, which may be mentioned here in brief. The reference in the Saṭhajā plates to a Gūjārāja posted as the pratihāra in the Hiranyagarbhāra-dāna ceremony performed by Dantidurga at Ujjain, as we have noted above, led D.R. Bhandarkar to conclude that a member of the Gūjāra-Pratihāra family was ruling at that place at this time.\footnote{A.I.K., p.4.} Following him, some other scholars of repute like R.C. Majumdar,\footnote{H.P.D., pp. 88 ff.} A.S. Altekar,\footnote{H.K., pp. 219 ff.} R.S. Tripathi\footnote{H.P.D., p. 10.} and D.C. Ganguly\footnote{P., 80 ff. v. 52.} held that Ujjain was the Pratihāra capital before it was shifted to Kānyaikubja. This view is further corroborated by a verse of the Jaina Harivamśa-parāṇa, which mentions Vatsaratya as the ruler of Avantī\footnote{See J.D.L., Vol. X, pp. 23-31; Ind. Cult., Vol. XI, pp. 161 ff.; and M.T.A., pp. 322 ff.} but it is not accepted by others who point out that the Daśvatāra temple inscription makes it clear that the Mālava kingdom was then different from the Gūjāra kingdom which lay somewhere on the seacoast, and after its conquest Dantidurga may have chosen Ujjain, which was a sacred place, for performing the ceremony in which he may have invited the different rulers to participate. The verse of the Harivamśa-parāṇa, which too has been added as an evidence in support of the theory, is, according to them, ambiguously worded and therefore its testimony is doubtful.\footnote{Here also see D.C. Sircar’s view giving cogent reasons for mentioning Avantī and the Gūrjaras separately in the Sinir and Nilgund inscriptions of Amōghavardha (Ep. Ind., Vol. XXXIV, pp. 137 ff.). P. Bhattacharya contradicts this view in P.B.P., p. 26, n. 4. But her points are not convincing as they make a number of successes.}

It seems, however, that the remark of these scholars, viz., that the Mālava kingdom was then separate from the Gūjāra kingdom,\footnote{Ep. Ind., Vol. X, pp. 176 ff. Also see V.V. Mirashi, Studies in Indology, Vol. II, p. 226, where he says that Mālāva was included in the dominions of the Pratihāras from whom it was conquered by Krishna III.} applies only to the earlier time when Dantidurga commenced his career and even for some time thereafter. But during the time of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa king Kṛṣṇa III, the former of these kingdoms appears to have been under the sway of the Gūjāra-Pratihāras, as is shown by the Pratāpa-gaṇḍa grant of Mahendrapāla II, dated V.S. 1003 (946 A.C.), which mentions his donation of a village situated in the western pathaka of Daśapura (Mandasor) for the worship and repairs to the temple of the goddess Vāṇayakshī, and from the same record we also know that this Pratihāra king had a feudatory under him at Ujjain and that his commander-in-chief (baidhikritra), Śrī-Sarman, was carrying on the affairs of state at Mandapikā or Māndī.\footnote{Ep. Ind., Vol. XIV, pp. 176 ff.}
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We now take up another question, viz., the origin of the Paramáras. Like the origin of many other dynasties that ruled over the different parts of India during the period under review, that of the Paramáras also is shrouded in mystery. The bardic tradition of the Râjâpûtas regards them as fire-born along with the Pratihâras, the Chaulíkyas and the Châhâmânâs. With slight variations in the narrations of the different bards, it relates that once when the wish-fulfilling cow (Râmadhânu) of the sage Vasishthâ, who was performing sacrifices on Mount Ábî, was stolen and carried away by the son of Gâdhi (Visvâmitra), he, being indignant threw an offering into the fire with some holy sayings, and as a result of that, a hero, clad in golden armour and adorned with bow and arrows, sprang out from the fire-altar, to receive instructions. The sage ordered him to kill the enemies (parât mâraya) and called him by the name Paramâra. He also gave the hero his gÔtra, Vasishthâ. This warrior, according to the tradition, was the originator of the royal family of the Paramáras.¹

The origin of the house to the eponymous Paramâra is traced also in the Navasâhasântakachârîa, composed by Padmápaguṭa-Parimala, the court-poet of Sîndhurâjâ² (c. 995-1010 A.C.) and also in the Tîlakamâñjîvari which was composed by Dhanapāla during the reign of Sîndhurâjâ’s son Bhâjâdeva; and it was also adopted in works of much later date, e.g. in the Prîthvirâjâ-Râsî and the A’în-i-Ákbarî.³

In this respect, however, we have first of all to remark that the Aṅgikula myth appears to have no historical value, for it is beyond one’s comprehension that fire actually produced warriors. The earliest of our inscriptions are ignorant of this origin of the Paramâra house; and as far as epigraphs are concerned, it is found first in the Udaipur prâsastî, which belongs to the latter part of the eleventh century A.C.⁴ Thus Padmápaguṭa appears to have been the real originator of this theory; his work, after all is a kâvyâ, and he appears to have utilized the bardic legend with a view to glorify the family of his patron. Padmápaguṭa’s account was followed by some other works like the Râsî and the A’în-i-Ákbarî and even by some later inscriptions; and from this we can conclude that the theory was current in the period when they were written. Moreover the former of these works (Râsî), which embellishes the story with fictitious details, is not fully trustworthy.⁵

In some of our inscriptions we find the name of the progenitor of the family not as Paramâra but as Dhîmarâjâ, which shows that the sacrificial fire gave rise to smoke which itself assumed the form of a hero. Citing an instance from an inscription from Ábî, G.H. Ojha propounded the view that the theory of the fire-origin of the Paramáras became popular because of the name Dhîmarâjâ which was given to their first ancestor.⁶ But it may be stated here that this one instance and the others where we find the name Dhîmarâjâ⁷ are all comparatively late and they have led some scholars to rightly suggest that it is the legend of Aṅgikula which gave rise in course of time to the name Dhîmarâjâ and the case is not vice versa, as Ojha was inclined to hold.⁸

² Canto XI, vv. 71 ff.
³ T.M., v. 79; A.A., Vol. II, pp. 214 ff. The Bhûrûshkya Purâna traces the origin of the Paramâras as early as the time of Ásîka, during whose reign some Kânyâkubja brîhmanâs performed sacrifice on the Mount Ábî. See Pratiṣār Śrîvaś, pt. I. ch. VI.
⁴ No. 24, vv. 5-6.
⁵ See H.M.H., Vol. II, pp. 18 ff; I.H.Q., Vol. XVI, pp. 738 ff.; E.C.D., p. 7. Also see our remarks about this work in the account of the Chandellás.
⁷ For example, in Nos. 65, 75 and 82. In the last of these records the hero who sprang from the fire is called Dhîmarâjâ and the family is named Paramâra.
⁸ See P.R.P., pp. 11-12.
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The Agnikula myth, however, led some European and Indian scholars to interpret it to mean that the Paramāras belong to the Hiṇa-Gūjara stock, the people belonging to which are believed to have entered India during the fifth and sixth centuries A.C. Watson, Campbell, Hoernle, Forbes, D.R. Bhandarkar and H.C. Ray are inclined to treat them as an offshoot of the Gūjaras, whereas V.A. Smith, who took them as related to the three other Agnikula races, mentioned above, actually quoted William Crooke's remarks that the myth "represents a right of purgation by fire, the scene of which was the Southern Rājputānā, whereby the impurity of the foreigners was removed and they became fit to enter the Hindu caste system". But this view is not supported by our inscriptions, and as already shown by some scholars, the myth can as well be interpreted to signify that some sort of religious right was performed in the presence of the sacred fire, by a priest (of the Vasishṭha gōtra?) to inspire some brave persons for the protection of religion and culture.

In his History of Medieval Hindu India, C.V. Vaidya suggested that "the original home of the Paramāras was Mount Ābī, from where they migrated to Mālva and established a kingdom of their own". This view appears to have been based on the statement of Padmapagupta who describes this mountain while giving the origin of the dynasty, and on some later epigraphs.

Considering the original home of the Paramāras, we find that D.C. Ganguly ventured to suggest that they were members of the imperial Rāṣṭra-kūta house. His argument rests on the assumption that the Harsola grants proceed with the expression tasmīn kula, which, according to him, has to be connected with the family of the Rāṣṭra-kūtas described just before. But in the absence of a confirmatory and definite evidence, this suggestion must be regarded as a pure guess, particularly when we do not exactly know whether there is a lacuna before tasmīn in the Harsola grants, as doubted by their editors themselves. It is also significant to note here that in case the Paramāras had belonged to the family of the Rāṣṭra-kūtas, they would not have in any case suppressed this fact but would have certainly mentioned this relation in their grants with a view to glorify their family. Ganguly's argument that Vākpatirajā-Muṇja, the son of Siyaka II, adopted the Rāṣṭra-kūta titles of Aṃgaḥavarsha, Śrīvallabha and Prithivīvallabha, which also lends colour to his view, does not stand on a sound basis, since we find that the Rāṣṭra-kūtas too are known to have adopted some of the titles of the Western Chālukyas whom they had overthrown; and it has been understood merely to mean that the former were the successors of the latter in their glory. Ganguly's another assumption, viz., that the original home of the Paramāras was in the Deccan is based on the statement of the Āṭṭin-i-Akbāri, according to which Dhanač (Dhanāchāya?), the founder of the family, transferred his seat from the Deccan and established himself in Mālva, comes from a very late source, and is not known to the inscriptions. Here it is also significant to note that Ganguly has revised his opinion later on, as he remarked that "It is generally assumed that the original home of the Paramāras was Mount Ābī in the Sirhī State, Rājputānā".

K.N. Dikshit and D.B. Diskalkar, who jointly edited the Harsola grants of Siyaka, were inclined to hold that "possibly the Paramāras were descended from a Rāṣṭra-kūta princess". They thought that as some of the Vākṣṭaka plates begin the genealogy with

---

2 E.H.I., 3rd edn., p. 412.
3 M.T.A., p. 329.
4 Vol. II., pp. 11 ff. This view is also held by G.H. Ojha in his Rājputānī-kā-śāstra, Vol. I., p. 191.
5 H.P.D., p. 9.
6 Cf. Prithivīvallabha, Śrīvallabha, Rananisika, Bhuvanakumārpa and Vīrāyuddha.
7 The Age of Imperial Kanauj, p. 94.
a description of the Gupta emperors from whom queen Prabhavati was descended, so the Paramāras may have descended from the Rāṣṭrakūṭa kings, Amoghavarsha and Akaḷavarsha, through a Rāṣṭrakūṭa princess, and therefore, the present records (Harsōḷā grants) open with the name of two Rāṣṭrakūṭa sovereigns".1

But, as pointed out by these scholars themselves, "a portion of the original draft (of the grants) is missing through the engraver's oversight", and nothing can be definitely said in respect of the relation of the Paramāras with the Rāṣṭrakūṭas, though scholars like H.C. Ray are also, inclined to hold this view, with some hesitation.2

Differing from all these scholars, D.C. Sircar has to suggest that the early Paramāras, who ruled over Mālava country near the Māghi river, were Mālavas by nationality.3 But we have no evidence to show that in the beginning the Paramāra rulers were known to be Mālavas. In fact they began to be called by this name only after they occupied the Mālava country.

Summarising all the available evidence, however, we may remark here that none of the theories propounded so far in this respect is fully convincing. The real origin of the dynasty being forgotten in course of time, the composers of the grants and the prāśasti had only to follow the general custom of the age in this respect for tracing the origin of the ruling dynasties to some mythical or legendary hero.

The caste of the Paramāra rulers is the next point requiring discussion. The Udaipur prāśasti uses the expression dvija-varga-ratna (a jewel among the twice-born) while describing Upendra, the founder of the family. The Pipālānagar grant of Arjunavarman, dated V.S. 1267 (1211 A.C.) says that the predecessor of this king was a crest-jewel (sēkharā) of the Kshatriyas,4 and accordingly, the Paramāra rulers appear to have been Kshatriyas, which view is corroborated by the Prabhāvakaś charisma which calls Vākpatirāja born in that dynasty as a Kshatriya.5 D. Sharma, however, has picked up a reference from the Purānātīrāvṛtti of Halāyudha, the court-poet of Vākpati-Muṇja, according to which his patron was known as belonging to the Brahma-kṣatriya caste. The verse runs as follows:

Brahma-kṣatriya-kulinah samastā-sāmanta-mūra-charanah
Sukala-sukritaka-puṇjaḥ Śrīnān Muṇjaś-Śhirām jayati 6

On the basis of this evidence, Sharma suggested that Muṇja belonged to a family which had the attributes of the Brāhmaṇas as well as of the Kshatriyas, i.e., the learning of the former and the valour of the latter.7 On the strength of this explanation, he further concluded that the Paramāras were originally Brāhmaṇas but were called Kshatriyas because they followed the profession of arms later on. But this view is not conclusive, for the expression used by Halāyudha to describe his patron, as already noticed above, may as well mean that Muṇja, though a king (Kshatriya), had also the attributes of a learned person (Brahma), i.e., he possessed both these qualities, viz., learning and valour.

C.V. Vaidya has already pointed out that the attribute Brāhma-kṣatriya is applied to Kshatriyas who were endowed with Brahma, i.e., who had kept up their connection with the Vedic Rishis.8

---

4 No. 47, v. 11.
5 P. 96, v. 394.
6 Ch. IV, p. 49.
7 Rājajīnī Bhyārī (Hindi), Vol. III, No. 2.
8 The expression can also be interpreted as showing him to have belonged to a family sprung from Brāhmaṇa-Kshatriya inter-marriage. See H.M.H.I., Vol. II, p. 62.
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We have no definite information regarding the place where the Paramāras settled themselves, prior to their conquest of the region in Gujarāt. Their association with Rāṣṭrakūṭas, however, tends to show that their cradle-land was somewhere in the Deccan, whereas, on the other hand, the Agrākūṭa legend, if it contains some element of truth, appears to suggest that they originated from an area around Abū.

The provenance of all the three earliest inscriptions of the house and the identification of the places mentioned therein suggest that the house had its earliest association with Gujarāt, and from this region it later on moved to Mālāvā and its adjacent territories from where we have its later records. This view, however, is not accepted by some who take just the opposite case.1 But we have no indication that this house first established itself at Dhrārā, for in that case, the Māhādāvāsaka viśhaya, in which gifts of land were made by Siyaka, as we know from his Harsōla grants, would be far away from Mālā, and, a subordinate chief, however powerful he may have been, was of course unable to control in those troubled days both those territories, viz., Gujarāt and Mālāvā, situated at a distance from each other. We are therefore constrained to follow the view that the Paramāras moved from west to the east and not vice versa. This view is also in consonance with the statement of verse eleven of the Udaipūr prastāti in which Vairisirnīha is said to have "suggested that Dhrārā belonged to him", which signifies that this ruler began to make headway in the direction of Dhrārā, i.e., towards the east, from Gujarāt.

As regards the genealogy of the early Paramāra rulers and their successors, there is some divergence in the sources themselves, leading scholars to differ on this point, and this question may be examined here at the outset. The land-grants, which are the earliest epigraphic records of the dynasty, give the genealogy of the house as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Harsōla grants (Nos. 1-2)</th>
<th>Dharampuri, Ujjain and Gaonri grants (Nos. 4-7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Bapparparājya</td>
<td>1. Krishnārājya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. his successor, Vairisirnīha;</td>
<td>2. his successor, Vairisirnīha;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. his successor, Siyaka</td>
<td>3. his successor, Siyaka.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All these grants, which mention each next ruler as the successor of the preceding one, are silent as to the relationship existing between them and use only the expression tat-puṭa-tanādyātā. But from both these lists it is apparent that the second and the third rulers of our inscriptions No. 1-2 are identical with those of Nos. 4-7, and following this, there is no difficulty in identifying Bapparparājya2 of Nos. 1-2 with Krishnārājya of Nos. 4-7.

On the other hand, quite a different sort of genealogy is drawn from the Naṇavasāthnānkachārita, a Mahā-kāvyā composed by Padmagupta in the first quarter of the eleventh century A.C. as already noticed. According to it, after the eponymous Paramāra, we have Upāndra, who is said to have been followed by some kings, who are not named, and after them, are mentioned three rulers, namely, Vākpati, his son, Vairisirnīha; and his son Siyaka, in succession.3 The use of the expression 'some other kings' (tad-ānv-ēśu) by Padmagupta clearly gives colour to the view that he had no definite information as to the genealogy, and this conclusion is borne out by the fact that he gives exactly the same description about two separate rulers, viz., Paramāra and Upāndra, which is a mere repetition.4 It is also significant to note here that with the single exception of Siyaka,

---

1 For example, see D.H.N.I., Vol. II, p. 890.
2 Suggesting that Bappat is the regular Prakṛti-equivalent of Vākpati. L.D. Barnett remarked that the syllable pu after it seems to be a mistake for ka, which appears to have been put for metrical exigency. We may also note that the author of the Gautāvāsakā kāvyā is called by the Prakṛti form of the name.
3 Canto XI, vv. 76-90.
4 Cf. vv. 73 and 78 in Canto XI.
the poet's description of all these rulers is more or less conventional and not even a single historical event in connection with any other ruler is mentioned by him.

The same genealogical list, with the addition of some more names, is given in the Udaipur praśasti, assigned to the latter half of the same century. The names of rulers found in it are: Upendra; his son, Vairisimha-Vajra; his son, Siyaka; his son, Vākpati; his son, Vairisimha-Vajra; his son, Śrī-Harsha; his son, Vākpati. The identification of Upendra of this list with Krishnarāja of the grants, referred to above, is accepted by F.W. Hall, Cunningham and Bühler. But as we have already seen, Krishnarāja has to be identified with Bappalparāja; and in that case we will have only Vairisimha, Siyaka and Vākpati in successive order, after Upendra, and shall have to omit all the second rulers of the name as found in the praśasti; but, on the other hand, if we identify the first-mentioned Vākpati of the praśasti with Bappalparāja of the Harsolā grants and with Krishnarāja of the others, then only we can have the six successors of Upendra as mentioned in the praśasti.

For all these reasons, C.V. Vaidya suggested that in the later sources, namely, those beginning with the Navasthānāṅkacharita, the names of Vairisimha, Siyaka and Vākpati are repeated in the genealogy through mistake. This suggestion seems to be plausible in view of our observations that these sources describe the first-mentioned rulers by names only in a conventional way, without giving any historical event in connection with them. It has also been noticed above that Padmagupta mentions only one and not two kings of the name of Vairisimha and Siyaka, as we find also in the Tilakamārījāri.

The genealogy given in the Udaipur praśasti is merely a copy of that which is given in the Navasthānāṅkacharita, of course with some additions, and thus it is not confirmatory as taken by some scholars. It is not an altogether separate evidence, since the poet of the praśasti is expected to know the story of the kāvya which was composed earlier in the same court.

With these remarks, we now proceed to trace the history of the house.

UPENDRA

The first historical king who flourished in the house was Upendra, who is mentioned by Padmagupta merely as the originator of the dynasty; and the Udaipur praśasti definitely says that he was the founder of the reigning house. This name does not appear in the land-grants, which trace the pedigree of the house from Krishnarāja, and this led Hall and some other scholars to hold that Upendra was another name of Krishnarāja. But we have seen above that except the fact that both these names are synonymous, we have no definite evidence in support of this identification.

2 K.N. Dikshit and D.B. Dikshit, who edited the Harsolā grants, also suggest that Krishna may have been another name of Vākpati (I). See Ep. Ind., Vol.XIX, p.239. This appears possible when we know that Vākpati (II) also had the title Šrivallabha which is a synonym of Krishna, and the first-mentioned Vākpati may also have used it.
4 For example, by H.C. Ray, for which, see D.H.N.I., Vol. II, p. 844; P. Bhatia also takes them as two different sources, which can hardly be believed.
5 Canto XI, vv. 76-79; and No. 24, v. 7, respectively.
6 In Nos. 4-7.
7 For Hall's view see the edition of the Udaipur praśasti in Ep. Ind., Vol. I, pp. 224 ff. The other scholars who follow him are Cunningham, G.H. Ojha and H.C. Ray.
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Verse eight of the Udaipur prāstāti describes Upendra as one who “gained high order of kingship by his own valour”. This goes to imply that he was ambitious as well as adventurous. From his description in the Navasthasāṅkakcharita, we know that he earned wide fame and was particularly renowned for performing multitudes of sacrifices.

As to the period of the reign of this ruler, we have as many different views as the writers themselves; and we can only summarily mention these views, without going into details, since a discussion over them, which requires a thorough investigation, would be out of the mark in the present context. Hall, in his edition of the Udaipur prāstāti, held that this king began to rule shortly after 800 A.C.1 D.C. Ganguly, who took him as a subordinate of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa king Kṛṣṇa III, held him as reigning provisionally from c. 810 to 837 A.C.,2 whereas A.S. Altekar and K.A.N. Sastri are inclined to believe that he was a contemporary of Indra III and they fix the period of his reign from about 900 to 925 A.C.3 Differing from all these scholars, P. Bhatia held him to have been a contemporary of Gōvinda III and took him to have been on the throne from c. 791 to 818 A.C.4 Both the last-mentioned views, as rightly pointed out by K.C. Jain, create many difficulties, particularly chronological;5 and viewing all the details mentioned by all these scholars, I am inclined to agree with Hall who took this king as ruling in the early years of the ninth century A.C.

In his Navasātri grant, dated Śaka 836 (914 A.C.), the Rāṣṭrakūṭa king Indra III takes the credit for defeating one Upendra; and some scholars tried to identify the latter of these rulers with the Paramāra Upendra, who is also taken by them to have been identical with Kṛṣṇarāja, the great-grandfather of Vākpati-Muniya.6 In this connection it is also conjectured by them that the Paramāras may have been the feudatories of the Gūrjara-Prakāshāras, who were the enemies of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas, and this may have been the reason of Indra’s attack on Upendra. But besides the fact that this suggestion is merely conjectural, this view goes against the statement of the Navasthasāṅkakcharita and the Udaipur prāstāti, both of which place him much earlier and as the very first person in the genealogical list. Following this statement, his identification with the adversary of Indra has been questioned by some other scholars.7 A close study of the arguments advanced by both these sides, however, makes us inclined to observe that with the insufficient data now available, it is impossible to prove or disprove any of these hypotheses. It has already been remarked above that the name of Upendra does not figure in any of the earlier inscriptions.

Whatever may have been the fact, Upendra appears to have flourished in Gujarāt and not in Mālāwā proper, as held by some scholars including Hall,8 since the latter of these regions was then under the Praśātras kings, as already noticed above. The statement of Pāḍmāguna that this king “composed, his own eulogy by erecting pillars of victory on the earth bounded by four oceans” appears to be only conventional; but it seems to imply that he may have extended his territory by some new conquests.

According to the bardic tales, the name of the queen of Upendra was Lakṣmīdevi,9 but this account is not corroborated by any epigraphic evidence.

---

2 H.P.D., p. 29.
3 Respectively, R.T.T., p. 100; and Dr. Lakshmanaswarāpa Commemoration Vol, p. 297.
4 P.B.P., p. 28.
6 See R.T.T., PP. 100 ff. For the grant, see J.B.B.R.R.S., Vol. XVIII, p. 253.
7 P.B.P., pp. 31 ff. For a detailed discussion, see Ep. Ind., Vol. XXXVI, PP. 227 ff.
8 See ibid., pp. 330 ff.
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VĀKPATIRĀJA I ALIAS KRISHNARĀJA
c. 895 to 920 A.C.

We have seen above that the Harṣōla grants of Sīyaka trace the donor's descent to Vākpatirāja, the Sanskrit form of Prakrit Bappaiparāja, as found in them. They also give him the full titles of a paramount sovereign. Padmaṅgupta's description of this ruler is merely conventional, but in the Udaipur prāṣasti he is compared with Śatamakha (Indra) for his military valour, and it is also stated in it that the horses of his armies drank the water of the Ganges and of the ocean, which is, of course, a panegyric of the poet. Verse ten of the prāṣasti informs us that this prince was "a sun for (those) water-lilies, the eyes of the maidens of Avanti". This description seems to suggest that he had established his hold over that city. From all the references mentioned here, Vākpatai appears to have been an important ruler, and may be regarded, as H.C. Ray is inclined to hold, "as the real founder of the importance of the family".

H.C. Ray and D.C. Ganguly hold that Indra III probably advanced by way of Ujjain during the reign of Vākpatil in the course of his campaign against the Pratihāra ruler Mahipāla (914-943 A.C.). It thus appears likely that Vākpatirāja's association with Malava began at Ujjain, and also that he was a contemporary of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa Indra III and the Pratihāra ruler Mahipāla, as suggested by H.C. Ray.

VAIRISIMHA
c. 920 to 945 A.C.

Vākpatirāja was succeeded by his son Vairisimha, whose description in the Navasaṅhasthīkacakarita is only vague and conventional. The Udaipur prāṣasti however, tells us that people called him by another name, Vajraṭavāmin, and also that by him "famous Dhārā was vindicated when he slew the crowd of his enemies with the sharp edge (dhārā) of his sword". The enemies whom he claims to have slain appear to have been the Gūrjara-Pratihāras of Kanauj. His contemporary on the Pratihāra throne was Mahēndrapāla, whose Pratapagad inscription is dated 945-46 A.C. Since this record shows that in or before that year some portion of Malvā around Māndū, Ujjain and Mandasaur was recovered by Mahēndrapāla, it has been concluded that in the latter part of his reign Vairisimha was driven out of Malvā into Gūrjara by the Gūrjara-Pratihāras. Thus Dhārā, which may have been temporally occupied by Vairisimha in the early part of his career, slipped out of his hands in his last days.

SIYAKA
c. 945 to 973 A.C.

Vairisimha was succeeded by his son Sīyaka alias Harsha, who is also mentioned as Simhabhaṭa by Mērutunga. In this respect Bühler remarked that "the complete name

---

1 No. 24, v. 10.
4 No. 24, v. II.
6 D.H.N.I., Vol. II, p. 847. From Rājadeśkharn's Raabhārista (I, v. 7) Malvā appears to have been regained by his predecessor.
7 K.C. Jain holds that Vairisimha occupied Dhārā only after 946 A.C. when the Pratihāra empire was dismembered. See M.T.A., p. 333. But he has not given his view about the period of reign of this prince.
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probably was Harshasinhā (Harakhṣīṅgha?), both parts of which were used as abbreviations, instead of the whole. The form Siyaka is a half Prakrit form of Simhaka. For in modern Gujarāti and in other dialects the termination of Simhā becomes in names not only Singh or Sangh, but very commonly Si which is immediately derived from the Prakrit Siha. Thus we find Padamsi instead of Padmasinhā, Narśi for Narasimhā, Arsi for Arisimhā, Amarsi for Amarasimhā.¹

Three copper-plate grunts of this king have so far been known. The first two of them, both of which were dated in V.S. 1005 (949 A.C.), were issued from Harshapura, modern Harosāla in the Ahmedabad District of Gujarat, and the third, which is fragmentary, was found in Ahmedabad itself, with a copper-smith, and bears the date V.S. 1025 (969 A.C.).² These records show that this king had a reign of at least 20 years, which is just the period of one generation. But his rule has to be taken as extending up to V.S. 1029 (972-73 A.C.), in view of the statement of Dhanapāla in the concluding verse of his work Pātyarkaṭhā, that it was completed in this year when the illustrious Harshadēva invaded the kingdom of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa king Kṛṣṇa.³ The upper limit of Siyaka's reign has of course been taken here conjecturally.

From the Harosāla grants we learn that Siyaka at this time was in possession of the territory of Mōhadāvāśa, modern Mōdhāst in the Ahmedabad District, adjoining Khetaka-mandala, which is roughly equivalent to the modern Kaira District. The grants mention him with the titles of a sovereign (maha-rajaṭādīrajas) and also a feudatory (maḥāmāṇaṇaṇakacchādīmanj), probably showing that he enjoyed the position of a semi-independent chief, and was thus entitled to issue land-grants under his own authority. He owed allegiance to the Rāṣṭrakūṭa monarch Akatlavarsha-Kṛṣṇa III (939-967 A.C.), who seems to have allotted certain portions of his territories to his nobles, to check the attacks of the Pratihāra enemies.⁴

One of the important events of the reign of Siyaka was his expedition against Yogarāja, probably in alliance with his neighbour, the lord of the Khetaka-mandala, whose name is not mentioned in the inscriptions but who appears to have been a successor of Prachandā known from the Kāpaḍvanj grant of Śaka 832 (910 A.C.). This adversary of Siyaka has been taken to have been a chief of the Chāvḍā (Chāpōṭkāṭa) dynasty, Avanivarman II, and his principality must have been somewhere to the west of the Māhī river,⁵ where Siyaka, after inflicting a defeat on him, made the grants, and where, according to the editors of the grants, he appears to have acknowledged the supremacy of the Gūjārā-Pratiharas who were the inveterate enemies of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas. On the other hand, it is held by some that he seems to have encroached upon Lāṭa, and it was evidently to dislodge him from that area that Siyaka marched against him and drove him

¹ Ep. Ind., Vol. I, p. 225. As against this suggestion, see D.H.N.I., Vol. II, p. 848. The name Harsha appears in No. 24, v. 12. That the same ruler bore both these names is evident from the T.M. v. 42 (2nd edn.) and also from the fact that in No. 83, v. 30, he is called Siyaka and in No. 84, v. 19, which mentions the same event, as Harsha.
² Nos. 1-3.
⁴ As also known from the Kāpaḍvanj grant of Śaka 832 (910 A.C.). See Ep. Ind., Vol. I, p. 52. Siyaka was a first grade feudatory, as is apparent from the use of the word chādīmanj in his title in the grants, and it is possible that he was playing the role of a semi-independent chief in North Indian politics by guarding the northern frontier of the kingdom of his overlord Kṛṣṇa III, who was in those days fully occupied in his struggle with the Chāḷās. See K.A.N. Sastri, The Colas, pp. 131 ff. This may have prompted Siyaka to assume independence, as we find in the Harosāla grants.
⁵ The existence of a Chāḷa principality immediately to the west of the Māhī is revealed by the Haddālā (Suvarnabhrata) copper-plate inscription of Śaka 836 (914 A.C.). See Ind. Ant., Vol. XII, pp. 190 ff., and ibid., Vol. XVIII, p. 50.
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back". In all likelihood this adversary of Siyaka appears to have been the same as the lord of Rudrapāḍi mentioned as defeated by him in the Navaśāthāsāṅkacharitä.²

To the east of Siyaka's territory around Mūḍāśa, in Gujarat, lay the country of Vāgada (Bānswāda-Dāṅgarpur area), where a junior branch of the Paramārās had established its sway under his uncle Dambarsinā, with Arthiṅgaś as his capital.³ This region was bounded on its east by that of Daśāpura, roughly the modern Mandāsūra District and the adjacent area, a part of which appears to have been then under the sway of the Gūrjar-Prathāras, as already seen above on the basis of the Pratābgaḍ inscription of Mahēndrapāla. We have no direct evidence to know whether Siyaka entered into a clash with any of the subordinates of the Paramāra ruler, though the statement of the Karhāḍ plates of Krishna III, viz., that the Rāṣṭrakūṭas then advanced as far as Chitrākūṭa (modern Chittor), seems to indicate that this region was conquered by the imperial Rāṣṭrakūṭa house some time before Śaka 880 (872-73 A.C.) when they were issued.⁴ It is not known if Siyaka participated in this expedition of his overlord, and if he did, it may have facilitated his further penetration in this direction.

It was almost at the same time that this bold Paramāra adventurer defeated the Hūpās, one of whose principalities then lay around the northwestern part of the present Mandāsūra District in Mādhyā Pradesh.⁵ The Navaśāthāsāṅkacharitä tells us that Siyaka "slaughtered the Hūṇa princes and turned their harem into a dwelling-place for the widows".⁶ The Hūṇa prince killed by Siyaka appears to have been as D.C. Ganguly has rightly guessed, a successor of Jējāpa, who was defeated by Bālavarman, the father of Yōgarīśa of Saurāśṭra;⁷ and in his expedition Siyaka also appears to have captured some of the Hūṇa territory, as we learn from the Mūḍī fragmentary inscription which says that he "enjoyed the earth which was sprinkled over by the blood of the Hūṇas".⁸ But even after this event the Hūṇas continued to be powerful in this region, as we shall see below in the account of Sindhurāty-a who finally curbed them.

Siyaka's plan of making extension in the east and northeast of his kingdom, however, appears to have been retarded by the growing power of the Chandella Yaśōvarman, who was his contemporary on the throne of Jejākaputra, and who is described in his Khajurāhī inscription of V.S. 1011 (952-54 A.C.) as "a god of death to the Mālavas".⁹ From another verse of the same inscription we know that the western boundary of the kingdom of Yaśōvarman's son Dhaṅga extended as far as Bāṅsvat (Vidishā) on the Malava-nādi (Vētravati).¹⁰ In view of this statement Siyaka seems to have extended his kingdom only up to Vidishā, though the details in this respect are not known; and as rightly observed

---

1 See Ep. Ind., Vol. XXXIX, pp. 18 ff., where it is said that the king of Rūḍrapāḍi appears to be the same as found in the fragmentary stone inscription at Vidishā. It is the same as found by Hall, for which, see my article in J.B.R.S., Vol. LVII (1970)), pp. 88 ff.
2 Canto XI, v. 89. The name is variously spelt as Rūḍīpāḍi, Rūḍrapāḍi and even Tūrāpāḍi, the last being taken by S. Sastri in Sources of Anc. Karnāṭak History, Vol. I, p. 115. Bührer reads the name as Rudrapāḍi. D.C. Ganguly connects this name with Rāṣṭrakūṭa, for which, see H.P.D., p. 42.
3 For the history of this house, see the respective section below. It is of interest to note here that Arthiṅgaś is about 70 kms. straight from Mūḍāśa and Bānswāda is about 100 kms. north by east of Mūḍāśa.
4 Ep. Ind., Vol. IV, pp. 278 ff. Pratābgaḍa is about 60 kms. north north-east of Bānswāda and about 50 kms. straight south of Chittor, and immediately to the south of it lies the Hūṇa-māndapa, referred to just below.
5 For the different locations of the Hūṇas, see P.B.P., p. 40, n. 3, but also see my paper contributed to the Or. Conf. at Ujjain, 1973, and J.B.R.S., Vol. LVII, pp. 84 ff.
6 Canto XI, v. 90.
7 H.P.D., p. 40.
8 No. 56, v. 27.
9 No. 98, v. 23.
10 Ind., v. 45.
by S.K. Mitra, the statement of the Khajuraho inscription may be taken to denote that both these rulers, viz., Dhaṅga and Śyāka, "provided a check to each other against further consolidation".1

Flared by his victories, Śyāka decided to cast off the imperial yoke of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas, and he also found a favourable opportunity to do so when Krīṣṇa III died in 967 A.C. and was succeeded by his younger brother, Khoṭṭiga. The latter of these kings was an old man and lacked the military skill of his elder brother. Śyāka openly revolted and launched an expedition against him. Khoṭṭiga proceeded to meet him and in an encounter which took place between the two armies at Khaḷīghaṭa, modern Khaḷīghāṭ on the Narmāḍa, Śyāka’s kinsman of the Vāgada branch, who had come for assistance, died a heroic death, the details of which will be narrated in the history of that house. But in the end victory smiled on the Paramāra ruler, who, after inflicting a crushing defeat on the army of his adversary, pursued him and, crossing the Narmāḍa, advanced straight to Mānyakhēṭa, the imperial capital, which was sacked and completely plundered by his army, not sparing even the royal treasury, along with the copies of the copper-plate charters lodged in it. The Udaipur prāsaṅgik describes this event by the statement that Harshadēva, who “equalling the snake-eater (Guruḍa) in fierceness, took in battle the wealth of king Khoṭṭiga”.2 The brunt of the Paramāra attack was so severe as to result in the death of Khoṭṭiga in the same year, i.e., in 972 A.C.

This invasion is probably referred to in an inscription from Śravāṇa Bēḻgola which states that the (Western Ganga) Mārasiniva II, by the strength of his arms, protected the encampment of the emperor (Khoṭṭiga) when it was located in the city of Mānyakhēṭa.3 If we take this statement as referring to the struggle mentioned above, the observation of D.C. Ganguly appears to be justified in concluding that on this occasion the Paramāra army could not conquer the main fort of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa capital where the royal residence was fixed, and thus “Śyāka’s success cannot be regarded as more than temporary.”4

We have seen above that Dhanapāla composed his Prakrit work entitled Pāiyalacakhi-nārāṇamālā in V.S. 1029 (972-73 A.C.) when Mānyakhēṭa was being looted by the people of Mālava.5 This gives us the time of Śyāka’s invasion of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa capital, which paved way for the collapse of this great empire.

Thus we see that Śyāka alias HarSHA was the real founder of the Paramāra kingdom in Mālwa. His military exploits well show that he left behind him a vast extent of territory from the Māhā region in the west to the Bēḷvā in the east and northeast, and the Narmāḍa in the south. In the north his kingdom extended up to Jhālāwāḍ. It is possible that he had extended his kingdom also to the south of the Narmāḍa, since, as we shall see below, in the time of his son and successor Muṇja, Gōḍāvari was its southern boundary.

Śyāka’s was a religious turn of mind; and after he returned from the invasion of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa capital, he seems to have abdicated his kingdom in favour of his son, Vākpati-Muṇja. Padmagupta states that Śyāka “adopted the life of an ascetic and clothed himself in the grass-robe of a royal sage”.6 The name of his queen was Vāḍaja.7

---

1 See E.R.K., p. 48.
2 No. 24, v. 12.
4 H.P.D., pp. 42 f.
5 See above p. 10.
7 Ibid., v. 86.
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VĀKPATI-MUNJA

c. 973 to c. 995 A.C.

Styaka, whose latest known date is 972-73 A.C., was succeeded by his son Vākpati. Mērutunga informs us that this king was also known as Muṭiṭa because he was picked up as a foundling by Sinhadasamahāta (Styaka) from the midst of a thicket of muṭiṭa reeds.1 Bühler rejects this story as unhistorical, but it has, somehow or other, found a place in the Ānī-Akbārī.2

This ruler was also called Utpala, as we know from a verse (prajaṇa-kupitām dvān dhishvaṇa...) which is attributed to Utpalatāṭa by the Kashmirian poet Kshemendra and to Vākpattraja by Vallabhaśīva in his Subhāśītavali (No. 3413). Padmāgupta mentions him by the name Vākpattraja.3 This conclusion is reinforced by the statement of Arjunavarma, who, as pointed out by D.C. Ganguly, clearly says that Muṭiṭa (i.e., Utpala) also bore the name of Vākpati.4

Four inscriptions of this ruler have so far been known. They are all on copperplates and were found, one at Dharampuri (Dhār Dist.), one at Ujjain, and the rest two at Gōnnyā, all in Mālwā proper, ranging in dates from V.S. 1031 (975 A.C.) to V.S. 1043 (986 A.C.).5 They all mention him with the imperial titles of Paramabhūtāraka, Maharajadhiraja and Paramēśvara, and also inform us that he assumed the biṇḍas of Amoghavarsa,6 Prathivivallābha and Śrīvallābha.

Vākpati was a great warrior and a successful military leader. Resuming his father’s scheme of conquest, he devoted his energies towards the expansion of his kingdom. The Udaipur prasasti records that “his lotus-like feet were coloured by the jewels on the heads of the Kānaṭhus, Lāpas, Kērājas and Chōlas”, and further says that he also “conquered Yuvārāja, slew his generals and held his sword high at Tripuri”7 Of these all, the kingdoms of the Kērājas and the Chōlas were far remote from that of Vākpati, and Bühler has rightly expressed his doubt about his coming into a clash with them; but H.C. Ray conjectured that he may have fought with these chiefs when he was engaged in his struggle with Tūlāpāṇa, the Kāṇṭha king.8 As for the rest of his adversaries mentioned here and in the other sources, as we shall presently see, most of them are known to have assumed independence during the confusion caused by the Rāṣṭrakūṭa-Pratihāra struggle.

Yuvārāja or Yuvārāja II was the younger son of the Kalachuri king Lakṣmaṇapāraṇa II (945-970 A.C.), but he had a short reign of about ten years from 980 to 990 A.C. He lacked the military dash of his father and appears to have been easily defeated. This conclusion is corroborated by the Kauthēm grant of Vikramaditya V., which states that “Utpala destroyed the power of the Chauḍiya, i.e., the king of the Chāḍis.” But the Paramāra ruler does not appear to have occupied the Kalachuri capital for long, as he found himself involved in a prolonged struggle with the Chāḷukyas on the southern border.

1 P.C.M., p. 30.
2 A.A., Vol. II, p. 215, where the name of Muṭiṭa’s father is given as Vijayaśaṃda.
3 See N.S.C., Canto I, v. 7 and ibid., Canto XI, v. 92. D.C. Ganguly states in H.P.D., p. 47, that Padmāgupta also mentions this ruler by the name of Utpala, but I am unable to find the reference in the edition of the Khya with me.
4 H.P.D., p. 47. The Nāgpur Museum stone inscription calls him by the name Muṭiṭa. See No. 33, v. 23; also see No. 56, v. 31 and No. 60, v. 28. The T.M. gives him the name Vākpati in v. 42 of its introductory portion, and Muṭiṭa in v. 33 of the same. Also see v. 43, where both these names are used for the same ruler.
5 Nos. 4-7, respectively.
6 From the expression aparabhikṣaṇa it appears to be a personal name rather than a biṇḍa, as generally taken.
7 No. 24 vv. 14-15.
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of his kingdom; and, as suggested by V.V. Mirashi, he may have made peace with the Kalachuri king and returned to his kingdom. The names of the Kalachuri generals whom the Udaipur praśasti claims to have been killed by Vākpati are not known.

Now we study Vākpati's conquests in the north. First of all he appears to have come in conflict with the contemporary ruler of Mēwād, the Guhila Šaktikumāra, the son and successor of Sālivāthana. The Biṣāpur inscription of Dhavala informs us that "Vākpati destroyed Aghāta (Ahār), the pride of Mēḍapāla and caused the Guhila prince to flee from the battlefield and take shelter with the Rašhrakūṭa king Dhavala of Hastikunḍi (mod. Hathūndī)."

After defeating the Guhila prince, Vākpati led his army into the adjoining region of Gujarāt, a large part of which was then governed by Müllerāja I (941-997 A.C.), the founder of the Chaullikyas dynasty. A struggle between the two rising powers was inevitable. Müllerāja came out to oppose Vākpati, but failed in preventing the advancing Mālava army, and was defeated. The Biṣāpur inscription tells us that his armies, bereft of a leader, sought refuge with the Rašhrakūṭa Dhavala. The miserable plight of the Gūrjara king is graphically recorded by Padmāgupta in his Aucṣṭiya-vichāra-charchā, vv. 9-10, in the following words:

"He neither eats food nor drinks water; nor he keeps the society of women; he lies on the sand, puts off from him all the worldly pleasures, and courts the hottest Sun. O! lion of the house of Mālava, it seems to me that this Gürjara king is doing penance in the forests of Mārvār because he is eager to obtain an atom of that praśita which is the dust of your feet".

"The silly Gūrjara queen, as she wanders terror striken in the forest, ever and anon casts her eyes on her husband's sword, to see if there be no water there", for often in the past she has heard the bard's say "the Great king, the hosts of your foes have been engulfed in the battle stirred up by your sword's edges (or torrent)".

Padmāgupta's statement, however, appears to have been exaggerated in view of the contrary version of Udayaprabha Sūrī, the religious preceptor of the ministers Vastupāla and Tēlahpāla. In his Sukṛitaśkritikalolīna, v. 26, this writer describes Müllerāja's victory over the kings of Paṇḍya, Karnāṭa, Kāśṭhī and the Turushkas (who were all distant from his kingdom), and adds that "the king of Mālava (evidently Munīja) left the battlefield out of fear."

D.C. Ganguly identified the Gürjara king with Müllerāja, and this view is followed by some other scholars. This suggestion, however, has been recently challenged by P. Bhatia, who pointed out that in the tenth century A.C. the word Gürjara, as used in these verses, was in common use for the Gürjara-Prathārás only, and it was in the twelfth century that the Chaullikya came to be known as the Gūrjaras. But it may be pointed out here that the word Gürjara denoting the land and the country was in use even before the tenth century, and as such, it appears to have been used by Padmāgupta, the court-poet, though his praise of Vākpati is highly figurative and therefore not to be taken n its true sense. We also know that by the time of Müllerāja all the principalities of

3 Ibid.
6 P.B., p. 48. The same view was held also by A.K. Majumdar, who translated the word vīnasihe to mean killed. See C.G., P. 30. But the use of the root nāt in the sense of running away is common enough in Sanskrit literature. Majumdar's conjecture that the Gūrjara king mentioned here may have been a Gūrjara-Prathāra king (unidentified), whose armies received shelter from the Rašhrakūṭa Dhavala (J.N., No. 94), seems plausible but not certain.
the Gürjara-Pratihāras had disappeared from the surrounding region, and Vijayapāla of this dynasty, whom Bhatia proposes to identify with the Gürjara king, had his kingdom confined only to Kanauj and the surrounding territory.

After defeating Mūlarāja, Vākpati appears to have led his army in the Lāta region, which comprised the land between the rivers Māhi and Tāpti. Its ruler at this time was Bārappā, a member of the Chauḷiṅka dynasty and the general of the Chauḷiṅka king Tāllapa. The details of the struggle that ensued between the two rivals are not known, but as the Udaipur prāśasti asserts, the Paramāra ruler succeeded in defeating Bārappā, who was also killed.

After his conquest of all these regions, Vākpati appears to have pushed his arm further into Mārwaḍ which touches the northern fringe of Mēwāḍ. Padmaṇagupta, in his usual eulogistic way, says that his patron "caused the pearls in the necklace of the Mārwaḍ women to dance", and this statement is reinforced by the testimony of the Kauthēm grant of Vikrāmaditya VI, which informs us that "the people of Mārwaḍ trembled at the approach of Utpala". The general name Mārwaḍ in this case signifies the Nāgol territory which was then held by the Chāhamānas, and if we believe with him that the Chauḷiṅka king Mūlarāja, after his defeat at the hands of the Paramāra king, fled to this region, it is also possible to hold Vākpati's penetration into this part of land in pursuit of the enemy. Three of the Nāgol-Chāhamāna kings, namely, Sōbhita, his son Balirāja and the latter's uncle Vigrahaṇapāla, reigned contemporaneously with Vākpati. The first of them is described in the Sēvāḍi plates of his successor Ratnapāla, dated V.S. 1176 (1120 A.C.), as the lord of Dharā; and the Sundhā Hill inscription of Chetvagadēva of V.S. 1319 (1262 A.C.) states that Ballāraja defeated the army of Muṣa. All the three rulers mentioned above died within a short period of fourteen years between 982 and 996 A.C., and from this it has been concluded that the death of all these kings might not in every case have been due to natural causes, but due to their conflict with the Paramāras of Mālwa. It seems that in the early phase of the struggle they gained some success against the Paramāras, but in the end Vākpati succeeded in defeating probably the last mentioned king. Or, it is also possible to conclude that the struggle did not end in a decisive victory for either side, and Vākpati's raid of this part of land was merely sweeping. The latter of the views appears more likely in view of Vākpati's apprehension of an attack on his kingdom by his adversary, Tailapa.

D.C. Ganguly puts forward a theory that in his expedition to Mārwaḍ Vākpati also conquered the region around Abū and divided it among the princes of the Paramāra royal blood, namely, his sons Aranyarāja and Chandana and his nephew Dūsala. His view has been accepted by H.C. Ray and K.M. Munshi, but I agree with P. Bhatia in holding that this theory is fallacious, particularly as it presents chronological difficulties.

The Kauthēm grant also refers to Vākpati's victory over the Hūnas, who appear to have been the same people who were defeated by his father Siyaka. Perhaps we may also hold that the Gaonṛya plates of V.S. 1038 which register his donation of land in the Hūna-marāḷa were issued after his victory over that region.

---

2 E.C.D., p. 123.
4 E.C.D., p. 123.
5 A.P.P., p. 50.
6 H.P.D., pp. 22, 22, 28.
8 For details, see A.P.P., pp. 21 ff.
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Making a survey of his military exploits, we see that Vākpati was a brave general who had inherited the military dash of his father Siyaka, and who extended his kingdom in all directions except in the south, where, however, he had not only to suffer a reverse but also to meet his tragic end. The last of his expeditions that Vākpati undertook in this direction was against Tailapa, his rival for supremacy and the founder of the Chāluṇya kingdom, who, too, was striving hard to extend his kingdom after the downfall of the Rāshtrakūṭa house overthrown by him. Mērutūṅga tells us that Vākpati had conquered Tailapa six times.1 This statement would agree with the assertion of the Udaipūr prastāsi, viz. that Vākpati had subdued the Kārṇṭas, against whom he really may have gained some success in his previous expeditions in that direction.2 The last of his campaigns against Tailapa is also recorded by Mērutūṅga, who informs us that when Vākpati again determined to march against this adversary, his chief minister (mahānāyaka) Rudrāditya endeavoured to dissuade him and conjured him not to cross the Gūḍāvari and advance beyond; but being overconfident, the king ignored his minister’s advice and crossed the river. And he was defeated in the struggle that ensued and caught by the enemy and bound with a rope of reed (mūñja). Tailapa first treated him honourably, but on an attempt to escape being detected, assassinated him.3

That this story appears to have a historical basis is known from the mention of the minister Rudrāditya in the Ujjain and Gaonry (I) grants of Vākpati. It is also confirmed by two grants of Vikramāditya VI (c. 1055-1126 A.C.) and by the Āin-i-Akbarī which informs us that Muñja “ended his life in the wars of the Deccan”.4 The date of this event has been fixed by Bühler, who points out that since Amitagati composed his Subhāśīta ratnasaṃdhī in V.S. 1050 (993-4 A.C.), during the reign of Muñja, as mentioned in its colophon, and since Tailapa himself died in Śaka 919 (997-98 A.C.), it is certain that Muñja’s death must have occurred between these two dates.5

Though a gifted leader, Vākpati was even more renowned as a poet and a patron of the men of letters, as implied by his very name. The Udaipūr prastāsi praises him for his learning, eloquence and poetic gifts (v. 13). It is specially noteworthy that even in the records of his adversaries, the Western Chāluṇyas, he is described as a poet of high rank (kavi-vrīṣṭā). Contemporary and later poets bestow their admiration on him and mourn his loss by voicing their lamentations. An account of the luminaries that adorned his court would be found in the section, dealing with Literature. He was also a liberal king. All his grants record the names of brāhmaṇas and learned persons migrating to Māḷvā from distant places situated in Bengal, Bihar, Assam and Ahīchhatra.

The name of this king is associated with a big tank at Dhar, Muñja-sāgara, and also with a town in Gujarāt, called Muñjapura.6

SINDHURĀJA

C. 995 to C. 1000 A. C.

Padmagupta tells us that “Vākpati placed the earth in Sindhurāja’s arms when he started for Ambika’s town”.7 This statement suggests that the latter had been made the heir-apparent by the former, some time before he proceeded against Tailapa. In view of

1 P.C.M., p. 33. But according to the Bombay edn., p. 38, sixteen times.
3 P.C.M., pp. 33 ff. Also see Ind. Ant., Vol. XXI, p. 168. The records of the Paramārās are naturally reticent about this affair.
6 A tank of this name still exists at Dhar. For the town, see K.M. Munshi, The Glory that was Gîrjānâdî, Vol. III, p. 117.
7 N.S.C., Canto XI, vv. 85 ff.
this suggestion we have to discredit the tradition recorded by Mērutunga and others according to whom Vākpati-Muñja alias Utpala was succeeded not by Sīndurāja who was for long at enmity with his elder brother, but by Bhōja-deva.  

It is difficult to fix the lower limit of Sīndurāja’s reign, which can be determined only by that of the accession of his son Bhōja who succeeded him. Mērutunga assigns to Bhōja a regnal period of fifty-five years, seven months and three days; and his latest known date is Šaka 977 or 1055 A.C. Accordingly, if we take his reign as extending from 1000 to 1055 A.C. Sīndurāja should be regarded as terminating his reign in about 1000 A.C.

Sīndurāja assumed the titles of Kuntārāja and Navasāthānaka. No inscription of him has yet been discovered, but we have some information of his achievements from the Navasāthānakkācharita and some later Paramāra inscriptions. Padmagupta mentions him as Avanīśvara, Mālavāraja and Parama-mahābahūt tag, and records his victories over the king of Kuntala and the countries of the Hūnas, Vāgada, Murała, Laṭa, Aparānta and Kōsala. The statement of the court poet of Sīndurāja’s success over all these powers is the most casual, and only the first of his achievements is corroborated by the Udaipur prākṣasti.

Soon after his accession, Sīndurāja appears to have made an attempt to revive the fortune and glory of his house, which had vanished with the death of Muñja. His contemporary on the throne of the Western Chalukyas was Satyaśraya (997-1008 A.C.), the son and successor of Tailapa II. Satyaśraya was at this time involved in a protracted struggle with the Chōla king Rajendra (985-1014 A.C.); and taking advantage of his occupation, Sīndurāja appears to have invaded his kingdom and probably recovered some of the territories lost by his elder brother. Whether the Paramāra king actually came in contact with Satyaśraya is not known, but that he succeeded in recovering his kingdom (svavijaya), which had been annexed by the king of Kuntala (Tailapa), is shown by the categorical assertion of Padmagupta in his Navasāthānakkācharita, Canto I, verse 74.

We do not know anything about Sīndurāja’s clash with the Hūnas, as stated by Padmagupta. However we cannot altogether rule out the possibility that it may possibly have been the same campaign led against them by his elder brother Vākpati, in which he may have participated. The Hūnas, however, appear to have been finally defeated and their territory may have been incorporated into the Paramāra kingdom.

With reference to Padmagupta’s statement about Sīndurāja’s victory over the people of Vāgada, D.C. Ganguly thought that it was against the Guhila territory of Vāgada that was subdued by him. But we have no evidence in support of this conjecture. Pratipal Bhatia, on the other hand, suggested that it is not unlikely that Sīndurāja attacked Vāgada and defeated its ruler Chandapa, who might have been his contemporary. But we know that this region was then under the junior branch of the Paramāras, who owed their allegiance to the main line, and we have also seen that the Vāgada ruler Kanka, or

---

1 See P.C.M., p. 36. The T.M., (2nd ed.) v. 43, says that Muñja was so fond of Bhōja that he had him appointed as his Yuvrajja. The statement of the P.C.M. that Sīndurāja had no good relations with Vākpati, is doubted by Bühler but is accepted by Ray by pointing out that the N.S.C., which exaggerates the victory of the former of these rulers passes over in silence all that of the latter. See D.H.N.I., Vol. II, p 859, and n. 7. But have we have to remember that the theme of the N.S.C. is to describe Sīndurāja and not Vākpati.

2 P.C.M., p. 57.

3 Daśābaliya-Chintāmanta-Sāravali, I.O.R., Madras, Vol. XIX, Pt. ii, supplement, introd., p. 1. We do not know if Bhōja continued even after this date. Mērutunga’s statement is not corroborated by any other evidence, and the period of this king is taken here as merely provisional. Some take Sīndurāja as continuing up to 1010 A.C. and others as even up to 1015 A.C., respectively, see P.B.P., p. 58, and C.I.I., vol. IV, p. cxviii.

4 See N.S.C., Canto I, v. 74; Canto X, vv. 14-19. Also see No. 24, v. 16.


6 H.P.D., pp. 77-78.

7 P.B.P., p. 61.
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Chachcha, lost his life in the struggle of his overlord against the Rāṣṭrākūṭa Khōṣṭiga; and in view of this, we can only assume, though there is no evidence in support of our conjecture, that Katika's son, Chandapa, who was probably a contemporary of Sindhrurāja, may have tried to renounce his subordination to the main branch and was put down. It is not also unlikely that Padmagupta's description refers to Sindhrurāja's imperial control over the region in a casual way.

The country of the Muralas has been identified with Kērala. ¹ P. Bhatia suggested that after his victory over Aparatīna, Sindhrurāja pushed further south and defeated the Muralas;² but it seems more likely that the Muralas might have come into conflict with him, as feudatories or allies of the Western Chalukyas, or the Śīlāhāras. In the absence of any confirmatory independent evidence, this is only a conjecture, for it is not possible to think of Sindhrurāja's victory over so many powers in the south. He was on the throne only for a short time and was not a daring soldier like his brother Vākpati.

As to Sindhrurāja's expedition against Lāṭa, it is possible to presume that his adversary on this occasion was Gōṅgirāja, the son and successor of Bānapati, who was defeated by Vākpati.³ Gōṅgirāja was a brave general, as he is described in a copper-plate grant dated 1050 A.C. as one who relieved his own land like the great Vishnu,⁴ which signifies the assertion of his authority over his paternal throne; and Padmagupta's reference appears to have been to this ruler. It is likely that in Gōṅgirāja's struggle with Sindhrurāja, the Chaulukyas ruler Chāmudārāja (997-1009 A.C.), the son and successor of Mūlarāja, also may have come in a clash with the Paramāra army. The Vaṅgacūr, prastasti of Kumārapāla, dated 1151 A.C., asserts that "seeing from afar the armies of Chāmudārāja, Sindhrurāja together with his elephant forces, made such a cowardly flight that all his well-established fame was lost by it."⁵ Padmagupta is silent about this defeat of Sindhrurāja at the hands of Chāmudārāja, as it is a reverse. Thus the court-poet's account of his master's victories is not fully reliable, unless it is corroborated by an independent evidence.

The theme of the Navasaṭṭhasāṅkāchaṁśita, which is a Mahākavya composed by Sindhrurāja's court-poet Padmagupta-Parimala, is to describe the king's marriage with Sātiprabhā, the daughter of the Nāga king Śāṅkhapāla; and, to obtain his object, he had to kill the asura Vajrāṅkuśa. In his struggle against the demon prince, the Paramāra king was assisted by the Vidyādhara. The story has a mythical garb, but, as pointed out long ago by Bühler, it has, without doubt, a historical background.⁶ The historical significance of the Kāvyam has been brought out by scholars to mean that the Nāga ruler Śāṅkhapāla, who has been identified with a king of Chakrākūṭa in the Bastar District of modern Madhya Pradesh and who was at war with the Kalachuris of Mahākosal, sought Sindhrurāja's aid against Vajrāṅkuśa alias Vaijukka, who was not a prince of the demons as stated by Padmagupta, but a chief of the aborigines, with whom the Kalachuri Kalingārāja (1000-1020 A.C.) was probably allied. Sindhrurāja marched against Vaijukka and slew him in battle. In this expedition he was assisted by the Vidyādhara prince Śīkhandakētu; and as the Śīlāhāras claim themselves to be the descendants of Vidyādhara Jimūtavāhara, the latter has been identified by V.V. Mirashi with the Śīlāhāra king of North Kōṅkana,

---

¹ N.L. Dey's Geog. Dictionary, pp. 98 and 134.
² P.B.P., p. 66.
⁴ Ind. Ant., Vol. XII, p. 203.
⁵ Ep. Ind., Vol. I, p. 308, v.1. The Kūmārapāḷakaṁśita (v. 31) states that Sindhrurāja was killed in this battle by Chāmudārāja; but this statement of the fourteenth century has to be discarded in view of the epigraphic evidence. For the identification of Sindhrurāja, see C.L., p. 428, n. 6.
Arikēsarin *alias* Kēśirāja, but he appears, more probably, to have been his father, Aparājita.1

After his success, the Nāga king cemented his political alliance by giving his daughter Sāśiprabhā in marriage to Sindhurāja. Thus we see that Sindhurāja strengthened the southern-eastern portion of his kingdom against an apprehensive invasion of Mālavā by the Chōlas, who were then rising in power and who had almost checked the growth of the house of Satyārāya, the Western Chālukya king, who may have assumed paramount power almost at the same time.2 The Tirumalai *prakāṣṭi*, which was composed in the twelfth year of the Chōla emperor Rājendrā I (1012-1044 A.C.) states that he sent an expedition to the north under his *dandandāyaka* (General) in 1022 A.C.3

Aparājita is well-known as a general name for the territory of North Kōṇkaṇa, and Padmagupta's reference to the conquest of its ruler by Sindhurāja, which is only casual and conventional as also some others, appears to signify nothing more than that the latter succeeded in securing the alliance of the former and possibly also in enforcing on him his overlordship. We have already seen how the Śilahāra prince Aparājīta allied himself with Sindhurāja in the latter's campaign in Bastar. Support for our view may be found in the suggestion of A.S. Altekar, who held that Aparājita, who in his Bhādrā copper-plate grant of Saka 919 (997 A.C.) regrettfully refers to the overthrow of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas but had not recognised the Chālukya supremacy till that year, may have thought it best to secure the alliance of the Paramāras, who were the avowed enemies of the Chālukyas.4 The same scholar also has stated that the suggestion of V.V. Mirashi that the cause of the invasion of Aparājita by Sindhurāja must be to help the legitimate heir Arikēsarin to the throne, in a war of succession that followed Aparājīta's death, is not tenable.5 And viewing the situation as a whole, I think that Padmagupta's statement regarding the defeat of the Śilahāra prince by Sindhurāja must be taken as purely conventional and equally so is the assertion of the immediately next verse, in which the poet claims that his patron spread his conquests as far as the extreme north. It is not substantiated by any epigraphic evidence.

It is difficult to estimate the truth contained in the statement of Padmagupta who speaks of his master's victory over Kōsala. This part of land has been taken to denote South Kōsala which comprised the modern Chhatisgarh and the adjoining territory extending up to the boundary of the Kaṭak District.6 V.V. Mirashi formerly suggested that the ruler of Kōsala defeated by Sindhurāja was one of the Gupta rulers of Sripura in C.P.7 but later on, on the basis of the Ratnapur inscription, he changed his views and held that Sindhurāja's adversary, the king of Kōsala, was Kaliṅgarāja, who "conquered the country of Dakśina Kōsala by the prowess of his arms."8 The king of Kōsala has also been identified with the Sōmavaraṇa ruler, Yāyāti Mahāśivaṅgupta.9 In view of all these different theories the identification of Sindhurāja's enemy, as referred to by Padmagupta, is highly uncertain.

---

1. *C.I.I.*, Vol. IV, p. cxv. On the basis of allowing 25 years for each reign, A.S. Altekar took the period of the reign of Aparājīta from c. 975 to c. 1010 A.C. and that of his son, Arikēsarin, from this date to c. 1025 A.C. See *Ind. Cult.*, Vol. II, pp. 404 f.; and though provisional, it appears to show that Sindhurāja's contemporar y was more probably Aparājita. In the *Ind. Ant.*, Vol. LXII, pp. 102 ff. V.V. Mirashi suggested that Aparājīta was probably a contemporary of the Nāga chief of Bastar. But my view is in accordance with that of P. Bhatia (*K.P.P.*, p. 64), since from the Kharāpāḷā grant of his great-grandson Anantadēva, 1095 A.C., he (Aparājita) is known to have helped the Nāga chief of Bastar. See *Ind. Cult.*, Vol. II, p. 405.


5. See *Ind. Ant.*, Vol. LXII, p. 102, for Mirashi's view. For the contrary view, see *Ind. Cult.*, op. cit.
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The end of Sindhurāja is not definitely known. From the statement of the Kumārapalabhaṭṭartha and the Vadnagar prāṣasti, both cited above, G. H. Ojha was inclined to hold that Sindhurāja was killed in his struggle with Chāmundaḥarta. But here we have to remember that the first of these works is after all a panegyric of the past and composed much later, and the verse of the prāṣasti uses the word nāṣyta for Sindhurāja, which is also used in Sanskrit to denote "disappearance". Thus the view propounded by Ojha is far from certain.

Sindhurāja was also a patron of men of letters. Padmagupta, who composed the Navasthasāṁkacharita in his reign, states that he was urged by the king to complete it.²

BHŌJADĒVA

c. 1000 to c. 1055 A.C.

Sindhurāja was succeeded by his son Bhōjadēva, who was one of the greatest and well-known Indian rulers of the eleventh century A.C. For his reign we have eight copper-plate records and two stone inscriptions,³ ranging in dates from V.S. 1067 (1011 A.C.) to V.S. 1103 (1046 A.C.). Five of these records are from Mālwa proper, one from Bāんswāḍa, and one each from the Baroda and Nāšik region to its south west, showing the extent of his empire. Two more dates of his reign within this limit are supplied by literary works — one by Al-Bīrūnī who records in his Indica in 1030 A.C. that Bhōjadēva was then on the throne of Dhārā, and the other, Śaka 964 (1042-43 A.C.), is furnished by the Rājamṛtiṭhakakarana.⁴

It is difficult to determine with certainty when Bhōja ascended the throne. Bühler took this event as happening after about 1005 A.C., when the Navasthasāṁkacharita was composed, as he thought, but certainly before 1011-12 or 1018-19 A.C., the date of Bhōja’s war with the Chalukya ruler, Jayasimha II of Kalyānī. Pointing out that Padmagupta does not mention Bhōja, which is a certain sign that this ruler had not then achieved the age of 16, the Indian age for majority, Bühler further conjectured 1010 A.C. to be the approximate date for Bhōja’s accession.⁵ This view is accepted by many scholars, but it goes against the date that has been proposed by us on the basis of the statement of the Prabandhachintainjani, to be about ten years earlier. It may be stated here that Bühler’s view about the date of the composition of the Navasthasāṁkacharita is merely conjectural and not certain.

Bühler also conjectured the death of Bhōja as taking place after 1062 A.C., but this goes against the evidence of the Mandhāra grant of his successor Jayasimha, issued in V.S. 1112 (1055-56 A.C.),⁶ and therefore it must be taken as happening some time before this year.

Soon after his accession, Bhōja embarked upon a bold career of conquest. Regarding his military exploits and conquests, the Udaipur prāṣasti makes a general statement that he “resembled Prithu and ruled the earth from Kailāsa (in the north) to Malaya hills (in the south), and atop the two mountains of the setting and the rising Sun (farther west and east respectively)”.² This is, however, merely a prāṣasti, and historically worthless.

---

1 Ojha, Nībandha-sangraha (Hindi), p. 175.
2 Canto I, v. 8.
3 Nos. 8-17. Of these, Nos. 14 and 17 are stone inscriptions and the rest are all on copper-plates. Nos. 15 and 16 were issued by his feudatories.
5 Ibid., p. 232.
6 For Bühler’s view, see ibid., p. 233; for Jayasimha’s grant, see No. 18.
7 No. 24, v. 17.
But the same inscription further asserts that "his mercenaries conquered the Karnaśus, the lord of Lāṭa, the king of Gūjrja, the Turushkis, chief among whom were the lord of Chēdī, Indraratha, Tōggala (2) and Bhimā." Support for this statement is to be found in the Kālvan grant of his feudatory, Yaśovarman, which claims Bhōja's victory over the lords of Karpāṭa, Lāṭa, Gūjrja, Chēdī and Kōṅkana. Bearing in mind that there is much exaggeration in the account of the praśastikāraṇas, we now propose to see how far these statements are really true.

Bhōja first appears to have declared war against the Western Chālukyas whose kingdom stretched immediately to the south of Mālava. It was evidently to avenge the death of his uncle Vākpati Mūrja, which must have been rankling in his mind. According to the Bhōjaprakārama, Bhōja killed Taḷalapa; but since the latter king was then already dead, R.G. Bhandarker suggested that the king killed by Bhōja was Vikramāditya V. In his expedition, Bhōja seems to have secured some preliminary success, as implied by the statement recorded in the Kālvan grant and the Udaipur prakāraṇa, in alliance with the Kalachuri Gāṅgēya and Rājendrā Chōla, who too were avowed enemies of the Chālukyas. But in the end, the combined armies appear to have been repulsed, as we know from the records of the Western Chālukyas. An inscription of 1019 A.C. and of the reign of Jayasimha states that the king was "a moon to the lotus which was king Bhōja and also that he put to flight the confederacy of Mālava". Another record dated 1028 A.C. tells us that he (Jayasimha) routed the elephant squadron of the Chōla, Gāṅgēya and Bhōjādēva. In this struggle Jayasimha appears to have been helped by his vassal Bāchirāja, about whom it is said that he put Bhōja to shame, by his victorious arms. The Mālava-Chālukya struggle appears to have remained indecisive, for we find the Chālukyas again taking an offensive, as stated below.

During his southern expedition, Bhōja also inflicted a defeat on Indraratha, the Sōmavamba ruler of Adinagarā, modern Mukhalingam in the Ganjām District of Orissa, and a vassal of the Gāṅgōrēya of Kālīnag. Bhōja seems to have fought this battle in alliance with the Kalachuri Gāṅgēya and probably also with Rājendrā Chōla, who too claims to have vanquished this ruler of Adinagara in two of his inscriptions, dated 1018 and 1025 A.C. Bhōja's alliance with Gāṅgēya, however, does not appear to have lasted long, for, some time later, the former inflicted a defeat on the latter, as recorded in the Kālvan grant and the Udaipur prakāraṇa. On the evidence of the Rēwā stone inscription of Karpāṇa, V.V. Mirashi has shown that Gāṅgēya led a campaign in Orissa; and I am tempted to suggest that it is perhaps on this occasion that Bhōja invaded the Kalachuri kingdom.

The celebration of Bhōja's victory over the Kalachuri king is recorded in one of the nāndi-verses of the Pārijātamāhārja, inscribed on slabs found at Dhār. Whether any portion of the Kalachuri territory was annexed by Bhōja on this occasion remains uncertain.

The Kālvan grant and the Udaipur prakāraṇa also record Bhōja's victory over Lāṭa, the region bordering the Western coast of the peninsula of India. His contemporary Lāṭa ruler was Kirtirāja, who is known to us from his Surat grant dated 1018 A.C. He

---

1 No. 16, I, 6. Also see No. 49, v. 56 and Aruṣavaman's pragastipatra in Ep. Ind., Vol. VIII, pp. 101 f.

2 E.H.D., p. 61. This view is not accepted by G.H. Ojha, who thinks that the king killed by Bhōja was Jayasimha. Ojha's view is followed by D.C. Ganguly. See H.F.D., p.90.

3 No. 16, I, 6; and No. 24, v. 19, respectively.

4 See C.I.I., Vol. IV, No. 50, 1, 18; and No. 51, 1, 9. The battle was fought on the banks of Gāntamangāl or Gāṅdāvarī. See ibid., p. 16.

5 Ind. Ant., Vol. V, p. 17; and Ep. Ind., Vol. XV, p. 336, respectively.

6 Hyderabad Arch. Series, No. 8, p. 20, v. 37.

7 S.I., Vol. III, Pt. iii, p. 424; and Ep. Ind., Vol. IX, p. 233, respectively. For details, see P.B.P., p. 78.
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was defeated and brought under sway, as is perhaps signified by a statement recorded in a copper-plate grant of Triśūchanapañtha, grandson of Kirtirāja, which states that “during his reign his fame was temporarily taken away by his enemies”.  

Following his ambitious military scheme, the victorious Paramāra ruler then pushed his arms further in the south and entered Kōṅkana, the territory of the Śilāhāras. Bhōja’s contemporary on the throne of North Kōṅkana was Arikṣāraśīra Kaśirāja (c. 1015-c. 1025 A.C.), whose father Aparājitija had helped Sindhurāja in the latter’s campaign against the Māna kings, as seen above. But in the meanwhile the situation had changed. We are informed by the Canarese poet Rapan that Arikṣāraśīra was defeated and probably also brought under subjection by the Western Chāulkya ruler Satyārāja, an inveterate enemy of the Paramāras; and to drive off this adversary may have been the cause of Bhōja’s expedition in that region. We do not know whether the Chāulkya forces were repelled, but it is certain that Arikṣāraśīra acknowledged his subjection to Bhōja, some time before 1020 A.C. when the latter celebrated his victory over Kōṅkana, as we know from the Bēṃṭi and the Bāṅswāda grants, both registered in the same year, V.S. 1076, with a difference of seven months, between them. That both these grants refer to the same event is shown by us in our edition of the inscriptions. Bhōja’s occupation of this region, however, was short-lived, as we know from the Miraj plates, dated 1024 A.C. informing us that “Bhāṣaṃhā had then seized all the possessions of the overlord of Kōṅkana”. 

Sometime subsequently, Bhōja’s attention was directed towards the north, where the incessant Gaznavide invasions were creating havoc just about this time. The Udaipur pradānti records that he defeated the Turushkas, and this statement must be taken to imply that he came into hostile contact with them. The material enlightening us on this point is scanty, leading scholars to differ in their opinions. D.C. Ganguly, on the authority of Firishta, held that Bhōja despatched a contingent to help the Kanauj king Anandapāla, who invited the aid of the Hindu Rāja of Ujjain, Gwāllor, Kālnāj, Delhi and Ajmer, to repulse Mahmūd’s Invasion in 1008 A.C. But the account of this Muslim chronicler is not supported by any other writer, and Ganguly himself has also remarked that it should be accepted ‘with reservation’. H.C. Ray, on the other hand, suggested that Bhōja possibly succeeded in extending his influence in the Kunnu valley by taking advantage of the weakness of the Chandella king Vidyādharma, and here he met and defeated some detachment of Mahmūd, who then invaded Gwāllor and Bundelkhand. Ganguly’s suggestion seems to be based on the only evidence of the find-spot of the Dubkund inscription of the Kachchhapaghāta Virasinhha, which speaks highly of Bhōja, but it is not known whether the Paramāra ruler actually defeated the Muslims on this occasion, as conjectured by Ray. Thus it is all a mere guess. Still another view is advanced by P. Bhatia who is inclined to hold that besides the fact that Bhōja gave shelter to the Kanauj ruler Triśūchanapāla, who was hard-pressed by Mahmūd, in 1019 A.C., the Turkish invader lacked the courage to return by the way he came, as we are informed by Gardizi, the earliest authority on the subject, “because on that side lay the armies of Param Deo”. The word Param Deo, as ingeniously suggested by Bhatia, is a corrupt form of Paramāradēva, signifying Bhōja’s capital, and it is perhaps Mahmūd’s avoiding Bhōja’s troops and

1. Ind. Ant., Vol. XII, p. 204.
3. No. 10, I. 13; and No. 11, I. 13, respectively. There is an additional reason to show that the Bāṅswāda grant appears to be later. It was dated on the bright half of Miśa, and though not stated in it, this day is generally taken as sacred to the goddess of Learning to whom Bhōja was ardently devoted. Thus this important achievement appears to have been celebrated throughout the year on different days, in the region.
taking another route which appears to have been highly extolled by the \textit{prasastikāra}.\textsuperscript{1} Of all the views expressed here, this seems to be most cogent. It is, however, certain that Bhōja did not come into a direct clash with the Muslims.

In his expedition in the north, Bhōja appears to have penetrated into a part of the Kachchhaphaghāṭa kingdom, bordering on the northern part of his own, but was repulsed by Kīrtirāja, who was then on the throne of Gwālior and whom I have tentatively taken to have ruled from \textit{circa} 1020 to \textit{circa} 1040 A.C. The Sāsabhā inscription of Mahīpāla, dated V.S. 1150 (1092 A.C.): tells us that Kīrtirāja "conquered in battle the countless hosts of the prince of Mālwā," who appears to have been no other than his contemporary Bhōjadēva. The defeat inflicted by this ruler on the Paramāra forces was so crushing that, as we are also informed by the same record, "the invading troops fled away, leaving even their spears, which were collected by the townspeople for thatching the roofs of their houses."\textsuperscript{2} H.C. Ray seems to be right in holding that 'it was practically impossible for a minor chief like Kīrtirāja to inflict this terrible shock on the invading forces without the moral and material assistance of his mighty sovereign, the Chandēla Vidyādāra.'\textsuperscript{3} It also seems possible that the Dubkund Kachchhaphaghāṭa ruler transferred his allegiance from his Chandēla overlord to Bhōja, as is perhaps signified by the expression of the Dubkund inscription, dated V.S. 1145 (1088 A.C.), viz., "that the highly intelligent king, the illustrious Bhōjadēva, had widely celebrated the skill shown in the management of horses and chariots of Abhimanyu."\textsuperscript{4}

Bhōja's political relations with the Chandēlas are known only from a verse in the Mahōbā inscription which states that "he and Kalachuri Chandra (the moon of the Kalachuris) waited upon the Chandella prince Vidyādāra, the master of warfare, who had caused the destruction of the king of Kānayakubja, and who was lying on a couch".\textsuperscript{5} The moon of the Kalachuris has been identified with Gaṅgēya, who was Vidyādāra's contemporary, but with reference to Bhōjadēva's name appearing in the inscription, scholars are not unanimous about his relations with Vidyādāra. D.C. Ganguly held that the Paramāra ruler attacked Vidyādāra with no favourable results,\textsuperscript{6} whereas V.V. Mirashi thought it to refer to Bhōja's siding the Chandēlas in the expedition led by Vidyādāra, in which Rājapāla, the ruler of Kanauj, was killed;\textsuperscript{7} and P. Bhatia, and following her, K.C. Jain, try to show that "the proved claim to success" made for Vidyādāra might have been related to the repulse of the Mālava army by the Kachchhaphaghāṭa Kīrtirāja, with the help of his overlord Vidyādāra,\textsuperscript{8} which we have just seen. Considering all the different views, we may however observe that whereas Ganguly's theory has nothing to support it, that of Bhatia appears to be rather beyond the mark. It does not explain why Vidyādāra's opponent Bhōja should worship his feet and hold him in high esteem. The tenor of the verse which embodies expressions such as \textit{sāhyavat} and \textit{talpa-bhājjan}, coupled with the statement that Vidyādāra caused the downfall of the king of Kānayakubja, goes to show that Mirashi's view is most reasonable, though it is not corroborated by any other evidence.

Another kingdom bordering on the north of the Paramāra empire was that of the Chāhāmānas of Sākambhari. Bhōja's contemporaries on the Chāhāmāna throne were Vākpatirāja II and his successor Vīryaratma. According to some late sources, Vākpatirāja

\textsuperscript{1} P.B.P., pp. 81 f.
\textsuperscript{2} No. 155, v. 10.
\textsuperscript{4} No. 154, v. 11. That it contains a veiled hint of Abhimanyu's subordination to Bhōja was suggested by H.C. Ray in \textit{D.H.N.J.}, Vol. II, pp. 831 and 870.
\textsuperscript{5} No. 113 v. 22.
\textsuperscript{6} H.P.D., pp. 103 f.
\textsuperscript{7} \textit{C.T.I.}, Vol. IV, p. 130f.
\textsuperscript{8} P.B.P., p. 84; M.T.A., p. 348.
had inflicted a defeat on him.\(^1\) If there is any truth in the information supplied by these late sources, it may be conjectured that to avenge this defeat, Bhōja made an attack on the Chāhāmānas in the time of Viryarāma and after killing him, occupied his capital.\(^2\) But Bhōja could not retain his hold for long. for, we learn from the Sundhā Hill inscription that Viryarāma’s successor Chāmudnārāya, succeeded in liberating his ancestral kingdom with the help of his Nāgol kinsman, Anahilla, who is known to have been one of the most energetic rulers of his family. Subsequently, Anahilla also killed the Paramāra general Sādha,\(^3\) who appears to have been stationed at that place by Bhōja. This general has not so far been identified.

The Tilakawāḍa grant of V.S. 1103 (1046 A.C.) states that Bhōja received help from his feudatory Sūrādīya in his struggle against Sāhavihari,\(^4\) and this name has been taken by some to denote the Chāhāmānas.\(^5\) In our edition of the record we have shown that the two names cannot be connected, and I agree with D.C. Ganguly in identifying Sāhavahana with the Chambal prince.\(^6\) In view of Bhōja’s warfare in some of the still distant regions in the north, it appears possible that his army may have come into conflict with this prince in some of his campaigns in that direction, and it is not necessary to presume that he marched against this enemy in that distant region.

Bhōja was indeed a great warrior, who not only raided all these regions but also extended his power far and wide. But his grandiose imperialistic policy proved disastrous in the end and showed signs of the disruption of the Paramāra empire, as we find in the case of the Rāshtrakūtas, the Prathārās and particularly in that of the Kalachuri Karna, who has been rightly called the Hindu Napoleon. He had created enemies on all sides. We have already referred to his struggle with the Western Chaulukya Jayasimha, whose kingdom he overran in the early part of his reign though not with very favourable results. Jayasimha’s successor was Somēśvara I (1040-1069 A.C.), who assumed the titles of Āhavamalla and Trallōkamalla, and who is represented by Bilaha to have marched against Dhrārā.\(^7\) We are further informed that Āhavamalla burnt Dhrārā and Ujjain, and Bhōja was compelled to abandon the city, Mānjī, which was another important place near Dhrārā, was captured by one of Somēśvara’s generals, Guṇḍamaya.\(^8\)

Bhōja’s most inveterate enemies were perhaps on the eastern and western frontiers of his kingdom, viz., the Kalachuris and the Chaulukyas respectively. Since the time when the Chaulukya Mūlarāja had suffered a defeat at the hands of Vākpati-Muṅja, the Chaulukya-Paramāra relations had become exceedingly hostile, and to add to this, Bhōja humiliated Mūlarāja’s son Chāmudnārāja (1010 A.C.) by forcing him to give up his royal garb when the latter was passing through Mālw in course of a pilgrimage to Vārānasi.\(^9\) Chāmudnārāja’s successor, Bhrīma I (1022-1064 A.C.) also was a contemporary of Bhōja; and we are informed by Mēruvunga that taking advantage of the former’s occupation in Sind, the latter sent his general Kulačandra to invade Gujarāt. The general sacked

---

1 Prithivīdēwa-vijayō, Canto V, vv. 55-60. For the other references, see E.C.D., p. 34, where it is also remarked that the information supplied by these late sources is untenable.
2 Prithivīdēwa-vijayō, Canto V v. 66. Bhōja’s attack on the Chāhāmānas Vākpati may have been due to the fact that the latter had slain the Gahila Ambāprasadha who was his feudatory. For details, see P.B.P., p. 87. That the Paramāra king was in possession of this region is known from the Chirwāl inscription (Vicceuv. Orient. Journ., Vol. XXI, pp. 159ff.)
3 Ep. Ind., Vol. IX p. 75, v. 17. The use of the prefix anu shows that the liberation of his kingdom by Chāmudnārāja and the assassination of Sādha are to be taken as two separate events, one following the other. Also see E.C.D., p. 35, n. 16.
4 No. 15, v. 4.
5 P.B.P., pp. 87 f.; M.T.A., pp. 349 f.
6 H.P.D., pp. 109 f., where the details of the struggle are given.
7 V.D.C., Canto I, vv. 91-94. Also see Hyderab. Arch. Series, No. 8, p. 13, v. 43.
8 A.R., Mysore Arch. Dept., 1928, pp. 68 f.
Anahilla-pattana and returned victorious. It is perhaps this victory of Bhūja that is referred to in the Kālvan grant and in verse 19 of the Udaipur prasasti. But the hostility did not come to an end here, as we shall see below.

In his war against the Gūjjaras, Bhōja was helped by his feudatory Satyavāja of the Vāgada branch, who is stated to have received his fortune through the favour of his sovereign, as discussed below in the political history of that house. Taking the case of the Abhi Paramāra house, at the time of the struggle, Bhōja also appears to have incited Dhandhuka against the latter's overlord Bhīma. Bhīma captured Dhandhuka's kingdom, and the latter ran to take refuge with Bhōja, as to be seen below, in the account of that branch.

Reverting to the Chaulikya-Paramāra strife, we see that after his return from Sindh, Bhīma became enraged when he knew about Bhōja's campaign against his kingdom in his absence, and ultimately made up his mind to wipe out the very existence of the Paramāra kingdom. He formed an alliance with the Kalachurī Karṇa, whose father Gaṅgeya, as observed above, had sustained a defeat at the hands of Bhōja, some time before. Bhīma proceeded against Mālava from the west and Karṇa from the east, almost simultaneously. Just about this time, Bhōja died, leaving the kingdom in a state of great confusion. As we learn from the Vājñagar prasasti, the invaders soon seized Dharā, "the capital of the Mālava-chakravartin", and dethroned Jayasimha, the immediate successor of Bhōja.

Bhōja was the most powerful ruler of the Paramāra dynasty. He is well known not only for his extensive military conquests, but also as a pious man, a poet, a patron of men of letters, and a voluminous writer. His military skill was of a high order; and as a warrior he extended his empire up to the Nāsik District in the south and Bhūjpuru (Rāṣṭra District) in the east, and made his hold firm in the outlying provinces of Gujarāt and Rājasthān, as we know from the Moḍāsi and the Bāṅswādī grants. It is true that victory did not always smile on him in his retaliatory expeditions, and towards the close of his reign the kingdom was seriously disturbed by the menace of those whom he had vanquished earlier; but considering that his was an age of mutually warring states, the success he achieved was indeed creditable. It is also his imperialistic policy that created enemies on all the sides of his kingdom. Particularly in his later age he devoted more of his time to peaceful and cultural pursuits and entrusted his military exploits to his generals; and this policy also proved to be disastrous.

A stanza in the Pattana Manuscript Catalogue published in the G.O.S., No. LXXVI, p. 49, enumerates Bhōja's victory over the kings of Dravidā, Lṛṣa, Baṅga, Gaudā, Gūjjarā, Kīra and Kāṃbojā; and the next one says that he terrifed the kings of Chōḍa, Āndhra, Karṇa, Gūjjarā, Chēṭi and Kāṇyakubja. His success against some of these kings has already been discussed above; but this description of the poet, which is full of figures of speech, shows his eagerness to exhibit his skill in poetic composition and is of much less historical interest. Nevertheless, as coming from a poet living in the kingdom of an enemy's house, it speaks highly of Bhōja's warlike activities in general.

Bhōja's literary activities are described in a subsequent section below. The Udaipur prasasti calls him a kari-rāja. His benevolent nature is known from the donations recorded in the grants issued by him. In the field of religion he was himself a zealous Saiva, (Bharga-bhāṣu, in the Udaipur prasasti), which also gives him the credit of building a number of temples in honour of this deity. It is probable that following the precepts

---

1 P.C.M., pp. 32 ff. Also see H.P.D., pp. 112, where it is said that some of the Gujarāt chroniclers are vague and some do not agree in details or are not corroborated by epigraphic evidence.
2 P.C.M., p. 51.
laid down by himself in the *Samarañgamasturadhātra*, he also began the actual construction of some other temples, which were completed by his successors.\(^1\) The policy of his religious tolerance is indicated by the Kāḷvaṇ plate recording a donation to a Jaina saint by one of his feudatories, and also from the Bhōjpūr inscription which records the installation of a Jaina image at that place in his reign.

From literary references we gather that Bhōja rebuilt and beautified the city of Dhārā. All the earlier inscriptions of the house (Nos. 1-8) are from either Gujarāt or from the Ujjain area, and it is in Bhōja’s Mahārāj grant that we find the expression Dhārā-avasthītār-asmābhīh \(^2\) for the first time. This seems to suggest that this monarch permanently established his capital at this city, some time before 1018 A.C., the date of this grant. Al Bīrūnī, who visited India in 1030 A.C., mentions Dhārā as the capital of Māṇḍva.\(^3\) But even subsequent to this time, Ujjain does not appear to have lost its importance, for we find that Padmāgupta-Parimāla, who wrote a few years earlier, mentions it as the first and Dhārā as the other capital of his patron, Sinhārujā.\(^4\)

Bhuvanapāla, the great-grandfather of the unnamed treasury officer of the Yajavālaka king Chāhāḍaṇa, served Bhōja as his Chief Minister for sometime, as we are informed by the incomplete and undated inscription from Narwar. This information, however, is not corroborated by any of the Paramārā records.

Bhōja was the most glorious and renowned king of his dynasty. His name will endure as a talented ruler who encouraged literature and art and a patron of scholars and himself a polymath and a poet of high rank. The best tribute to this exalted king is paid in the Vāṇagar *prācīti* of Kumārāpāla who belonged to his inimical house of the Chaullīkayas, by using the epithet of Māṇḍva-Chakrawarī\(^5\) for him. Viewing the prosperity that Māṇḍva enjoyed during his reign, he has appropriately been called ‘Bhōja, the Great.’

**JAYASIMHA,**

c. 1055 to c. 1070 A.C.

Jayasimha is known to have been a successor of Bhōjadēva, who, as we have seen above, died in the political confusion prevailing in the Māṇḍva kingdom. His relationship in the house is not definitely known; he may have been a brother or a son of Bhōja.\(^6\)

We have two records of the time of this ruler.\(^7\) One of them is a copper-plate grant issued by Jayasimha himself and found at Māṇḍhāṭa in the East Nēmāḍ District of Madhya Pradesh. It is dated V.S. 1112 (1055 A.C.). It uses for the prince the expression *tāt-pātāthuḍhāṬṭa* which separates his name from that of Bhōja. Another record of the time of this ruler is on stone found at Panāhēḍa (locally called Pāḍhēḍa) in the Bāhāwaḍ District of Rājasthān. It is dated V.S. 1116 (1059 A.C.) when his vassal, Māṇḍalika, was on the throne of the junior branch of the Vāgāḍa country. This inscription too is silent as to the relationship of Jayasimha with his predecessor Bhōja.

---

1 By way of an example, I am tempted to suggest that the construction of the celebrated Śiva temple at Udaipur (Vidīlāhī Dist.) may have been begun by him and it was completed by Udayādiya who in No. 19 is stated only to have raised the flag-staff.

2 No. 9, 1, 7. Padmāgupta, however, mentions Dhārā as the capital of the dynasty in N.S.C. Canto.


4 N.S.C., Canto I, v. 88 and v. 90, respectively.


6 The first of these views is due to A.S. Aliquar (Ep. Ind., Vol. XXIII, pp. 132 ff.) and the second, which I think rather more probable, is due to H.C. Ray. See D.H.N.I., Vol. II, p. 873. On the statement of the P.C.M., Ray has also noted the name of the poetess Arundhati as one of the queens of Bhōja but it is doubtful whether she or some other lady was the mother of Jayasimha. See *ibid.*, n. 2.

7 Nos. 18 and 83.
POLITICAL HISTORY

Reference has already been made to the joint attack of Bhima and Karṇa and also to Bhōja’s death and annexation of his kingdom by the enemies who dethroned Jayasimha. In this conundrum the dethroned prince was compelled to seek the aid of the Western Chāluksya emperor Āhavamalla alias Sōmeśvara I, who was himself an adversary of the Paramāras, but presumably guided by the diplomatic policy to weaken the Kalachuri king lest he should approach the northern border of the Chāluksya kingdom some time subsequently, he agreed to help Jayasimha and deposed his second son, Vikramādiya, with a strong force to help him. Vikramādiya himself was an astute general, and his mission appears to have been facilitated by a quarrel which in the meanwhile sprang up between Bhima and Karṇa, on the distribution of the conquered region. The Chāluksya prince eventually succeeded in driving away the allied forces of the enemies and in establishing his ally Jayasimha on the throne of Mālava. This event took place some time before 1055 A.C. when Jayasimha issued his Māndhāta grant referred to above.

Nothing definite about the military achievement of Jayasimha has so far been known, except that some time before 1059 A.C. he came into a struggle with a general of the name of Kanha. His contemporary on the subordinate throne of Vāgaḍa was Māndalika, who, as we have seen in the history of that house, caught this great general, whose identity is so far unknown and whom he presented to Jayasimha. In the absence of any evidence, nothing can be definitely said about the battle, fought by this subordinate ruler.

Jayasimha was intensely loyal and greatly devoted to Vikramādiya for the latter’s help in placing him on the throne; and on the evidence of some Chōla inscriptions, D.C. Ganguly held that the Paramāra ruler joined his ally in the latter’s expedition against the eastern Chāluksya king, Rājēndra II. In support of his contention, Ganguly observed that the name of Vikramādiya’s ally, which appears as Jananātha in some records, has to be taken as denoting Jayasimha; but we have no definite evidence for this identification, and therefore I agree with P. Bhatia and others who hold Ganguly’s theory to be of doubtful validity. As already pointed out by both these scholars, the reading of the name itself and its interpretations are not free from difficulties, which have given rise to a controversy.

The name of Jayasimha is not to be found in any other record of the house, particularly in Udaipur and the Nagpur Museum prākāsas and in the Māndhāta grant of Jayasimha-Jayavārman, all of which mention Udayādiya as the immediate successor of Bhōja. The first of these records, after making reference to the death of Bhōja, says that “the earth, like Dhāra, was filled with dense darkness and his foes (and) his hereditary warriors became infirm in body. Then arose king Udayādiya, another Sun, as it were, destroying the dense darkness, the exalted foes, with the rays issued from his strong shield.” This statement is corroborated by the Nagpur Museum stone inscription which states that “when the realm was over run by floods (kula-śkula, i.e., crowded with nobles) in which the sovereign was submerged and the earth was troubled by kings and taken possession of by Karṇa, who joined with the Karṇās and others, Udayādiya acted like

1. H.C. Ray observed that Jayasimha may have been compelled to acknowledge the sovereignty of Karṇa. See D.H.N.I., Vol. II, p. 874. But this is only a surmise, unsupported by any evidence.
2. According to Mṛcṣuṅga, the understanding between the two parties was that Karṇa promised half of the Mālava kingdom to Bhima, but he violated this agreement and annexed the whole of Mālava. This enraged Bhima, who invaded the Chōli country, See C.I.L., Vol. IV, p. xxi, and p. 401, n. 5.
5. For details, see P.B.P., pp. 99 ff., and M.T.A., p. 353.
the holy Boar."1 We have instances to show that genealogical lists in inscriptions occasionally omit the names of rulers, owing either to their short rule or due to the fact that they belonged to a collateral line; but as H. C. Ray has pointed out, the motive omitting Jayasimha's name in all the above-mentioned records is significant, and the reason for this omission may have been the fact that "Udayaditya usurped the Malava crown by ousting the legal successor of Bhōja".2 But to me the motive for this omission appears to have been the fact that Jayasimha secured his throne with the help of the Chalukyas who were the inveterate enemies of the Paramāras; and hence it was quite natural for the poets of these records to drop altogether the whole unpleasant episode along with his name.

The Nagpur Museum stone inscription categorically asserts that at the time of Bhōja's death the country of Malava was being invaded and taken possession of by Karna, who was joined with the Karpataśas and others. Karna is evidently the Kalachuri emperor, as already pointed out by F. Kielhorn and V. V. Mirashi.3 We have seen that this ruler had been repelled from Malava in his joint attack with the Chaulukya Bhima, by Vikramāditya; and the present one was his second attack, which has been placed some fifteen years subsequently.4 Some members of the royal family also appear to have been watching an opportunity; and they invaded the country when it was torn by internal dissensions, probably giving rise to a civil war, as is implied by the statement of the Nagpur Museum stone inscription, as observed above. It is also possible that Jayasimha's authority may have been challenged by some other scions of the Paramāra house who may have been presumably encouraged by Karna himself as suggested by V. V. Mirashi.5

In the meantime the situation in the Deccan had considerably changed. The mighty Chalukya ruler Āhavamalla-Sōmesvara was dead and succeeded by his son Sōmesvara II (c. 1068-1076 A.C.), who suspected his younger brother Vikramāditya to be conspiring against him with Jayasimha of Malava; and in order to punish the former, he made an alliance with Karna and invaded Malava. The Sudi stone inscription dated Śaka 996 (1075 A.C.) describes Sōmesvara (II) as a blazing fire to the ocean that is the race of the Malavas.6

The Dūngargōn stone inscription of the time of Jagaddēva, dated Śaka 1034 (1112 A.C.), shows the number of the enemies who attacked Malīva, to be three.7 Two of these invaders were, of course, the Kalachuri Karna and the Chalukya Sōmesvara, as already seen; and I am disposed to agree with V. V. Mirashi, who, on the evidence of some records found in the Kanarese country, has shown the third enemy to have been the Gaṅga chief Udayaditya combined with the valiant Hoysala prince Erāṇa.8

Invaded simultaneously by all these enemies, the Malava kingdom appeared as if facing a great disaster, which, according to the Nagpur Museum stone inscription, "resembled the catastrophe of world destruction when the mighty oceans sweep over and submerge it". Jayasimha appears to have been killed in the struggle, as probably implied by the expression naśitē svāmīni, and there was nobody to cope with the situation. At
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1 No. 35, v. 32. The same idea is expressed in No. 60, v. 36. The expression māgnaśvāmīni is probably a veiled reference to Jayasimha's death which appears to have occurred in the chaos following Bhōja's death.
3 Ep. Ind., Vol. II, p. 181, and ibid., Vol. XXVI, p. 179, respectively. Also see C.I.I., Vol. IV, p. xcix, n. 1. The latter part of the Udaipur prasasti says that Udayaditya totally destroyed the lord of Dīhala, and his opponent must therefore be taken to have been the Kalachuri king and not Chaulukya.
4 For details, see C.I.I., Vol. IV, pp. xcviix t.
5 See ibid.
7 No. 28, v. 5.
this critical time, Udayāditya, a brother of Bhōja, rose to the occasion, and as we are informed by the Nagpur Museum stone inscription, acted like the holy Boar. The latter part (B) of the Udaipur prasānti is rather specific on this point; it figuratively asserts that in the battle which was very fierce, Udayāditya obtained victory as his bride and also that his elephant brought about the total destruction (saṃhāra) of the lord of Dāhala. This statement seems to imply that Karpa was probably killed by Udayaditya, who retrieved the fortune of the family not only by frustrating Karpa's imperial ambition but also by driving away the other adversaries who had helped him in his war against the Paramātras. In this gigantic task he was helped by Vigraharāja, the Chāhāmāna ruler of Sākambhari.

The time of the struggle may tolerably be fixed. It certainly took place after 1068-69 A.C. when Sōmēśvara ascended the throne of Kalyāṇi, but before 1071 A.C., the date of the Balagārive inscription, in which it is referred to. Thus it may be placed between these two dates and about 1070 A.C., which may perhaps be taken as the last year of the reign of Jayasimha and the first year of that of Udayāditya.

UDAYĀDITYA,
c. 1070 to 1093 A.C.

For this ruler we have five inscriptions - three from Madhya Pradesh, found at Udaipur (Vidishā Dist.), Dāhr and Kamōd (Ujjain Dist.) and dated, respectively; in V.S. 1137, 1138 and 1140; and two from Rājasthān, discovered at Jhālārāṇa and Shērgarhi, respectively, dated in V.S. 1143 and 1144. Three more inscriptions, technically known as nāga-bandhas, were found one each at Ujjain, Dāhr and Un. They are all undated and may probably be ascribed to this ruler. Thus the earliest and the latest known dates for Udayāditya are 1080 and 1085 A.C., respectively; but as we have just seen, the upper limit of his reign may tentatively be placed at circa 1070 A.C.

How Udayāditya was related to Bhōja has for long been a matter of keen controversy. Verse 32 of the Nagpur Museum stone inscription mentions him as a bandhu of Bhōja, and the Dōngargātron stone inscription introduces him as a bhrātṛ of that ruler.10 Showing the different meanings of both of these words, viz., bandhu and bhrātṛ, and
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1 No. 33, v. 32.
2 No. 24, vv. 23-24. Suggesting that Karpa may have been killed on the battle-field, V.V. Mirashi held that it seems to conflict with the statement of the Khaṅkhā and the Jahālpur plates of his son Yathākarpa, according to which the former rulers himself performed the coronation ceremony of the latter and this is the reason why Karpa should have abdicated the throne in favour of his son. See C.I.I. Vol. IV, p. c and n. 1; also his Nos. 56-57, v. 30. But the conflict, which is only seeming, disappears by suggesting that the coronation may have been performed by Karpa just before he marched against Mālava, apprehending the fierce nature of the battle in which victory was at stake and too in danger. We have a similar example of Muṅja-Vākpati who coronated his younger brother Sīndhurāja actually before his march against Tailapa, who was his deadly enemy. See N.S.C., Canto XI, v. 98.
3 For details, see C.G., p. 58.
4 E.C., Vol. VII, Sk., 136, p. 181. This is the year of the death of Āhavamalla.
5 Myśore Inscriptions, pp. 164 ff.
6 According to V.V. Mirashi, it is c. 1073 A.C.
7 Nos. 19-23. Of these, No. 21 is recently discovered and has been edited here for the first time.
8 Nos. 25-27.
9 A still earlier date V.S. 1116 and Śaka 981 (1059-60 A.C.) of this king is given in a very late record of the sixteenth century found at Udaipur. But F.E. Hall has called it "a horribly incorrect scrawl". See J.A.S.B., Vol. VII, p. 45, and Vol. IX, p. 545 ff. Also see Ep. Ind., Vol. III, p. 48, n. 1. The inscription is in Sanskrit and not in vernacular, as generally taken. However, relying only on the date of the record, which may have been historically, true, it may perhaps be held that Udayāditya may have been placed by his brother Bhōja to govern the region around Udaipur, which he continued till 1059-60 A.C., and hence his name in this inscription.
10 No. 33, v. 32, and No. 26, v. 5, respectively.
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giving some instances from epigraphs, D.C. Ganguly suggested that Udayāditya was a distant relation of Bhōja.1 Relying on the evidence supplied by an inscription dated in the sixteenth century and found at Udaipur in the Vīdīshā District, the same scholar held that Udayāditya was the son of Gāttā (Jāttā), grandson of Gōndala and great-grandson of Śūravira of the Prāvara (Paramāra) family. But the controversy is set at nought by the statement of the Jainā stone inscription, which describes Jagaddēva, the son of Udayāditya, as a paternal nephew of Bhōja.2 On the evidence of this inscription, H.C. Ray and V.V. Mirashi concluded that Udayāditya was a brother of Bhōja.3 This view is now generally accepted, though it is rather doubtful whether both these rulers were couterine brothers of each other. For it seems less likely that this successor of Bhōja was still ruling in 1093 A.C. which is his latest known date supplied by the Dēwās grant of his son Naravarman, stating that the latter performed the first anniversary of the former in V.S. 1152 or 1094 A.C.4

After his accession to the throne, the first and the foremost task before Udayāditya was to establish order and peace in the kingdom and also to make it immune from foreign invasions. We have seen that Bhōja died in chaos which may have continued in the interregnum of about fifteen years when Udayāditya began to rule. The Sehore grant of Arjunavarman, dated V.S. 1270 (1213 A.C.), states that he (Udayāditya) with his fierce arms, exterminated mighty kings maintaining powerful armies.5 Some of the feudatories also may have openly revolted against him, as can be known from the example of Mandalika, of the Vāgāda branch of the Paramāras, who was devoted to Jayasimha and whose son Chāmundaṛāja may have turned against Udayāditya for the same reason, as we have seen in the account of that branch.

Udayāditya had for some years seen no danger from the south, since the Chālukya Sōmeśvara II was then engaged in a struggle with the Chōla monarch, Vira Rājendra.6 But in 1076 A.C. Sōmeśvara was ousted by his younger brother Vikramāditya VI, who was an ally of the Paramāra Jayasimha, as we have already noticed, and who, for the same reason, appears to have led a successful campaign in Mālwa, soon after his accession. In an inscription dated 1077 A.C., he is described as the “source of a great fever of terror to the king of Dhāra”.7 It is therefore presumable that he may have annexed to his kingdom a part of the Mālwa territory to the south of the Gōdāvari.

A great danger which Udayāditya had to face was from the Chaulikya Karpa (1064-1094 A.C.), who invaded Mālwa some time after 1079 A.C. In this invasion, Karpa is known to have achieved some initial success, probably taking advantage of Udayāditya’s pre-occupation in some other direction, but ultimately he was repelled by the Paramāra king.8

Udayāditya also followed the master-stroke policy of forming matrimonial alliances to strengthen his political relations. He gave in marriage his daughter Śyāmalādēvi to the Guhila prince Vijayasimha, and her daughter Alhanadēvi in her turn, was married to the Kalachuri Gayākarna.9

Udayāditya was not only a military leader of a high rank but also noteworthy for
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1 H.P.D., p. 133.
2 No. 25, v, 6.
4 No. 81.
5 No. 48, v. 8.
7 E.C. Vol VII, Sk., No. 124, p. 171.
propagating education among his subjects. He developed the educational institutes established by Bhojadēva, at Dhār, by engraving charts containing the Nagari alphabet and grammatical terminations. The same type of charts are also found at Ujjain and Unj, as noted below in the section dealing with literature. He was also a great builder. He constructed, or rather, completed, the celebrated Śiva temple at Udaipur (Vidisha District), one of the “superb specimens of the Hindu architecture of the eleventh century”.  

Udayādiṭya was a follower of Śaivism. He is known to have obtained a son, Jagaddēva, through his devotion to Śiva. He granted a village named Vilapadraka, to the god Sōmanātha, situated in the fort of Kosavardhana, identified with the modern Shergadh, in the Kotā District of Rajasthan. His example appears to have been followed by his subjects, as we know from a Śiva temple built by the paṭṭakīla Jannaka, an oilman, at Jhātrāpātan, and also from an image of Pārvati performing penance (agnī-ṣṭhitā), found at Dhār and installed during his reign. The image is a specimen of the statutory art of the time.

The Ṛṣamālā records a tradition, according to which “Udayādīṭya performed service to a Raṅga of Mandoogarh, on whom, when summoned, he was in the habit of offering speedy attendance.” Mandoogarh is no doubt Māṇḍū, near Dhār, and H.C. Ray is inclined to think that the chief of this place was an officer of the Chitlukya king Vikramādīṭya VI. But neither this tradition is confirmed by evidence nor Ray’s contention.

The Ṛṣamālā also contains another tradition, according to which Udayādīṭya had two queens, one of whom was of the Vāghēla clan and the other of the Sōłaṅki clan. The Vāghēla queen bore him a son Rindhuwal (i.e. Raṇadhavala?) who was elder and the heir-apparent. The son of the Sōłaṅki queen was Jug-dēva (Jagaddēva). On account of a “palace intrigue”, as H.C. Ray calls it, the latter of these sons left Mālaṅ and entered the service of the Chaullīka king Siddharāja of Gujarāt, whom he served for eighteen years. But when the former “advanced towards Dhārā, Jug-dēva resigned his service and returned to his father, who invested him with the royal authority and died. He reigned for 52 years...”. But this statement involves chronological difficulties, since Siddharāja (1094-1144 A.C.) was not a contemporary of Udayādīṭya; and as Ray has observed, the tradition appears to be totally unreliable, except giving us the historic name Jagaddēva and Rindhuwal (Raṇadhavala), which are also known from the epigraphic sources, as we shall see later on.

The Nagpur Museum stone inscription, dated V.S. 1161(1104-05 A.C.), mentions two sons of Udayādīṭya, namely, Lakshmādeva (probably the elder) and Naravarman. We have seen above that according to the evidence furnished by the recently found Dēwās grant, Naravarman was the immediate successor of his father, and here we have also to take into account another statement which goes in favour of this view, viz., that of the Kamēd inscription, which too has been recently discovered and is dated V.S. 1140 (1082 A.C.). It records the donation of a plot of land by Naravarman for perpetually burning a lamp for (in honour of) his brother Lakshmādeva, which undoubtedly shows that the latter had deceased some time before the date of this inscription. This conclusion corroborates...

1 No. 181.
2 Ibid.
3 No. 28, v. 7.
4 No. 23, II. 6-8.
5 Nos. 22 and 20, respectively.
7 Ibid.
8 No. 21.
our finding that Udayāditya was immediately succeeded on the Paramārā throne by his son Naravarman; and accordingly, we have to abandon the view, held so far, viz., that Lakshmādēva’s reign has to be fitted in between those of Udayāditya and Naravarman.¹ In view of the evidence which has come out very recently, we are reduced to the only presumption that Udayāditya may have placed both his sons, Lakshmādēva and Naravarman, in charge of the eastern and western regions of his dominion, bestowing on each of them full powers of a regent or viceroy, since we find them both making donations in their own authority in his lifetime.

If the view expressed above is accepted, we are further led to believe that the military achievements attributed to Lakshmādēva in the Nagpur Museum stone inscription are all to be dated in his father’s lifetime, and certainly before 1082 A.C., the date of the Kāmd inscription.

The Nagpur Museum stone inscription devotes as many as twenty verses to describing, in a figurative way, the various military campaigns of Lakshmādēva, as we find in Rāghu’s dig-vijaya in the Rāghuvamāsa. This prince is said to have subdued the earth in all directions. In the east, he threatened the lord of Gauḍa, defeated the armies of Anga and Kaliṅga and occupied Tripuri; in the south, he subjugated the Chōlas and some other tributaries, and invaded the Pāṇḍya country and Ceylon; in the west, he achieved victory over the Timingalas and other tribes living in the Maināka mountain; and in the north, he vanquished the Turushkas and the Kiras.² Of this laudatory account, as Kielhorn has rightly observed, the only tangible and probably true facts mentioned are an expedition undertaken against Tripuri (v. 34), and some fight with the Turushkas (v. 54), for, as it is well known, some of the kingdoms in the extremities of India, for example, that of the Pāṇḍyas and that of the Chōlas and Ceylon were far beyond the range of the possibility of his invasions. Lakshmādēva’s Kāḷachuri adversary was Yāsāṅkarpa (1073-1123 A.C.) who was a weak ruler and who suffered defeat not only at the hands of the Chandellā Sallakṣānaivarman, as we have shown in our account of the Chandellā dynasty, but also at the hands of the Chāluṅka Vikramaditya VI,³ and taking advantage of this situation, Lakshmādēva also may have led a successful campaign against Tripuri. Lakshmādēva’s encounter with the Turushkas appears to refer to the invasion of Māhmūd, Governor of Pūnjab, who, as Sālāmān tells us, invaded Mālwā and occupied Ujjain and destroyed temples at that place, when the Paramāras had to succumb.⁴ This account is just the reverse of that of the praśasti. It is possible that Māhmūd may have had some initial success, but was ultimately repelled.

D.C. Ganguly has wrongly identified Lakshmādēva with Jagaddēva, another son of Udayāditya.⁵ H.C. Ray held that Jagaddēva was a biruda of Lakshmādēva, but he also assumed the possibility that the former may have been a brother or half-brother of the latter.⁶ But they were in fact two different princes and related as brothers, as we shall see below in an appendix at the end of this section.

**NARAVARMAN**

1093 to 1134 A.C.

On the evidence of the Dwats grant, which records that this ruler performed the first death anniversary of his father Udayāditya in the month of August in 1094 A.C.
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¹ As was first pointed out by Kielhorn in Ep. Ind., Vol. II, p. 182.
² No. 33, vv. 35-54.
⁴ Elph., Vol IV, p. 524
⁵ H.P.D., p. 142.
POLITICAL HISTORY

we have seen that he ascended the throne in 1093 or 1094 A.C., and continued to rule till about October-November of 1134 A.C., as we know from the grant issued by his son Yaśōvarman on the occasion of his first death anniversary, in 1135 A.C.\(^1\) Thus Naravarman had a reign of about forty-one years.

Besides the afore-mentioned Dēwās grant, we have the following records for the reign of this king. One of them is from Amērā, in the Vidishā District, and dated V.S. 1151 (1094 A.C.); the Nagpur Museum stone inscription, dated V.S. 1161 (1104-05 A.C.); the Kadambapadraha grant dated V.S. 1167 (1110 A.C.); the Shērgadhī (Kōṭa District, Rājasthān) stone inscription, dated V.S. 1191 (1134 A.C.), the Rājpur copper-plate inscription, and in addition to these, two stone inscriptions from Vidishā, both of which are fragmentary and do not show any date.\(^2\)

Naravarman's reign was not as glorious as that of his father. The Paramāra records are altogether reticent about his warlike achievements. The reason for this silence appears to be that he was not a military leader of great ability nor did he undertake any successful campaign against any of his adversaries. We also know from the records of the Chaulūkyas that he had also to suffer reverses. His eastern neighbours were the Chandellēs of Jēkākabhuksi and his contemporary on the Chandellē throne was Sallakshanavarman (c. 1100-1110 A.C.), who is reported in a later Chandellē inscription to have snatched the royal fortune of the Mālwā.\(^3\) This statement seems to imply that Sallakshana, who defeated the Chēḍī king Yaśāṅkarmā, as to be seen in the history of the Chandellēs and whose kingdom was almost coterminous with that of Naravarman, may have carried on some border raids in Mālwā, though it is doubtful whether he succeeded in wresting any territory of Naravarman's kingdom, as observed below in the account of the Chandellē royal house.

Naravarman had also to suffer reverses at the hands of the Chāhamānas of Sākambhari. He was defeated by the Chāhamāna ruler, Ajayarāja, who captured his general Sōllana, after slaying the three warriors Chāchigadēva, Sindhula and Yaśāṅraja.\(^4\) The battle is said to have been fought "on the borders of Avantī",\(^5\) which shows that the offensive was taken by the Chāhamānas, and Naravarman could not succeed in repelling it. The Bijōlia inscription also represents Ajayarāja's son, Arnārāja, to have gained a victory over Nirvāna-Nārāyaṇa, which was an epitaph of Naravarman.\(^6\) It is not known if both the events refer to the same battle in which Arṇārāja may have fought as prince under his father.

On the basis of the Vikrama-Chōḷarāula, D.C. Ganguly held that Naravarman came into a conflict with the Chōḷa king Vikrama (1118-1135 A.C.)\(^7\) but this is not corroborated by any evidence. The Paramāra king's conflict with the forces of the remote Chōḷa king appears to be rather inconceivable, though it is possible that his army may have come into clash with the forces of this enemy in one of his expeditions in the south.

An important feature of the history of this period is the resumption of the rivalry between the Paramāras and the Chaulūkyas, which had ceased for some time after the
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\(^1\) No. 38.

\(^2\) Nos. 30, 32-37, and 198, respectively. To these we have to add the Madhumalharaghar (Hīḍānti) stone inscription, dated V.S. 1164 (1107 A.C.), which records the construction of a Śiva temple by Hara, the son of Mahākāla and grandson of the minister Rudrāyana. The record was noticed by Col. Tod in J.R.A.S., Vol. 1, p. 226. The stone is now not traceable. It supplies an intermediate date. See I.N.I., No. 175.

\(^3\) No. 145, v. 4.


\(^5\) See E.C.D., p.180, ii. 11-12. It is suggested that Ajayarāja invaded Mālwā in order to help Jayaśintha C.G., p. 71; but also see P.B.P., 117.

\(^6\) Ep. Ind., p. 84, v. 17. As the history of the Chāhamānas of this period is not known in detail, we may hold with D.C. Ganguly that the defeated Mālavarija was either Naravarman or Yaśāṅvarman. See H.P.D., p. 166.

\(^7\) H.P.D., pp. 161 f.
defeat of Karṇa at the hands of Udayāditya. This hostility was resumed in the reign of Karṇa’s successor, Jayasimha Siddhārāja (1094-1143 A.C.), a powerful ruler who ascended the throne almost at the same time as Naravarman. Mēruttunga tells us that Naravarman’s son, Yaśōvarman invaded Gujarāt while Jayasimha was out of his capital, and it was with great difficulty that the Gujarāt minister, Sāntu, pacified the invader and made him withdraw. The chronicler then proceeds to state that on knowing it all after his return, Jayasimha was incensed and declared a war against Mālāvā, which continued for twelve years down to the time of Yaśōvarman.1 Mēruttunga’s account is supported by the other chroniclers of Gujarāt, for example, by the Dvārakārajya-Kāvyā and the Vasantavilāsa,2 and is also corroborated by epigraphic evidences. The Talwādā (Bāṅswādā Dist.) inscription of Jayasimha, the date of which is defeas but falls between V.S. 1161 and 1195 (1104-1139 A.C.), states that Jayasimha “humbled the pride of Naravarman”.3 The Nānānā grant of the Chāhārīmā Aḥāna supplements this information by telling us that this prince joined his overlord Jayasimha, in his campaign in Mālāvā, and frightened by his presence, Naravarman betook himself to his fort.4

It is stated in the Kumārapālācharita (V, v. 41) that Jayasimha destroyed Dhārā and killed its king Naravarman. Since both Naravarman and his son Yaśōvarman were contemporaries of Jayasimha, H.C. Ray held it possible that both these rulers lost their lives in the protracted struggle which lasted for about twelve years.5 This suggestion appears plausible only so far as Naravarman is concerned, as we do not hear of him after this incident, but it is not tenable in the case of Yaśōvarman, who is known to have continued even after the struggle was over, as we shall see in its proper place. It may, however, be remarked here that the calamity which befall the kingdom of the Paramāras in the last days of Bhōjarāva, though temporarily warded off during the reign of Udayāditya, now assumed greater intensity, resulting in the gradual degeneration of the Paramāra kingdom and leading to its downfall, in course of time.

In his last days, Naravarman’s kingdom appears to have become circumscribed, and some of his subordinates also may have caused troubles, which he could not suppress, as he had grown very old by this time.6 On the evidence of an inscription found at Ingaṇapadra, modern Rīgnīd in the Ratlam District of Madhya Pradesh, dated V.S. 1190 (1132-33 A.C.), I have shown elsewhere that Vījāyapāla, whose donation to a Śiva temple is recorded in it and who seems to have been a local governor or a feudatory under the Paramāra king, openly declared independence, as shown by the imperial titles attached to his name in the record.7 It is thus evident that Naravarman was not in a position to have a strong hold over his own kingdom; and in view of what has been stated here, his description as a great military leader in some of the later inscriptions8 has to be taken as merely conventional. Thus it seems evident that from his time onwards the empire reared by the genius of Bhōjarāva and the heroism of Udayāditya began to decline.

However, Naravarman himself was a great scholar and a talented poet, as is evidenced by the praṣasti composed by him and engraved on a stone slab now preserved
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2 D.K., Canto XIV. The account is corroborated by the other Gujarāt chronicles, though varying in details.
6 From the evidence of the Kamāri stone inscription (No. 21), we have suggested that Naravarman may have been placed in charge of the region around Ujjain some time before this year, and he must have been at least 20 years of age by that time. This indicates that when he died in 1133 A.C. he must have been an old man of about 70.
7 No. 158.
8 The same remark is applicable to other stone inscriptions (No. 49, v. 9, and No. 60, vv. 37-38), describing the king’s digvijaya in all directions. These are, after all, praṣasti.
in the Nagpur Museum. Verse 56 of the same inscription says that he also composed some other prātisātī which were engraved in the temple referred to in it. He also encouraged learning, as we know from the eulogy of the Sun-god, composed by the Mahākavi-chakravarti Chittapa, at the instance of the commander (danda-nīyaka) Śrīchandra. From the Kharaṭarakachchhina-bhūtadurg-deva of Jinaḍāla, we learn that he honoured the Jaina teacher Jinaḍavallabhaśūrī, for the latter's skill in poetry.²

Naravarman adopted the title of Nirvāṇa-Nārāyaṇa, and was devoted to the goddess Charchikā, who is said to have made him powerful.³ His religious toleration is evident from the fact that in his reign a pair of Jaina images was set up at Bhōjpur and three Jaina images at Shēragāḍh.⁴ He was sagacious in sustaining virtue. Every morning he is said to have bestowed upon Brāhmaṇas some donations and thereby rendering virtue, one-footed as it were, multiplied.⁵ His virtuous conduct also set an example before his subjects; in an inscription from Vidisha he is described as para-nāti-sahādāra.⁶ He also encouraged executing public works, as known from the example of one of his generals named Vikrama, who excavated a tank at Amērā in the Vidisha District.⁷

From his queen Mōmaladevi, Naravarman had a son named Yaśōvarman, who succeeded him.

**YAŚÖVARMAN**

_c._ 1134 to _c._ 1142 (?) _A.C._

The history of this ruler is known from two copper-plate grants and one stone inscription. Both the copper-plate grants were found at Ujjain and are fragmentary. One of them, which is dated V.S. 1192 (c. 1135 _A.C._), records the grant of some land by the king himself, in exchange of some other land which had been previously donated on the occasion of the first death anniversary of his mother Mōmaladevi. The other date for this king is one year before this date, as we find recorded in the grant of his son, Lakshmivarman, dated V.S. 1200 (c. 1144 _A.C._)⁸ The stone inscription⁹ under reference was discovered at Jhālarpātān in Rājasthān; it is highly weather-worn and in its body can be read the names of Naravarman and Yaśōvarman, though the complete sense of it cannot be made out. It ends with the date _V._ S. 1199 (c. 1142 _A.C._).

The only event which we know of the reign of this king is his struggle with the Chaullīkya Jayasimha, which was an episode in the prolonged struggle which commenced during the reign of Naravarman, as seen above, but its result was rather more disastrous in the end. The causes of Jayasimha's invasion of Mālvā have been differently stated in the sources. According to Hēmachandra, it was a Yōgini's advice to Jayasimha to go to the holy city of Ujjain to worship Kālikā and the other Yōginis, if he was desirous of acquiring high religious merit; she also impressed upon him the necessity of establishing friendly relations with Yaśōvarman in order to obtain permission to enter Mālava. This

---

1 No. 37, l. 12.
3 No. 36, vv. 1-2; and _Ibid._, l. 12-13.
4 Nos. 32 and 33, respectively.
5 No. 49, vv. 9-10.
6 No. 36, l. 11. 13-14.
7 No. 30, l. 21.
8 Nos. 36 and 40, respectively.
9 _P.R.A.S._, _W.C._, 1906, p. 56. The record is damaged and the unit figure in the date is not clear. Thus it cannot definitively be assigned to the reign of Yaśōvarman. The stone is now not traceable and as no impression too being available, it is not cited here.
enraged Siddharāja and he decided to launch an attack on the Paramāra kingdom.\(^1\) Above, we have seen what Mērutūṅga relates; viz., that Jayasimha was enraged when in his absence his kingdom was invaded by Yaśōvarman; and this account is supported by Sōmēśvara.\(^2\)

Jayasimha’s invasion of Mālava seems to have taken place almost about the time when its eastern frontier was threatened by the ambitious Chandellā king, Madanavarman, who had already penetrated into the western region of the Bēṭvā, some time before 1134 A.C., when he issued his Augasī grant, as shown in detail in the history of the Chandellā dynasty. Yaśōvarman was thus hard-pressed, and Jayasimha succeeded in inflicting a crushing defeat on him, as we are informed by the Gujārāt chroniclers, with some variations in details. For example, Mērutūṅga tells us that Siddharāja laid siege to the fort of Dhrā and ultimately imprisoned Yaśōvarman, whom he led in triumph to Anahilla-paṭṭana. Arisimha relates that Jayasimha imprisoned Yaśōvarman, king of Dhrā.\(^3\) The same is the statement of Sōmēśvara in his Kīrīkaṇamudd\(^4\) and Suraś-ōtsava.\(^5\) According to Hēṃachandrā, Jayasimha seized and imprisoned Yaśōvarman.\(^6\) The Vasanta-vaṇāṭha informs us that Jayasimha brought from Ujjain the Yōgini-Pīṭha, defeated and imprisoned the lord of Dhrā, like a parrot in a cage.\(^7\) Thus there is a general agreement among the Jaina chroniclers regarding Siddharāja’s complete success over Yaśōvarman, who was not only defeated but also captured and the former’s supremacy was established over Dhrā, the capital of Mālava. The same event is also narrated in the Rāṣṭramūla.\(^8\)

The statement of the Gujārāt chroniclers are corroborated by epigraphic evidence. That Jayasimha achieved substantial success in his expedition against Yaśōvarman is shown by the title Avantiṇīthā assumed by him in his Gālā grant, dated V.S. 1193 (c. 1136 A.C.).\(^9\) The same title appears also in his Ujjain stone inscription, dated V.S. 1195 (c. 1138 A.C.), which supplements our information by stating that he placed the Avanti-maṇḍapa under the charge of one Mahādevā as his Governor at that place. Mahādeva’s father Dādāka of the Nāgara family was the keeper of the seals at Anhilwād.\(^10\) The Dōhad inscription of V.S. 1196 (c. 1139 A.C.) also states that Jayasimha put the king of Mālava in prison.\(^11\) The Vaṇnagar prasādi of Kumārapala tells us that Jayasimha fettered the proud king of Mālva;\(^12\) and the Sundhā hill inscription records that Jayasimha gave a golden kalaśa as a reward to the Chāthamāna Āśarāja of Nāḍōl for his bravery in the war against the Mālava king.\(^13\) This implies that Āśarāja helped his Chaṇḍilīka overlord on this occasion.

\(^1\) D.K., Canto XIV, vv. 5 ff.
\(^2\) P.C.M., pp. 58 f.; and K.K., II, vv. 30-32.
\(^3\) We have no means to know definitely whether Yaśōvarman invaded Gujārāt as a prince during his father Nāravarman’s reign or after the defeat of the latter ruler at the hands of Jayasimha Siddharāja. However, relying on the statement of Mērutūṅga that the war between Mālva and Gujārāt prolonged for 12 years and taking it as ending with the capture of Yaśōvarman in 1142 A.C., the date supplied by the Jhūṁrāṭān inscription, Yaśōvarman’s invasion of Gujārāt may be tentatively placed in about 1130 A.C., when his father was on the throne. This is supported by the account of the Kumārapala-prasādi (I, v. 41), which says that the war ended when Siddharāja succeeded in entering the fort of Dhrā after his elephant had broken the gate.
\(^4\) Sūkṛasiṃhavāṁśa, II, v. 34.
\(^5\) II, vv. 31-42.
\(^6\) Gravīṇā-prasāti, V, vv. 31-33.
\(^7\) D.K., in Ind. Ant., Vol. IV, p. 266.
\(^8\) Canto III, vv. 21-23.
\(^9\) Forbe’s translation, pp. 111 f.
\(^12\) Ibid., Vol. X, p. 139, v. 1. I.N.I., No. 245.
POLITICAL HISTORY

The incorporation of the Paramāra kingdom within that of the Chaulukyas must have been effected some time subsequent to 25th November, 1135, which is the Christian equivalent of the date of Yaśovarman's inscription, and prior to 22nd April, 1136, the date of the Gālā inscription which first proclaims Jayasimha as lord of Avanti (Avantināthī). Thus the misfortune, which had its beginning in the time of Naravarman, came to its final phase in that of his son Yaśovarman, and, as we have just seen, it ended in making Jayasimha, the Śrīvakṣṭhavarna ruler of Western India.

Some times later, Yaśovarman seems to have obtained his release through the favour of Jayasimha Siddharāja, and also regained a portion of his kingdom over which he ruled, probably as a Chaulukya feudatory. He is called a Mahārāja in the Jhārāpīṭṭha inscription, the date of which is read with tolerable certainty as V.S. 1199 (c. 1142 A.C.), Phālguna śīta.¹

JAYAVARMAN

c. 1142 to c. 1143 A.C.

Jayavarman was the eldest son² of Yaśovarman, who, as we have just seen was captured by Siddharāja in 1135-36 A.C. The only inscription of this ruler that is so far known is his incomplete Ujjain grant, of which only the first plate is available and the second, in which the date was apparently mentioned, is not forthcoming.³

The period of the reign of this prince is purely conjectural. Its lower limit can no doubt be placed to be some time before 1144 A.C. when his younger brother and immediate successor, Lakshmivarman, issued his Ujjain grant,⁴ but its upper limit cannot be determined with certainty, for he appears to have begun his political career even before 1142 A.C., the date of the Jhārāpīṭṭha inscription, as we have seen above. From the identification of the localities mentioned in his Ujjain grant, it would appear that soon after the annexation of the Paramāra kingdom by Jayasimha Siddharāja, this prince (Yaśovarman) fled away to the easternmost part of the territory of his kingdom where, in course of time, he established himself and also made some gifts from his camp at Chandrapuri, which is in the Bhopāl region, and the same gift he reannounced from his camp at Vardhamānapura, which is no other than the modern Badnāwar near Dhār.⁵

This would suggest that taking advantage of the intrigues and dissensions which had then sprung up in the Chaulukya court in the later years of Jayasimha, he came out of his eastern retreat and succeeded in re-occupying Dhār, or at least a portion of his ancestral kingdom,⁶ as is also shown by the titles of a paramount sovereign attached to his name in his grant.

¹ P.R.A.S., W.C., 1905-06, p. 56. IN.J., No. 252. The last number of the date is taken as doubtful by P. Bhatia for which see P.B.P. p. 124, n. 1. But in the P.R.A.S., W.C. Report, it is said to have been read with tolerable certainty. It is true that "the variation of dates is a very safe basis to reach at new conclusions", but the possibility in the present case cannot altogether be precluded since the name of Naravarman can also be read in the body of the inscription. Thus Yaśovarman mentioned in it appears to be no other than the Paramāra king.
² Here I agree with Kidhorn and others, according to whom Jayavarman was the eldest son of his father, Hall's theory that Lakshmivarman was the eldest of the brothers, cannot be held. See Ep. Ind., Vol. XXIV, p. 229.
³ No. 39.
⁴ No. 40.
⁵ See the identification of places in No. 39.
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The name of this prince is mentioned as Jayavarman in his own plate and also in two other grants, viz., the Pipilānagar grant of the Mahākumātra Hariśchandra, dated V.S. 1235-36 and the Bhōptol grant of the Mahākumātra Udayavarman, dated V.S. 1256.1 But in all the three grants of Arjunavarman, the name Ajayavarman is found.2 This has given rise to a keen controversy among scholars as to the problem whether both these names were identical, or they were intended to denote two separate persons who were both sons of Yaśōvarman and therefore brothers. Kiethorn held that both these names indicate two separate persons,3 whereas Fleet,4 Ganguly5 and N.P. Chakravartī6 took both these names to have been borne by the same prince. In this connection it has also to be noted that in none of these inscriptions we find both these names, and also that the name Ajayavarman is found only in the three grants of Arjunavarman, which are not only later in time but also that the latter two give the genealogical portion exactly as copied from the first of them. Thus it is evident that the name Jayavarman, which occurs in all the earlier grants, was changed to Ajayavarman, in later records, for metrical exigencies.

Jayavarman's contemporary on the Chālukya throne was Jagadēkamalla II (1138-50), whose victory over Mālwa is referred to in a number of inscriptions.7 Jayavarman is known to have ruled for an extremely short time, probably for a few months; and it is, therefore, doubtful if all the victories of the Chalukya king which are mentioned in these inscriptions, which do not give the name of the king of Mālwa, can plainly be referred to his reign. The same is the case of some records which eulogise the Hoysaḷa chief Vishnuvardhana (1128-42 A.C.) and his son Narasimha (1142-73 A.C.), as winning victories over Mālava.8 These records also do not mention the name of the ruler of Mālwa, and thus the victories mentioned in them cannot be connected with the reign of Jayavarman.

BALLĀLA

During this period of confusion we hear of one Ballāla as ruling over Avanti-Mālava from its capital Dhārā. The identity of this prince is uncertain, as we shall presently see. Almost at the same time the Śākambhari Chāhāmāna ruler, Arnorāja (1133-1151 A.C.) declared a war against the Chalukya king Kumārapāla (1143-72 A.C.), the grand-nephew and successor of Jayasimha Siddhārāja. Hēmāchandra tells us that Arṇā (Arṇorāja) advanced upon the frontiers of Gujarāt, in alliance with Ballāla, the king of Avanti and they simultaneously attacked the country from the front and the rear.9 Kumārapāla marched out to meet the Chāhāmāna forces and sent his feudatory, Yaśōdhavaḷa, the Paramārṣa king of Ābīl, against Ballāla. In the account of the Paramātras of Ābīl, I have shown that Yaśōdhavaḷa fought with Ballāla and slew him in the struggle.10 He appears to have been slain some time in 1150 or 1151 A.C., the first of these years being that of the Chittor inscription in which the defeat of Arṇorāja alone has been referred to, and the

---

1 Nos. 38, 45 and 46, respectively.
2 Nos. 47-49.
5 H.P.D., p. 81.
7 Mysore Inscriptions, pp. 58, 61 and 138.
10 Hēmāchandra, in his D.K., XIX, v. 126, gives the credit of killing Ballāla to some brähmāṇa soldiers of Kumārapāla's army and the Vattavakkāla (III, 29) refers to Kumārapāla's victory over Ballāla.
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second, that of the Vadinagar prasasti, which states that the head of the lord of Malava was suspended from the gate of Kumārapāla’s palace.1

The identity of Ballāla is far from certain. Lüders long ago took him as “of unknown lineage” and C.V. Vaidya identified him with the Paramāra Jayavarman himself.2 But showing some chronological difficulties, Ganguly held that he may have been a scion of the Hoyasa dynasty in which this name is very common.3 Differing from all these scholars, A.K. Majumdar suggested that Ballāla was perhaps a local chief, or a former feudatory of the Paramāras, who, during the period of confusion, declared himself as the ruler of Dhāra.4 But none of these views is definite for want of evidence.

After the death of Ballāla, a portion of Malwa was annexed by Kumārapāla who assumed the title of Avantivarman5 and who made it a Chaullūkya province once again. An inscription at Udaipur (Vidishā District), dated V.S. 1220 (1163 A.C.), tells us that this place was being governed in that year by a Mahāśāhārīrīka Rājapāla, in the reign of Ku(mārapāla) of Ana(hilapātra), the vanquisher of the lord of Śākambhari and Avanti.6 Another inscription existing at the same place refers to an officer named Lūnapāśaka as governing the town, which was included in the Bhāllivasvāmi-mahābāḍāsaka-mandala, in V.S. 1229 (1171 A.C.).7

THE PARAMĀRA MAHĀKUMĀRAS

We have seen above how in the beginning of the fifth decade of the twelfth century A.C. the country of Malava had once again been incorporated into the Chaullūkya kingdom, and consequently, the Paramāra princes were compelled to move to the east in the region of Bhopot, Vidishā and Hoshangāhād, where they established themselves. The rulers belonging to this branch assumed the unostentatious title of Mahākumāra, and in the inscriptions issued by them they are styled as those who had obtained the privilege of the five great sounds (samadhigata-pātichā-mahā-sabā-alankāra). Their relation with the Chaullūkya of Gujarāt during this period is not known.

The history of this branch of the Paramāras, which extends from 1144 A.C., the earliest known date of Lakshmīvarman, to 1173 A.C., which is the approximate date of Kumārapāla’s death, is rather complicated due to the differences in the genealogies given in their inscriptions.8 And first of all we give here the succession in the family of Yāgovarman, as conceived by Kielhorn, from the information available in his time.9

4 H.P.D., pp. 172 ff.; also see Ind. Ant., Vol. LXI, p. 192; and Hēmādri’s prasasti, quoted in E.H.D., p. 242, v. 36.
5 C.G., pp. 454 ff.
6 Ind. Ant., Vol XVIII, pp. 343 ff.
7 Ibid.
8 Ibid., p. 347.
9 For the history of this branch, see H.P.D., pp. 175 ff.; D.H.N.I., Vol. II, pp. 887 ff.; P.B.P., pp. 127 ff.; M.T.A., pp. 364 ff., besides the writings of some other scholars in Ep. Ind. and Ind. Ant. We may note here that it is not unoften that views of all three scholars are conflicting, and they can only be noted here in brief.
10 Ind. Ant., Vol. XIX, p. 348. Kielhorn was inclined to suggest that Yāgovarman was in the first instance succeeded by his son Jayavarman, who was soon after deposed by Ajayavarman; the third brother, Lakshmīvarman, did not submit to Ajayavarman and succeeded in appropriating a portion of Malva, which he, his son and grandson de facto ruled over as independent chiefs. The theory is highly speculative.
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Yasōvarman

(3 sons)

Jayavarman  Ajayavarman  Lakshmivarman

We have also seen that the names Jayavarman and Ajayavarman do not denote two separate persons as taken by Kielhorn, but they are identical. Since Kielhorn wrote two inscriptions of another member of the family, namely Trailokyavarman, are known, in view of which, we propose to modify the genealogy as under:-

Yasōvarman

Jayavarman  Lakshmivarman  Trailokyavarman

(also known as Ajayavarman)

With these general remarks, we now propose to give the history of the individual princes, allowing every one of them the usual period of reign of 20 years, with some margin for error.

LAKSHMIVARMAN

c. 1143 to c. 1155 A.C.

This prince is the earliest of the family of the Paramāras who call themselves Mahākumāras in their inscriptions. One copper-plate grant and one stone inscription of the time of this ruler have so far been discovered. The copper-plate apparently is the first of the two plates, the second of which is not forthcoming. It was found at Ujjain and is dated V.S. 1200 (1144 A.C.). It records the confirmation, by this prince, of a grant originally made by the P.M.P. Yasōvarman, in V.S. 1191 (1134 A.C.); and the expression occurring in it, namely, "for the merit of his illustrious father (śrīnāt-piṭṝ-sṛṇy-ōṇṭhāṇa"; in l. 15), undoubtedly shows that he was a son of Yasōvarman. It has been suggested above that after the capture of Yasōvarman, his son Jayavarman seems to have carved out a principality for himself, somewhere on the easternmost border of the Paramāra kingdom, in the Vidisha-Bhopāl region, and also that from this region he came back to Dhāra, where he proclaimed himself as an independent sovereign. It seems that he had to leave his principality which he had newly carved in the Bhopāl region, due to some political situation, which may be considered here. In the history of the Chandellas of Jējākabhuiki, we have seen that the ambitious and one of the most valiant Chandella rulers, Madanavarman (c. 1129-63 A.C.), was at that time striving hard to extend his kingdom on the western side of the Bēṭvā, as we learn from his Augāśī grant issued from his camp near Bhūtīlāsvāmin. This place was then included in the Mahādvādāśaka maṇḍala, and as noted elsewhere, all the places also, which are mentioned in his grant, lie on the western side of the Bēṭvā. In view of this consideration, it is not unlikely that it was due to the occupation of this part of the country by the Chandellas that Jayavarman had then to move to the west, towards Dhāra, which he re-occupied for a

1 Nos. 42 and 43.
2 Nos. 40 and 41, respectively.
3 See No. 113.
short time; but ultimately he had to lose his life in his struggle against his enemies, the Chaulukyas. Thus it would also appear that after the fall of Jayavarman, his younger brother Lakshmivarman fought with the Chandellas who were then advancing on the other side of the Betwa, and defeating them, he drove them away from the principality which originally belonged to his father Yaswarman, who made a gift of some places lying in the same Mahādevadāsaka-mandala, and this is why his brother Lakshmivarman had to confirm the same when he re-occupied it.  

What we have stated above is also suggested by the Bhopal grant issued in V.S. 1256 (1200 A.C.) by Lakshmivarman's grandson, Udayavarman, recording that "the Mahākumāra, the illustrious Lakshmivarmanadēva, had obtained sovereignty of his own by the favour of the sword which he had taken in his hand, when the rule of the illustrious Jayavarmanadēva had passed away". The statement of the Pipāñagar grant, dated V.S. 1235-36 (1178-79 A.C.), is noteworthy namely, that Mahākumāra, the illustrious Hariscondradēva, also pays "regard to the last-mentioned prince, though it is silent as to the re-capture of the province that his father had lost; the silence may probably be ascribed to the inadvertence of the person who drafted the grant. Thus we find that in all these records Jayavarman's name is mentioned with due regard, and it is only the grant issued by Lakshmivarman in which his name does not appear, apparently for the simple reason that he was a collateral. 

The stone inscription referred to above as belonging to the reign of this prince is engraved on a pillar found at Bhopāl. The writing on it is not in a fair state of preservation, and the date given in it appears to have been lost; but the title of Mahākumāra given to the Paramāra prince in its body conclusively proves that he ruled in the Bhopāl region where the inscribed pillar was found. The inscription states that his (Lakshmivarman's) feudatory Vijayasilha, who belonged to a family named Adhidroṇachārya, gained victory over his enemy in a battle. S.L. Katare, who edited the inscription, finds it difficult to identify this enemy, though he suggested that he may have been Ballāla who is otherwise known as the ruler of Avantī and Mālwa. If it is possible to identify this enemy with the Chandella ruler Madanavarman, who was expelled by Lakshmivarman from the Mahādevadāsaka-mandala, of course presumably, with the help of his feudatory Vijayasilha, it lends an additional support to our conclusion, viz., that the former of these princes obtained for himself this principality "by the favour of his sword", as seen above.

HARIŚCHANDRA

C. 1155 to C. 1186 A.C.

Lakshmivarman was succeeded by his son Hariśchandra, for whose reign we have two copper-plate grants, one from Bhopāl, dated V.S. 1214 (1157 A.C.), and the other from Pipāñagar (Shajāpur District), dated V.S. 1235-36 (1178-79 A.C.), showing him to have occupied the throne for at least 21-22 years. That the period of his reign has to be extended for at least eight years as shown by a dwarf pillar inscription which was recently found at Hoshingabād and is dated V.S. 1243 (1186 A.C.).

---

1 This suggestion, which is due to N.P. Chakravorti (Ep. Ind., Vol. XXIV, p. 228), is confirmed by the Mau stone inscription (No. 125).
2 No. 46, ll. 5-6.
3 No. 45, ll. 7-8.
4 The original find-spot is not known but it could not have been brought to Bhopāl from a distant place.
5 J.M.P.I.P., No. 2, p. 7. Lakshmivarman had no hold over the Ujjain region and we also know that Ballāla was killed by the Paramāra king Yasōdhavala.
6 Nos. 44 and 45, respectively.
7 No. 183.
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The genealogy given in both the copper-plate grants shows some difference, as noted below in tabular form:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bhāpālī Grant (No. 44)</th>
<th>Pipilānagar Grant (No. 45)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P.M.P. Naravarman</td>
<td>P.M.P. Udayāditya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.M.P. Yaśōvarman</td>
<td>P.M.P. Naravarman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.K. Traillōkyavarman</td>
<td>P.M.P. Yaśōvarman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.K. Hariśchandra</td>
<td>P.M.P. Jayavarman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M.K. Hariśchandra</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparing both these lists, we see that whereas the former of these grants mentions the name of Traillōkyavarman, by whose favour Hariśchandra is said to have obtained his victorious kingdom (or victory and kingdom, (vījay-ādhipatya), the latter gives this credit to Jayavarman, instead of Traillōkyavarman, whose name is dropped in it. It may also be noted here that the latter of these inscriptions begins with the name of Udayāditya. In this respect, we have to recall the observations of Kiellhorn, who has pointed out some instances where predecessors are sometimes omitted in the genealogical lists in Indian inscriptions; and we follow N.P. Chakravarti, who, in the course of his edition of the first of the above-mentioned grants, observes that “inscriptions do not always give a full genealogy of the ruler to whose reign they refer themselves but mention the names of one or two or even none of his predecessors”.

1 In this particular case, the motive for mentioning the name of Traillōkyavarman before Hariśchandra in the first of the above-mentioned grants may have been, as also shown by Chakravarti, that probably the latter, who appears to have come to the throne as a minor, took up the reigns of the government from the former, “to whom he was grateful for managing the affairs during his minority.”

2 But when Hariśchandra issued his Pipilānagar grant, twenty one years subsequently, the name of Traillōkyavarman, who then appears to have ceased to be the regent, is substituted by that of Jayavarman as the sovereign ruler, or rather as one who had originally carved out the principality enjoyed by his successors.

We have nothing definite to show that Traillōkyavarman ever occupied the throne; and the title of Mahākumāra attached to his name in the Bhāpālī grant of Hariśchandra has been rightly interpreted to show that he wielded the full power of a chief during the latter’s minority. The objection which is raised by some scholars, namely, that Hariśchandra does not describe himself as the tātipādamudhyāta of Lakshmīvarman, does not go to show, as far as we think, that both these princes were ruling over separate principalities, nor even that Hariśchandra was adopted by Traillōkyavarman; for in the last line of his Pipilānagar grant, Hariśchandra mentions the name of his father, Lakshmīvarman, which is rather more significant to show the relationship of father and son, rather than the general statement tātipādamudhyāta.

There are good grounds to believe that Hariśchandra came into a clash with the Chaullūkayas of Gujārat. The first of his grants shows that the Mahādvādaśaka-mandala was a part of his kingdom in 1157 A.C.; but some time later and certainly before 1163 A.C., it was wrested from him by the Chaullūkya ruler Kumārapāla, whose inscription

1 Ep. Ind., Vol. XXIV, p. 228.
2 Ibid.
3 N.P. Chakravarti observed that Traillōkyavarman was probably dead when Hariśchandra issued his second grant in V.S. 1235-36; but this view cannot now be held in view of the former’s inscription, dated V.S. 1216 (1188-90 A.C.), being found after he wrote.
5 For example, see P.B.P., pp. 132 f. It also appears curious that Lakshmīvarman should have given his only son in adoption, as conjectured by Bhātia, D.C. Gugliel’s observation that the son had a different principality than that of his father (H.P.D., p. 184) does not appear to be justified in view of the remarks made above.
of this year is found at Udaipur, which is stated to have been situated in the same manḍala.¹ And Hariśchandra, in his turn, appears to have recovered this region some time before 1178 A.C., when he issued his Pipilānagar grant. The object of this record is to mention his donation to two villages in the Nila-giri-manḍala, which touches the Mahādvāsakṣa-manḍala on its southeast; and as the former of these manḍalas is mentioned for the first time in a grant issued by a prince belonging to the Mahākumārā family, this appears to have been his new extension of dominion. It is not however, known whether he was compelled to move further in the direction of this manḍala owing to the pressure of the Chaulikyas.

TRAILŌKYAVARMAN

It has been observed above that Trailōkyavarman, who too is known to have belonged to the Mahākumārā line, was probably a brother of Lakshmivarman, and appears to have acted as a regent during the minority of Hariśchandra. Two of his inscriptions, both on stone and both fragmentary, have recently come to light. One of them, which is dated V.S. 1216 (1158-59 A.C.), was found at Vidiśā and it records the construction of a temple of Vishnu, probably by Trailōkyavarman himself, who also laid the tax of a vinīśopaṇa on a bull-load passing by its side, for its maintenance and worship.² The record mentions this prince as a nṛpāti, which may also be taken as signifying that though a regent, he enjoyed all the powers of a prince; and this supports our conclusion stated above.

The other inscription of this prince does not bear any date, but it shows the title of Mahākumārā attached to the name of this prince. It records the donation of a village for conducting the worship of a deity at Harshapur, modern Harshī in the East Nėmād District.³ In neither of these records, however, we have any definite evidence to show that Trailōkyavarman ever occupied the throne.

UDAYAVARMAN
c. 1186 to c. 1215 A.C.

This prince appears to have commenced his reign about 1190 A.C., or even a little earlier, but certainly after 1186 A.C. which is the latest known year of his father Hariśchandra. The lower limit of his reign is highly speculative.

The only known inscription of the reign of this king is a copper-plate charter, issued by him in V.S. 1256 (1200 A.C.) and recording his donation of the village Gunaurā in the Vindhyā-manḍala on the auspicious day of Mahāvasākhi.⁴ In its genealogical portion the record tells us that this prince was the son of the Mahākumārā Hariśchandra; but the omission of the same title before the name of the donor himself, which may have been due to the inadvertence of the composer of the record, need not necessarily lead us to hold with D.C. Ganguly that this ruler succeeded "to the throne of Lakshmivarman without the intervention of Hariśchandra," who was his father.⁵ In fact, in the genealogical portion of this grant we find a long expression full of compounds; and it is doubtful whether the title Mahākumārā appearing first before the name of Hariśchandra should be construed with his own name or with that of his son which follows in the same expression.

2. No. 42.
3. No. 43.
4. No. 46.
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No political event of the reign of Udayavarman is so far known. We have two inscriptions from Bhōpāl, dated respectively in V.S. 1241 (1184 A.C.) and Śaka year 1108 (1156 A.C.), and both of them referring to a ruler named Udayāditya. If the reading of the date in both of them is certain, they are to be taken as probably referring to Udayavarman, since no ruler of the name of Udayāditya is so far known to have ruled in the Bhōpāl region during this period. Or, it may appear that this prince was also known as Udayāditya, for which we have no confirmatory evidence.

VINDHYAVARMAN

c. 1187 to c. 1194 A.C.

We have no inscription for the reign of this king, nor any evidence to fix the year of his accession; and the period of his reign is also speculative. The inscriptions of the Paramāra Māhākumāras range from V.S. 1200 (1144 A.C.) to V.S. 1256 (1200 A.C.), which is roughly a period of fifty-five years, during which, none of the princes is known to have made an attempt to revive the fallen fortune of the family. With the death of the Chaullikya monarch Kumārapāla in 1173 A.C., the gradual process of decline in his kingdom had set in and it continued during the time of his weak successors, viz., his son Ajayapāla (1173-76 A.C.), his son Mīlarāja II (1176-78 A.C.) and the latter's younger brother Bhimadēva (1178-1241 A.C.). This period not only created internal dissensions in the Chaullikya kingdom but also it exposed to constant hostile incursions from outside; and naturally the control of the Chaullikya throne over Mālava had also become loose. In this period of confusion, a heroic effort was made by Vindhyavarman, the valiant son of Jayavarman, to avenge the defeat of his father at the hands of the Chaullikyas. The early history of this prince is not known, but we find him successful in retrieving the lost dominions of his ancestors. The Pipātānagar grant of Arjunavarman and the Māndhātā grant of Dēvapāla probably contain an allusion to his exploits against the Chaullikyas, by representing him as eager to extirpate the Gūjaras and they also add that this king, who was skilled in war, rescued Dhārā by his strong sword. 2

The epigraphic evidence is not only borne out but also supplemented by literary tradition. The Khurāragachchhā-bṛhadvargavālī, for example, says that the Chaullikya forces led by their general, Jagadēva Pratihāra, were operating in Mālava in 1186 A.C. and the Surāvativa on the other hand, reversely records Vindhyavarman's defeat at the hands of the Chaullikya general Kumāra. 4 But in spite of all these reverses, if they are taken to refer to the battle of Vindhyavarman against the Chaullikyas, the Paramāra prince emerged victorious, since he is mentioned as the king of Avanti, Dhārā and Mālava, by his court-poet Sulhana, who wrote his commentary on the Vṛttarāmānakāra in V.S. 1246

1 Referred to by F.E. Hall in J.A.O.S., Vol. VII, p. 35. About the date of the first of these records, Hall himself is doubtful, but about that of the second, which is in verse, there can be no doubt. We quote it here from Hall's reading:-
 Bhīpālāh bhūmi-пālo = śyām = Udayāditya-pārahivah,
 TEn = edam nṛmaśram sthāvarn vass-pām-ēvarē śakē
 The equivalent Christian date of Saka 1108 would be 1185 A.C., falling not in the reign of Udayāditya but of Udayavarman; and the discrepancy may be reconciled only if we assume that Udayavarman was also known as Udayāditya, and if so, he may have come to the throne before this date. Hall informs us that the inscription was found in the Bhitā-mālārā at Bhōpāl, but this temple is at Vīḍhākhal and not at Bhōpāl.
 2 No. 47, v. 12; and Nos. 48 and 51, which copied the genealogical portion of this record.
 3 pp. 8 and 34.
 4 Canto XV, vv. 36-37. This may have been Vindhyavarman's initial attempt, but in the end, he was successful.
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(1190 A.C.) We also learn from the Jaina teacher Āśādharā that he migrated to Mālaśava in the reign of Vīdhyaśāvarman, from the country of Sāpādalakshu which was then subjugated by the Turks in V.S. 1249 (1192 A.C.). All these references go to show that Vīdhyaśāvarman after all succeeded in liberating a great part of his ancestral dominion, some time before 1190 A.C., when Sulhaṇa wrote his commentary, as referred to above.

The name of the Chaulukyā monarch from whom the Paramāra ruler wrested the empire is not given in any of the sources; and according to D.C. Ganguly, he was Mīllāraṇa II. But as Mīllāraṇa’s reign terminated in 1178 A.C., this king, as correctly shown by Pratipal Bhātia, appears to be no other than his successor Bhima II, who was on the Chaulukya throne in 1187 A.C. when the country of Mālaśava resumed independence.

Vīdhyaśāvarman, however, could not have reigned in peace as he had to measure his sword with the equally ambitious Yādava king of Dēvagiri, Bhillama V (c. 1185-1192 A.C.), who had by that time not only made himself master of the extensive territories of the effete Chaulukyā kingdom but also had assumed the epithets and titles of a paramount sovereign. An inscription found at Mutgi in the Bijāpur District and dated in 1189 A.C. mentions Bhillama as “a wrestler against the Mālaśavas,” and further below, as “a severe pain in their head.” The silence of the Paramāra records on this point may be taken to indicate that Vīdhyaśāvarman had to suffer reverses at the hands of the Yādava ruler. He also struggled with Ballāla, who defeated him, as we know from some of the Hōysala records.

Vīdhyaśāvarman’s Minister for Peace and War (Sāndhivigrahika) was Bilhaṇa who composed the inscription found at Māṇḍū. He was a friend of Āśādharā. The court-poet of this king was Sulhaṇa, as we have already seen above.

The lower limit of the reign of this king is not definitely known. He was succeeded by his son Subhāṭavaṃśa, some time towards the close of the twelfth century.

SUBHĀṬAVAṆṢA

c. 1194 to c. 1209 A.C.

We have no inscription of the reign of this king, who was also known as Śrībhāṭa and Sōhāṭa.

Subhāṭavaṃśa had inherited the warlike spirit of his father, and the deteriorating condition of Gujarāt gave him an opportunity to invade the country. In his campaign he appears to have first marched against Lāta, where he despoiled the city of Dabhōi of its wealth, not sparing even the golden cupolas of its temples, as we are informed by the literary sources. He also compelled its ruler Sīhha, who was a feudatory of the Chaulukya ruler Bhima, to transfer his allegiance to him.

Just after this significant victory, Subhāṭavaṃśa penetrated into Gujarāt, which he ravaged and plundered its riches. His success in this region is attested to by the records of his successors, Arjunavaṃśa and Dēvapāla, which state that “the fire prowess of this conqueror (Subhāṭavaṃśa), like the fiery rays of the Sun, which exercised its thundering

1 For this and for some other references from Sulhaṇa, see P.B.P., p. 137, foot-note 3-5.
2 Sāgaradharmamārtha, p. 1.
3 H.P.D., pp. 189.
4 See P.B.P., p. 138.
6 For example, see E.C., Vol. VI, ed. Nos. 127, 150; and Ak., No. 40.
7 No. 183, v. 19.
8 Sukṭēṣtarakīrtana, Canto IX, v. 33; Subhrīkīrtikalabhītī, p. 16; Vasanāvallīsa, Canto V, v. 4.
9 H.M.M., p. 7; H.P.D., p. 197.
rage in the *pattana* of blustering Gujarāras (*Garjjad-Gurjara-pattana*), is witnessed to the present day in the forest conflagration that still prevails in the country.\(^1\) This statement is corroborated by Merutunga.\(^2\)

Subhaṭavarmān’s success in Gujarāt, however, appears to have been only temporary, for his progress in the country was checked by the united efforts of the Chaullikya generals Lavaṇḍaprasāda and Śrīdhara. From the Veṇavāl inscription dated V.S. 1273 (1216 A.C.), we learn that “by his (Śrīdhara’s) counsell Bhima again made the country stable that had been shaken by the warlike elephants of Mālava and protected Devaparjana by his power.”\(^3\) This statement clearly indicates that the Paramārā ruler could not make any territorial extension in his ravages.

About the same time Subhaṭavarmān had also to enter into a contest with his southern neighbour, the Yādava Jaitugi (1192-1207 A.C.), who was extending his sphere of influence in the north. An undated inscription from Managoli in the Bijāpur District, which has been assigned to about 1200 A.C., states that his general Sahadeva vanquished his opponents in the neighbourhood, and adds that he was an Indra (Vajradhara) to the mountain-like army-leader of Mālava.\(^4\) The inscription is silent as to the name of the leader of Mālava army, but he appears to be no other than Subhaṭavarmān who was then on the throne. The success of the Yādavas appears to be only of the nature of a raid.

Subhaṭavarmān was not only a brave warrior but also a patron of scholars. Pandita Āḍādhara composed some of his works during his reign, as seen in the section on literature, below. Sulhana was his court-poet.

**ARJUNAVARMĀN**

c. 1210 to 1215 A.C.

Arjunavarmān was the son and successor of Subhaṭavarmān. We have three inscriptions of his reign, dated respectively, in V.S. 1267, 1270 and 1272, corresponding to 1211, 1213 and 1215 A.C. They were all found in the Bhopāl region. According to them, this king had the *hirdāra* of *tridhihāvīra*,\(^5\) which apparently is to be taken to signify *his being the dharma-, dāna-, and yudha-vīra*.

One of the grants mentioned above and dated V.S. 1270 was issued by the king from his camp in Bhirigukachchhā, which was then the capital of Lāta.\(^6\) Thus it is evident that this country was incorporated into the kingdom of Mālava, sometime before its date.

Arjunavarmān continued the traditional war with the Chaullikyas of Gujarāt. We are told in his inscriptions that when he put Jayasimha to flight even in child’s play, “his fame spread in the quarters in the guise of the laughters of the (eight) Dikpālas.”\(^7\) This account is corroborated by the drama *Pārijātamanjūri* of his court-poet Madana, which records that this ruler vanquished the *Chaullikya-mahi-mahēndra* Jayasimha and captured Jayasīrī,\(^8\) meaning both victory and the daughter of the king of Gujarāt; Merutunga calls him the destroyer of Gujarāt and records that he completely overran this kingdom.\(^9\)

---

1 No. 47, v. 15.
2 P.C.M., pp. 97 f.
5 Nos. 47-49.
6 No. 48.
7 See No. 47, v. 17.
8 Ep. Ind., Vol. VIII, p. 103.
9 P.C.M., p. 97.
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That Jayasimha is identical with Bhima II was first suggested by Hall\(^1\) and accepted by Hultzsch, for the reason that the latter of these rulers was also called the new Siddharaja like his predecessor Jayasimha.\(^2\) H.C. Ray, however, observed that it is more likely that this ruler was Jayantasihna, also called Jayasimha, who, during the period 1218-26 A.C. ousted Bhima II for a short time and temporarily usurped his throne (c. 1223 A.C.).\(^3\) Jayasimha was defeated and a treaty seems to have been concluded between the two kings by which he gave his daughter Jayasri, also known as Vijayasri, in marriage to Arjunavarman. This event took place before 1211 A.C. when the Piplanagar grant describing it was issued.

Like two of his predecessors, Arjunavarman also entered into a contest with his southern neighbour, Singihan (c. 1210-47 A.C.), the Yadava king who was his contemporary. He was the greatest and the most powerful of the Yadava monarchs and probably at this time Arjunavarman extended his help to the Yadava chief Sangramasimha alias Sintha.\(^4\) In the struggle that ensued, Arjunavarman received substantial help from his feudatory Sallakshana Srisinha of the Chahamana dynasty. The Mandhata grant of the time of Jayasimha Arjunavarman II, dated V.S. 1331, makes a bold claim on behalf of Sallakshana Srisinha that he led the Paramara forces on this occasion and, as we further learn, he defeated the army of Sinhanadena, no doubt the Yadava king of that name, pulled its leader Sagaratryaka down from his horse and captured the seven chowries, an achievement which pleased both Sintha and Arjuna.\(^5\) But soon after, Sintha appears to have launched another attack on Yadva, in which the victory was secured by his forces and the Yadava flag was planted on the ramparts of Broach.\(^6\) It is perhaps this struggle in which Arjunavarman was signal defeated and lost his life. The Bahal (Khandesh) inscription of the time of Sintha, dated Saka 1144 (1222-23 A.C.)\(^6\) and the Paithan (Hyderabad) grant of Ramachandra, dated Saka 1193 (1272 A.C.)\(^7\) record only the defeat of Arjuna, but the Mamdapur (Belgium District) inscription dated in Saka 1173 (1251 A.C.) represents him as "an axe for the forest which was Arjuna (Arjuna-vana-parasu).\(^8\) This evidence is corroborated by Hmaddri, who explicitly states that king Arjuna was killed by Sintha.\(^9\)

All the three grants issued by Arjunavarman speak highly of his personal achievements. They inform us that being "a treasure-house of the stores of poetry and song, he now has relieved the goddess (Sarasvati) of the burden of her books and lyre.\(^10\) This claim is corroborated by the king's commentary on the Anantatataka, as I have shown in the section on Literature. Arjunavarman was not only a scholar and a poet of high rank but also a patron of literary persons. His spiritual preceptor (upadhyaya) was Madana, who bore the titles of Bholasarvavat and Mahatavya,\(^11\) he was the author of Patirjita mahatam and also of the three grants mentioned above. Another scholar of Arjunavarman's court was the Jaina Pandita Asadhara, the preceptor of Madana.\(^12\) Mahatvanita

\(^4\) No. 60, v. 60.
\(^7\) Ind. Ant., Vol. XIV, pp. 314 ff.
\(^8\) Ep. Ind., Vol. XIX, pp. 19 ff.
\(^9\) Hmaddri's pratvati, quoted in E.H.D., p. 243, x. 43.
\(^10\) Nos. 47-48, v. 18.
\(^12\) According to the Patirjita mahatam, Nalakasa was his amitya. See Ep. Ind., Vol. VII, p. 103.
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Bilhana, who is referred to as Mahākavi in Jaina tradition, served this king as his Minister for Peace and War. All these instances go to show, as rightly observed by H.C. Ray, that this king “to some extent succeeded in reviving the glory of the days of Muniṣa and Bhōja.” In his Rasikasanjivani he introduces himself as “the lamp of the family of Bhōja” (Bhōja-kula-pradīpaka). According to the Pārijātamañjari, his queen was Sarvakalita, the daughter of the Kumāra king.

Arjunavarman’s reign came to an end some time after 1218 A.C., the year of his last known grant, and he was succeeded by Dévapāla, whose relationship with him will be discussed below.

DéVAPĀLA

c. 1218 to c. 1235 A.C.

For the reign of this king we have three stone inscriptions and one copper-plate grant, besides references in some later records. Of the stone inscriptions, one is dated V.S. 1275 (1218 A.C.) and was discovered at Harsudā (Harsūd in the East Narmā District); and the rest two which are dated in V.S. 1286 and 128(9), respectively corresponding to 1229 and 123(2) A.C., are engraved on the eastern doorway of the celebrated temple at Udaipur in the Vidisha District. The copper-plates which bear the royal charter issued by Dévapāla himself in V.S. 1282 (1225 A.C.), were found at Māndhātā in the East Narmā District. All these records range in dates from 1218 to 123(2) A.C.

The Māndhātā grant mentions this ruler as the son of (the Mahākumāra) Hariścandra, whose account we have given above in its proper place; but how he was related to his predecessor Arjunavarman is nowhere mentioned, though it can be inferred. The Māndhātā grant of V.S. 1331 (1274 A.C.) mentions Dévapāla’s son, Jayasthīru-Jayavarman II, as Arjunavarman’s son’s son (pātrā) and also his daughter’s son (daudhītra); and the only way in which we can reconcile these conflicting statements is that Dévapāla may have been adopted by Arjunavarman, who had probably no male issue, and the latter may have also given him his daughter in marriage. Perhaps he was given in adoption in the time of Udayavarman, who was his elder brother. And later, as Udayavarman died without a son, Dévapāla succeeded to both his brother’s and his adoptive father’s throne, as he is well known to have united the kingdom of the Mahākumāras line with that of the main line. In the Harsūd inscription of the time of Dévapāla we find the use of the subordinate titles of the Mahākumāras used for him, along with those which signify sovereign status, and it appears that even after assuming independence he retained the use of the subordinate title, like the Śunāgar emperor Pushyanittra. We have also to

1 See Ådādhara, op. cit., p. 1.
3 Respectively, Nos. 30, 32-33.
4 No. 51.
5 No. 60, v. 32.
6 This is actually stated in the verse itself rather not in the statement of D.C. Sircar as P. Bhatia holds it and remarks that Sircar’s statement is incorrect. See P.B.P., p. 156. What we have suggested is the only way in which we can reconcile the available evidence; and there is no difficulty in this explanation, except that of the saṅgīra marriage, which, however, may have been allowed by the custom of those days. Bhatia, of course, appears to be justified in suggesting from the verse referred to above, that Jayavarman’s grandmother, who was Arjunavarman’s wife came from the lunar race, but not necessarily connected with any Śrāvaṇa prince of Dévagiri, as she is also inclined to think, for in that case the hostilities between the two kingdoms, which continued even subsequently, should have immediately ceased.
7 Also see D.H.N.I., Vol. II, p. 902, where it is held that the line of the Mahākumāras may have ousted their relatives of the main branch by violence. There is hardly any evidence for the presumption.
8 No. 50.
bear in mind that this record is private. In his later grants, of course, he discarded the subordinate titles.

The southern flank of Dēvapāla’s kingdom was threatened by the Yādavas who were the avowed enemies of the Paramārās. We have seen above that Śinghaṇa killed Sinha, the ruler of Lāṭa; and it is possible that after the death of Sinha and Arjunavarman, Dēvapāla continued the struggle with the Yādavas. It also appears that after some fight a treaty was concluded between both the rival parties as actually indicated by the specimen of a treaty given in the Lekhapaṇḍitaśakti. 1 From the conditions laid down in the treaty, it was settled that neither of the parties was to enter the other’s jurisdiction.

This treaty between the two great rivals seems to have been concluded in view of entering of both into an alliance of attacking Gujarāt, simultaneously. The Hānniramadhamardana tells us that dissension between both these parties was brought about by Viradhavala, the Vāghaṇa chief-tain of Dholā. 2

In the latter part of his reign Dēvapāla had to encounter a more formidable foe in the form of the Muslims, who, by this time, had penetrated into the interior of the country. After his great success in his battles against Prithvirāja III of Delhi and Jaichand of Kanauj, along with the capture of Gwalior, the Muslim Sultan Itutmish, suddenly sacked Vīḍishā, where he demolished the fort and the temple of Bhīllasvāmin, in 1233 A.C. Dēvapāla, who was unprepared, for successful resistance could not stem the tide of the invasion; and, subsequent to their ravages in the city, the Muslim forces proceeded to Ujjain where they destroyed the celebrated temple of Mahākāla. 3 Itutmish also appointed a Governor at Vīḍishā. But the Muslim occupation of this place lasted only for a temporary period, as informed by the Māndhātā inscription of V.S. 1331 (1274 A.C.), Dēvapāla killed an adhipa of the Mītchchhas who appears to have been no other than the Muslim Governor placed at that place after it was captured by Itutmish. The battle was fought near the city of Bhīllasvāmin, i.e., Vīḍishā. 4 That Dēvapāla really recaptured the place is also known from an inscription of his son Jayasimha, found there and engraved in V.S. 1320 (1263 A.C.).

In the last days of Dēvapāla’s career, the Muslims constituted the greatest menace in Rājasthān, and were steadily advancing and causing devastation in this part of the country. Itutmish appeared in Ranthambhōr and captured it in 1226 A.C. Vāghhaṇa, the uncle of its Chāhamāna ruler Vīranāirtyaṇa, came to Māla and sought refuge there. But according to the Hannir-Mahākaviya, he put Dēvapāla to death when he came to know that the latter was conspiring in a plot to kill him at the instigation of the Sultan of Delhi, and made himself the master of Māla. 5 This statement is corroborated by the Prabandhakōṣa, which, in the genealogical portion given at the end, mentions Vāghhaṇa as the conqueror of Māla; but we have no epigraphic evidence in support of this statement.

The Jaina writer Ādādhara says that he composed the Trishasthirajatī-Sūtra in V.S. 1292 (1235 A.C.), during the reign of Jaitugi; 6 and accordingly we may place the termination of Dēvapāla’s reign in 1234-35 A.C., keeping in view his latest known date which is 1232 A.C., as seen above.

3 T.N., p. 622.
4 No. 60, v. 48.
5 H.M.K., Canto IV, vv. 107-23. D.C. Ganguly is inclined to hold that the Māla ruler killed by Vīghhaṇa was Jayavarman II. See H.P.D., p. 225.
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Devaspala's favourite goddess was Limbhya, due to whose grace he ascribes his accession. This deity was probably the same as Limbaja, mentioned in the Prabhavakacharita (vv. 151 f.) as the family goddess (gôrajî devî) of his predecessor Bhôjajâ. Here it is also interesting to note that the name of this deity survives even to this day in its corrupt form Limbaja-matâ, enshrined in a modern temple at Dhâr.

The activity of building temples continued in the time of this ruler, as we know from the Har sw inscription which records the construction of a temple in honour of Śiva, in the vicinity of which some other deities also were enshrined on the bank of a lake excavated there.

We have some glimpses of the administration under Devaspala. Bihana continued as his Minister of Peace and War, and Madana as the royal preceptor. His Mándhata grant was composed by the latter under the guidance of the former. Salakhaṇa, in his Neminathacharini, mentions Nagadèva as a Customs and Excise officer under the king. In an inscription from Udaipur, Dhâmadèva (or Vâmadèva ?) is mentioned as the keeper of seals (śrikaruna-vyâpata). The Jain scholar Āśadhara continued his literary activities in his reign, as can be seen below in the section on Literature. It is, however, worth noting here that in his Jivayajñakalpa, written in V.S. 1285 (1228 A.C.), he gives Sîthasamulla as another name of a biruda, of Devaspala.

The town of Dépalpur near Indore appears to be associated with his name.

JAITUGI

C. 1235 to C. 1255 A.C.

Devaspala was succeeded by his son Jaitugi in about 1235 A.C. The lower limit of his reign is flexible and has been conjectured on the basis of the year of his successor Jayavarman whose earliest known date is 1256 A.C. We have no inscription of the time of Jaitugi, but from the other sources we have two dates for him, V.S. 1292 (1135 A.C.) and V.S. 1300 (1243 A.C.). He assumed the title of Bâlantrâyanâ.

From Jaitugi's time the Paramâra kingdom began to deteriorate till it finally collapsed. During his reign it was invaded by enemies from all quarters. Jaitugi had no foresight to make provision for the defence of his realm against the coming danger, particularly when Mâlavâ had been ravaged by Itutmish in his father's time. In about 1250 A.C. the kingdom was successfully raided by the Yadava ruler Krishna (1247-261 A.C.), who was then following the imperial policy of his father Sinighana, by expanding his dominions. His raid, however, was only of a plundering nature, and it is not certain whether he succeeded in acquiring any territory. His success is only vaguely alluded to in his Mamâpur, Munôli and Arjunavâd inscriptions, all found in the Belgâm District. They represent him as a trinêtra, the three-eyed Śiva, to Madana (Kâmâdeva) who was the king of Mâlavâ (Jaitugi), meaning thereby that Krishna destroyed the power of the king of Mâlavâ as the god Śiva reduced Madana, the god of love, to ashes.

1 No. 50, 1. 6.
2 No. 51, 11. 79-80.
3 Paramanand Jaina, op. cit., p. 152.
4 No. 52, 17.
5 Jaina-pralasti-assoagna, p. 39, n. 5.
7 See No. 57, v. 22.
8 For example, see Ep. Ind., Vol. XIX, p. 23, 1. 19; J.B.B.R.A.S., Vol. XII, pp. 38-39, etc.
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Purushottama Puri plates also refer to Krishna's victory over the kings of Gujarāt, Mālavā Chōla and Kōsala.\(^1\)

About the same time the Paramāra kingdom was invaded by the Muslims also. Nasir-ud-din Balban, the general of Ilutmish, fell upon Mālavā, in 1250 A.C., and carried on his successful raid over this territory, though he failed to establish his permanent authority over any part of it.\(^2\) Almost about the same time, Jaitungi had also to face an invasion of his western neighbour, the Vaghēla Visaladeva of Gujarāt (c. 1245-1261 A.C.), who sacked the city of Dārā, as we learn from his inscriptions at Dabhōi and Kadi.\(^3\) All these invasions, none of which appears to have resulted in any substantial gain to the enemies, must have at least caused a great drain on the military resources of Mālavā, which hastened its downfall.

JAYASIMHA-JAYAVARMAN II

c. 1255 to 1275 A.C.

Jaitungi was succeeded by his younger brother (anujya) Jayavarman, who was also known as Jayasimha, as we shall presently see. Five stone inscriptions and two copper-plate grants of the time of this king have so far been discovered. The stone inscriptions come from Rāhatagadh (Sāgar Dist.), Paṭhārī and Vidiśā (both in Vidiśā Dist.), Mōdi (Mandsaur Dist.), all in the northwest of the kingdom, and Atrū in the north. Both the sets of copper-plates were found at Gojaipur, a small village near Māndhātā in the East Nimād District. The find-spots of the inscriptions indicate the extent of the Paramāra kingdom even in the time of its degeneration. All these records range in dates from V.S. 1312 (1256 A.C.) to V.S. 1331 (1274 A.C.).\(^4\)

Whether Jayavarman mentioned in the inscriptions from Rāhatagadh, Mōdi and Māndhātā is identical with Jayasimha of the records found at Atrū, Vidiśā and Paṭhārī was a subject of keen controversy for long among scholars. D.R. Bhandarkar was the first to suggest that both these names were borne by the same ruler, whereas D.C. Ganguly considered Jayavarman to have been different from Jayasimha.\(^5\) But from the Māndhātā inscription of V.S. 1331, which mentions both these names for the same ruler, it is now perfectly clear, as pointed out by D.C. Sircar who edited the record that the ruler mentioned by both these names is identical.\(^6\)

Jayavarman had to sustain reverses at the hands of the Yādavas who were his southern neighbours and bitterly hostile to the Paramāras. Jayavarman's contemporaries on the Yādava throne were Mahādeva (1260-70 A.C.) and his son Rāmachandra (1270-1309 A.C.), both of whom are known to have invaded his kingdom. The Sahāgūr inscription dated Saka 1186 (1265 A.C.) represents Mahādeva as a trimētra (three-eyed god Śiva) to Madana in the form of the Mālavā king.\(^7\) Hēmādri's Ratraprāśasī asserts that the ruler of Mālavā was so much frightened by Mahādeva that he put a child on his throne and retired to practise austerities when he came to know that he did not use his sword.

---

4. Nos. 54-60. To these we may add J.N.I., No. 550, which is dated V. 1331. The stone is now lost. In D.H.N.I., Vol. II, p. 965; H.C. Ray took the Atrū inscription as belonging to the reign of the Chaulukya Jayasimha; also cf. my remarks in editing the same.
5. See D.R. Bhandarkar's remarks on No. 552 of his List, and H.P.D., p. 227, for the respective views. Also see D.H.N.I., Vol. II, p. 905 n. 2, suggesting the identity of both these rulers.
6. The name Jayavarman appears in vv. 50 and 56 as well as in 1: 87 and v. 72; whereas he is called Jayasimha in vv. 51-52.
against a child or woman. But since Jayavarman continued to be on the throne even after Mahâdeva closed his reign in 1270 A.C., I agree with P. Bhatia who has, suggested that this was only a diplomatic gesture. The struggle initiated by Mahâdeva was continued by his son Râmachandra. His Tâhâ grant dated Śaka 1194 (1272 A.C.) claims for him a victory over the Mâlavas. The reference is clearly to his success against Jayavarman, who was his contemporary. However, on the other hand, the Mândhâta grant, referred to above, records that Jayavarman won success over the Dakshinâtya king of the south of the Vindhya. These conflicting statements may perhaps be reconciled if we hold that either of the parties achieved some preliminary success in its offensive but was finally vanquished by the other, or it was only a boundary skirmish; but for want of a corroborative evidence neither of these views can be finalised. The Râhatgâdh stone inscription dated V.S. 1312 (1256 A.C.), which is the first Paramâr record in the western part of the Sâgar District, may however lend colour to the view that Jayavarman captured this region from the Yâdavas who held it from the time of Sînhâna. On the evidence of the Pulfâja stone inscription which seems to be dated in 1200 A.C., it has been conjectured that this Yâdava king was powerful in this region and to him the Kalachuri king Vîjayasînhâ (1188-1210 A.C.), who apparently held this territory, seems to have submitted.

Jayavarman also came into a hostile contact with the Châhamâna of Rasâthambhôr, whose kingdom stretched on the northern flank of his empire. The Châhamâna king Jaitrisînhâ appears to have raided some of northern territories of Mâlava; and Jayavarman, who was unable to stem the tide of the advancing enemy, retired to Mândlî. We are informed by the Balvan inscription of Hammirâ, dated V.S. 1345 (1288 A.C.), that Jaitrisînhâ (the Châhamâna king) “acting as a new Sun, scorched Jaitrisînhâ (i.e., Jayasinha-Jayavarman) even when the latter was seated in the fort of Mândapa, i.e., Mândlî.” The same inscription further records that “the Châhamâna ruler captured at Jhampîghatia hundreds of the soldiers of the ruler of Mâlava, who were thereafter thrown into prison at Rasâthambhâpura.

From his inscriptions we have some glimpses of administration under Jayasimha-Jayavarman. His Chief Minister (Mahâpradhâra) was Ajayadêva, who communicated the order of his donations mentioned in the Mândhâta grant of V.S. 1317. This inscription also says that his Minister for Peace and War was Mâlîdhura. The Môji inscription mentions another Chief Minister under the king; but the letters showing his name are partly broken, and perhaps they may be read as Châdurî. Comparing the dates of both these records, this Chief Minister appears to have been a predecessor of Ajayadêva. His army-leader (Sadhantikha), according to his Mândhâta grant of V.S. 1331, was Anayasînhâ, belonging to the Châhamâna dynasty and the son of Salachanâsînhâ, who held this office, under Arjunavarman and vanquished Sînhâna’s forces, as seen above. Anayasînhâ was also a beneficent person; he built temples, excavated a pond at Mândlî and established Brahmâparis at this place and also at Mândhâta.

---

1 E.H.D., p. 286, v. 15.
4 No. 60, v. 54.
6 Ep. Ind., Vol. XIX, pp 49 f., vv. 7 and 9. Jhampîghatia has rightly been identified by D. Sharma with the modern Jhapâstî-ghat on the Chambal, about 15 kms. due south of the railway station of Lâkheri in the Kâli District, See E.C.D., p. 105, n. 20.
7 No. 57, II, 53 and 50, respectively.
8 No. 56, 1. 40.
9 No. 60, vv. 62-66.
assembly is known to have been Śrīkanṭha, who was appointed by the king himself and who was the composer of the Mândhātā grant, referred to above.¹

Jayavarman was a patron of learned persons and poets as we know from the example of Narāyana who was a Mahākavi-chakravartin and Thakkura, in whose favour the grant mentioned in the Aṭṭū inscription was made.²

The last date we have assigned to Jayasimha-Jayavarman is circa 1275 A.C., when he had already been on the throne for about 20 years, which is the normal period of a reign. Following his reign, we have no successive chronology of the few kings who are known from stray references, and we are in the dark as to their relation with each other. With these remarks, we intend to discuss the history of the dynasty in the following pages.

ARJUNAVARMAN II

accesion c. 1275 A.C. (?)

Jayavarman appears to have been succeeded by Arjunavarman II. He was a weak ruler and his kingdom, which had further tottered, was now a prey to the attacks of enemies on all sides. The first blow was probably struck by the Yadavas of Dēvagiri, who were the hereditary enemies of the Paramāras. The Ādāri inscription of the Yadava Ramachandra, dated Śaka 1198 (1276 A.C.) speaks of his victory over king Arjuna of Mālava,³ who was apparently Arjunavarman. Taking advantage of the situation, the valiant Chāhamāna ruler Hāmminā (1283-1310 A.C.) also led a successful military campaign in the Paramāra kingdom. He is said to have “wrested the glory of Mālava by force”.⁴ Almost at the same time the Vāghēsā, who too had been waiting for an opportunity, struck a blow at their tottering hereditary enemy. The Chintara prāśātau avers that the Vāghēsā ruler Śaraṅgadeva (c. 1275-1295 A.C.) reduced the power of the king of Mālava, with the help of his vassal Visala.⁵ He had also to sustain a defeat at the hands of another Visala (?) or his father, who is mentioned in the Girvād stone inscription of Pratāpasimha, the Abhī Paramāra ruler, dated V.S. 1344 (1285-86 A.C.).⁶

The fate of Arjunavarman against all these odds is not definitely known, except that he was unable to repulse any of these campaigns. His end, too, remains unknown.

BHĪJA II

Arjunavarman’s successor on the Paramāra throne appears to have been Bhīja II, whose relation with his predecessor is not known. The Hāmminā-Mahākavya of Nayaachandra Sūri, which was written nearly a hundred years after Hāmminā’s death but gives a very reliable account, states that in the course of his dig-vījaiva Hāmminā reached Ujjain and Dhārā, defeated the Paramāra ruler Bhīja, encamped at the former of these cities where he worshipped Mahākāla.⁷

During the days of Bhīja, the Paramāra kingdom further tottered and its downfall did not appear to have been distant. Moreover, the troubles were increased when the Chief Minister of Arjunavarman turned against him. The Muslim writers speak of one

¹ Ibid., v. 72.
² No. 55.
³ A.R., Arch. Survey, Mysore, 1929, p. 143.
⁴ Ep. Ind., Vol. XIX, p. 30, n.11. The defeated king of Mālava has been identified by G.H. Ojha, with Arjunavarman II. See Hist. of Rājputānā (Hindi), p. 206. But Hāmminā seems to have led two expeditions against Mālava, one during Arjunavarman’s reign and again during the reign of Bhīja II.
⁶ No. 82, v. 42. See our remarks in the edition of the inscription.
⁷ Ind. Ant., Vol. VIII, pp. 64 f.
Kōkā (sometimes called Harānanda) as the Rāja of Mālāvā who was vanquished by Alāuddin Khaljī in 1305 A.C. The same ruler is also called Gōgādevī who was defeated by the Guhilā Lakṣmaṇasimhā, a contemporary of Alāuddin. Kōkā, or Gōgā, thus appears to have been a contemporary of Bhōjā. Wassāf, who completed his Tāziyātul-Amsār in 1300 A.C., says: "It may be about thirty years previous to my laying the foundation of this book that the king of Mālāvā died, and dissensions arose between his son and minister. After long hostilities and much slaughter, each of them acquired possession of part of that country." From Wassāf’s writing it has been inferred that the king of Mālāvā and his son referred to here are Arjunavarmā II and Bhōjā II, respectively. In that case, Kōkā may have been either the minister who made himself master of some portion of the kingdom of Bhōjā II, or, may have put the Paramārā prince on the throne of Mālāvā and ruled in his name.

With all these internal dissensions extenuated by external troubles, the Paramārā kingdom could not survive for long as an independent entity. We have already seen that its prestige had been shaken in the invasion of Ilutmish who plundered Vidishā and Ujjain; but the things changed in the days of the imperialist Khaljī dynasty; and in 1292 A.C., as we are informed by Firishta, Alā-ud-din Khaljī, in the reign of his uncle Jalā-ud-din Firuz (1290-96 A.C.) invaded Mālāvā, captured the town of Bhīsā (Vidisha) and brought much plunder to Delhi. Again in 1305 A.C., Alā-ud-din sent his general "Einool-Moolk Moontany...with an army to effect the conquest of Mālāvā", who “was opposed by Kōkā, the Rāja of Mālāvā”; and in the engagement that ensued, Kōkā offered a determined resistance, with 40,000 Rājput horses and 100,000 foot, but ultimately "Einool-Moolk proved victorious, and reduced the cities of Oojeine, Mando, Dharamgurry and Chundra". The statement of Firishta, who alone among the Muslim historians mentions Kōkā and calls him the Rāja of Mālāvā, is supported by an epigraph found at Chanderi and now preserved in the archaeological museum at Gwalior. The record is in Persian and is dated in the last (fourth) line, in 20th Shā’ban 711 (A.H.), the year being equivalent to 1311 A.C. It records the construction of a mosque at the place where it was found "in the country of Kōkā. This information clearly shows that even in this year the country was more popularly known after the name of Kōkā.

Thus we see that by the year 1305 the Paramārā authority in Mālāvā was virtually extinguished, but even thereafter, some petty chiefs appear to have held parts of their former extensive kingdom. An inscription inscribed on a stone slab at the eastern entrance of the great temple at Udaipūr and dated V.S. 1366 (1310 A.C.), reveals the name of one Jayasimhā; and though the name of his family is not mentioned in the record, from the find-spot of it, it is evident that he was a ruler of Mālāvā. The date of this epigraph is so far removed from the last known date of Jayasimhā-Jayavarman (1274 A.C.) that he appears to have been a separate king; and G.H. Ojha actually designated him as Jayasimhā IV of Malava. But this view is highly doubtful for want of the mention of

2 D.R. Bhandarkar’s List of Inscriptions, No. 794.
4 See Ep. Ind., Vol. XXXII, p. 147. A.K. Majumdar, however, takes the defeated person as Gōgā, or Kōkā.
6 Ibid., pp. 361-62.
8 Hist. of Rājputānā (Hindi), Vol. I, p. 204.
the name of the dynasty, and, therefore, I am inclined to agree with H.C. Ray's remarks that "this must remain at present a guess, unsupported by any conclusive evidence".\footnote{D.H.N.I., Vol. II, p. 906: the places mentioned in the Gwalior Museum inscription which we have referred to above, are Ujjain, Dhar, Mândâ and Chandîr. It may thus be guessed that a portion of the kingdom of the Paramârâs comprising the region around Udaipur, the find-spot of this record, still remained unconquered; and if so, we may take this Jayaisingha as ruling in this region at this time. His subsequent history is not known.}

The Paramâra family also appears to have established some more branch lines of petty rulers. One chief of the name of Harîrâja has been recently brought to light by a fragmentary stone inscription deposited in the museum at Bhavnagar in Saurashtra, which I noticed in my personal visit to it. The date of the record, if at all it was given in it, is now lost and nothing about this chief except his family is known. Another stone inscription was found at Pokara, ancient Pushkarāja and now a tehsil of the same name in the Jaisalmer District of Rajasthân. The epigraph records the construction of a temple by Dhanapâla of the Paramâra (Paramâra) dynasty in commemoration of his father Gaurangha, and the date given is Saturday, the 6th of the bright half of Âsadh, V.S. 1070, which, as calculated by K.N. Dikshit who noticed the inscription, is equivalent to 26th July, 1012 A.C., the year being northern Vikrama current.\footnote{A.S.I., A.R., 1930-34, p. 220. The inscription was edited by Ram Vallabh Sonani in Śādha Patrika, a Hindi Monthly from Udaipur (Rajasthân), for 22nd of its year, Pt. II, pp. 67-69. It ought to be properly edited.} But we do not know anything about the two persons mentioned in this epigraph and it is also doubtful whether they were ruling chiefs.

**ADDENDUM**

Just before the rise of the Paramâras, the land of Mâlwa was a bone of contention between their immediate predecessors who were the Râshtrakûtas of the south and the Gûrjara-Pratihâras of the north; and here we propose to give a brief sketch of their struggle, to show how often this region passed over from one of these dynasties to the other.

Both the above-mentioned ruling houses are known to have begun their career, almost simultaneously, in the first half of the eighth century, when we find a Gûrjara ruling house holding Mâlwa, with its capital at Ujjain.\footnote{R.T.T., p. 31.} Just to its north-west was a Râshtrakûta principality, the existence of which is disclosed by the Indragad stone inscription, dated 710 A.C.\footnote{I.B.I.S., Vol. XXV, p. 47, v. 23.} It may here be conjectured, though without any evidence to prove it, that the find-spot of the stone on which this record is engraved may have been named after the Râshtrakûta Indra I, who flourished about this time and who might have extended his conquest to this region during the havoc caused by the Arab Muslim raids, which had weakened the contemporary Hindu princes of the west.

Indra's son Dantidurga, who began to rule in circa 745 A.C., is known to have captured Ujjain from a Gûrjara ruler, who was probably the same as the one referred to above, and obliged him to work as his doorman.\footnote{I.B.I.S., Vol. XXI, Pt. III, pp. 1 ff.} But soon thereafter the tide changed its course and in 783 A.C. Avanti (Ujjain) was once again under the sway of the Pratihâra Vatsarâja, Nâgabhata's grandson.\footnote{Jumâna's Harvanêtà Purâna. For details and the controversy over the interpretation of the verse, see A.I.K., p. 21.} How Vatsarâja appropriated this region is not known.
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The Baroda plates of Karkarāja inform us that the territory of Ujjain was snatched from the Pratihāras, by Gōvinda III (793-840 A.C.), who, probably comprehending some danger from the north, made arrangements for protecting it during the minority of his son Amāghavarsha, who at the time of his accession, was a boy of 13 or 14.1 In the long reign of this king (814-878 A.C.) this region was annexed by Nāgabhāṭa's grandson Mihira-Bhōja, whose earliest known date is 836 A.C.2 but subsequently, it was recovered by Krishna II (c. 878-914 A.C.) in a battle fought at Ujjain itself.3 In the meanwhile we hear of the rise of another Rāṣṭrakūṭa house at Paṭhāri (Vidishā Dist.), in the northeast of Ujjain, from an inscription dated 861 A.C.4

In the following years Mālwā is again known to have changed hands. Bhōja's grandson Mahipāla, whose earliest known date is 914 A.C.5 was attacked by Indra III (914-927 A.C.), who also dared to capture his capital Kanauj,6 the premier city of North India. This undoubtedly shows that the Rāṣṭrakūṭa king had full control over Mālwā, through which he passed in his invasion of the north. But no sooner than the wave of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa invasion subsided, Mahipāla re-established the fortune of his family, with the help of his feudatories, one of whom was Bhamānī I, the Kalachuri chief of Gorakhapūr, who is credited with the conquest of Dhāra in the Kalha plates of his successor Sōhadēva.7

R.C. Majumdar, and following him D.C. Ganguy, associate the statement of the Kalha plates to the help rendered by Bhamānī to his overlord Mahipāla;8 and if so, we have to take both these rulers as contemporaries of each other; and in the light of this fact, to revise the period of the former also, which is calculated by prof. V.V. Mirashi from circa 890 to 905 A.C.9 which however, would show that he was not a contemporary of Mahipāla and his reign closed about a decade preceding the latter's accession. Incidentally, it may also be remarked here that the period assigned to this ruler by Mirashi is also contrary to his own statement made elsewhere in the same work (p. exiil), viz., that the Paramāra adversary of Bhamānī, though not named, may have been Muṭija (c. 974-995 A.C.).

In view of all these preliminaries, we may now take up the question of the rise of the Paramāra rulers and their association with Mālwā. To me it appears to be more probable that the early Paramāra rulers, viz., Vākpatīrāja I (Bappapairāja), his son Vairisihna and the latter's son Siyaka were all ruling in some part of Gujarāt, and it was not possible for them to appropriate any part of Mālwā. From the Pratāpūgadh inscription of the time of Mahendrapāla II, dated V.S. 1003 = 946 A.C., we know that the Pratihāra kingdom then stretched up to the district of Duṣapurā (Mandasor) in the west and upto Ujjain and Māṇḍū in the south and also that all these places were guarded by royal officers of the house. The last-mentioned place is about 195 kms. due south of Mandsaur and about 115 kms. straight southwest of Ujjain, which is about 150 kms. south east of Mandsaur and the relative position of all these places, forming a triangle, shows that the western and the southern boundaries of the Pratihāra kingdom were well protected in 946 A.C., which is the time of the inscription, only three years before Siyaka issued

---

1 *Ind. Ant.*, Vol. XII, pp. 160, 164. It is possible, as already suggested by Dr. Altekar, that Gōvinda may have appointed his uncle Karka to rule over Mālwā after its conquest and annexation. See *R.T.T.*, p. 83, n.
8 *A.I.K.*, pp. 36 and 95, respectively.
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his Harsollā plate records. Thus it could not have been possible for Siyaka to enter into a struggle with all the powerful rivals, who were feudatories of the Pratīthāras, though in his later years he may have extended his conquests to some land adjoining east of his own dominion. Therefore I agree with the editors of the Harsollā plate records (K.N. Dikshit and D.B. Diskalkar), who observed that "the country round about Ujjain was obtained by them (the Paramāras) not before the later part of Siyaka's reign or the early part of Vākpati-Muñja's reign." It is significant to note here that all the three grants of the former of these rulers were found in Gujarāt, where the places mentioned in them have also been located, and those of the latter in Mālwa, the earlier one in the west, on the confines of Gujarāt, and the later one in the east. Here we have to note that the Gujarāt appears to have been handed over to them by the successors of Indra III, as already seen.

In view of what has been said above, Dr. Altekar's conjecture that the Paramāras were in the beginning very probably the feudatories of the Gūjara-Pratīthāras, is, after all, a hypothesis and not a proved fact. The basis of his surmise is the interpretation of a verse in the Nausāri grant which states that Indra III conquered Upendra, who, according to him, was identical with Krishnarāja of Vākpati's grants, both the words, viz., Upendra and Krishna, being synonymous, as already suggested by Hall and others, and the great-grandfather of Vākpati-Muñja. But the view that the Paramāras began their career as the feudatories of the Pratīthāras can be accepted only on the assumption that Padmagnupta, presumably having no definite knowledge of the genealogy of the early Paramāra kings, not only changed the name Krishna to Upendra, probably for metrical exigencies, but also placed this ruler (Upendra) at the top of the list, and this account was followed by the composer of the Udaipur prastāti by repeating the names of Vairisimhā and Siyaka, which led some scholars to hold that there were two rulers of each of these names. This repetition of names we do not find in Dhanapala's Tilakamaniyari, nor have we any epigraphic evidence in support of it, as already stated above.

The later half of the Nausāri grant has also a pun in it, viz., that it was by no means a matter of wonder for Indra (the ruler and the deity) if he conquered Upendra (the king and Vishnu), who was junior to him, as the use of the prefix upa shows.

Dr. Altekar's conjecture that Indra may have defeated the Paramāra Upendra (whom we have taken as identical with Krishna or Vākpatirāja I), if corroborated by any epigraphic evidence, may also explain why in the latter part of his career Siyaka undertook an expedition against Khōṭiga and plundered his capital in 972-73 A.C., when the Rāṣhtrakūṭa power began to decline, as already seen above, in the account of that ruler.

APPENDIX

A NOTE ON JAGADDEVA PARAMĀRA

Jagaddēva, whose name does not occur in the genealogy of the Paramāra rulers of Mālwa, is known from two of our inscriptions, one of which was found at Dōṅgargāon in the Yeotmal District of Berar and is dated Śaka 1034 or 1112 A.C., and the other, which bears no date, at Jainā in the Adilabād District of the Nizam's dominions, now included in the Andhra Pradesh, and about 105 kilometres almost due east of Dōṅgargāon.

1 Ep. Ind., Vol. XIX, p. 240. The statement of the Udaipur prastāti, viz., that "Vairisimha suggested that Dihāl belongs to him" (v. 11) has thus to be interpreted to show that he may have made an incursion in Mālwa, but his success was only ephemeral.
2 For details, see R.T.T., pp. 100 f. This part of the verse is: Upendram = Indra = jīva = ye na vismitam.
3 Introduction, vv. 40 ff.
5 Nos. 29-29.
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In our account of Udayaditya we have referred to the statement of the Räsamälä, viz., that Jagaddēva left Mālwā and entered the service of Jayasimha Siddharaja of Gujarāt. This narration no doubt presents chronological difficulties, since Jayasimha is known to have commenced his rule in 1094 A.C., after the death of Udayaditya, which took place in 1093 A.C., according to the Dēwās grant of his son Naravarman. In the same way, the other detail recorded in the Räsamälä, viz., that Jagaddēva quitted the service of Jayasimha when the latter made preparations to attack Mālwā and that on his return he was received with great affection by his father, who subsequently appointed him as his successor, investing him with the royal mark, and also that he ruled for fifty-two years, etc., have all been regarded unhistorical.

From verse 6 of the Döngargāon inscription we learn that Jagaddēva was a son of Udayaditya; and the Jainād inscription supplements this information by the account that "though Udayaditya had (several) sons, through the favour of Hara, he obtained still another, who was after his heart". Thus we may conclude that Jagaddēva was the youngest of all the brothers. The first of these records also states that after the death of Udayaditya, "the Royal Fortune offered herself to Jagaddēva, but he renounced her in favour of his elder brother, being apprehensive of incurring the sin of parivittī", i.e., marrying before an elder brother marries. Thus it would seem that Jagaddēva, who had been chosen by Udayaditya as his successor, relinquished his claim in favour of his elder brother, Naravarman, who ascended the throne in 1193 A.C.

As stated above, Jagaddēva’s name is not mentioned in any other Paramātra inscriptions and therefore he was supposed to have been identical with, or a biruda of Lakshmādeva, another son of Udayaditya, according to the Nagpur museum stone inscription, as held by some scholars. But while editing the Döngargāon inscription, Dr. V.V. Mirashi has shown that Jagaddēva was different from Lakshmādeva, and also from Naravarman, and on the basis of an inscription recently discovered we have concluded that Lakshmādeva, who was indeed different from Naravarman, predeceased him whereas Jagaddēva was alive even after his death, as shown below also.

Jagaddēva is mentioned in the Prabandhacintāmaṇi, which of course does not give his pedigree but states that he entered the service of Paramārdin, king of Kuntala, Paramārdin, or Purmdāriya, was a biruda of the Western Chālukya king Vikramaditya VI (1076-1126 A.C.), and that Jayasimha served him is corroborated by the verse of the Döngargāon inscription, according to which the latter called the former "the first among his own sons, the lord of his kingdom, his very self." Vikramaditya also appears to have entrusted Jagaddēva with the governorship of the country lying to the north of the Gōdāvari, which he had then wrested from the Paramātras, whose kingdom was coterminous with that of his own.

Jagaddēva was a brave prince who made his mark by martial exploits. The Jainād inscription states that he led successful raids over Andhra, Chakradurg and Dōrasamudra. The first of these territories, which signifies the region between the Kṛishṇa and the Gōdāvari, was then under the sway of the Chōḷa ruler Kulōttunga I (1070-1120 A.C.); the second, which is identical with a part of the modern Bastar District of Madhya Pradesh, was then being ruled over by the Chhindaka Nāga king, Sōmēśvara I (c. 1069-

1 Above, p. 31.
2 No. 31.
3 H.P.D., p. 142; and D.H.N.I., Vol. II, p. 878, respectively. Also see I.N.I., No. 2084, n. This identification is probably based on the statement of some Hōysal records mentioning Jagaddēva as the king of Mālwā, for which see Ep. Carn., Vol. II, p. 168. The Nagpur Museum stone inscription only contains a fulsome praise of Lakshmādeva but does not mention him as a successor of Udayaditya.
5 p. 186.
1097 A.C.), who is known from an inscription dated Saka 1033, 1 and Dūravasamudra or Dvāravasamudra was the capital of the Hoyasalās Erāyangag (1063-1100 A.C.) and Ballāla I (1100-1110 A.C.). 2 It is not possible to know whether Jagaddeva invaded all these kingdoms independently or by assisting his overlord Vikramāditya, who is known to have raided these territories, 3 though the latter of the alternatives appears to be more probable. His raid of Dvāravasamudra is corroborated by a Hoyasala inscription, which records that "the emperor (Vikramāditya VI) sent Jagaddeva at the head of a large Chālukya army to invade the Hoyasala country but was repulsed by Ballāla I and his brothers Vishnuvardhana and Udayāditya, the valiant sons of the Hoyasala king Erāyangga." 4

Jagaddeva appears to have come to a clash with the Gūjrāras, also. Verse 10 of the Jainād inscription states that "it is strange that even to-day the extending waves of the flood of tears of the wives of the Gūjrāra heroes weeping day and night in the cave entrances of the Arbuda mountain, indicate the twang of the bow of this king which was (on the other hand) the evening thunder in the study of the accounts of Jayasimha's valour". 5 We have no independent evidence of Jagaddeva's struggle with the army of the Gūjrāras, though it has been suggested that he fought under Jayasimha, the successor of the Paramāra king Bhōja, against the king of the Gūjrāras. 6 But besides the fact that it presents chronological difficulties, this suggestion cannot be accepted for want of a corroborative evidence.

Jagaddeva was not only chivalrous but also liberal. From the Dōngargāo inscription we learn that he granted a village to the Brāhmaṇa Śrīnivasā, who built there a temple in honour of Śiva. The minister of this prince was Lōlārka, the son of Gūnaratāja and grandson of Mahēndu of the Dāhima family. The Jainād inscription states that Padmāvati, the wife of Lōlārka, erected the temple of Nimbāditya, at a place, the name of which is not mentioned but which appears to have been identical with Jainād itself where the inscription was found.

According to the Rāsamūla, Jagaddeva lived to the age of eighty-five, and following this, it may be concluded that probably he outlived his brother Naravarman. The Paramāra king Arjunavarman, in his Ratikasaṃhāraṇa states that his predecessor, Jagaddeva, was very graceful. 7 His daughter, Mālayaṇḍī was married to Sāmalavarman, the king of east Bengal. 8 "His self-abnegation, chivalry and liberality made him far-famed", as we learn from the Dōngargarh inscription (v. 11) and also from the Gujarāt chronicles. 9

OTHER PARAMĀRA DYNASTIES

Besides the imperial royal house of Mālwā, there were two other royal houses of the Paramāras which held their sway, more or less simultaneously, in the adjoining territories. One of these houses grew to power in the region around Mount Abū, gradually extending its control over parts of Mārwād, and the other held the country known as Vagada, comprising parts of the modern districts of Bāṇavādā and Dūngarpur in southern

---

2 The dates of these two kings mentioned here are as suggested by K. A. N. Sastri in his History of South India (1955), p. 215. For difference of opinion, see S.E., p. 233 n. 4.
3 V.D.C. IV, vv. 21-30.
5 Here I follow the translation of the verse as given by N.P. Chakravarti, in Ep. Ind., Vol. XXII, p. 63, n. 1.
6 See ibid., p. 57. Also see n. 22 on the same page.
7 Ibid., p. 8.
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Rājasthān. Some of the branches of the former of these dynasties subsequently extended their territories in the neighbouring regions of Bhinmāl, Kirtijkī and Jālīr and they were known after these places. We have epigraphic evidence to know that all these three houses were only offshoots of the main stock, which was, of course, different from that of the Vāgada Paramāras. The dominions of the Abū house, though smaller in extent than that of the imperial Paramāra house, was more extensive than the other, which governed the limited region of Vāgada.

The rulers belonging to all these houses were semi-independent chiefs; and whereas those of the Abū branch owed their allegiance to the Chaulūkya dynasty of Gujarāt, those at Vāgada were subordinate to the main line of Mālava, with which they were connected by blood-relationship, as we shall see while narrating the history of the respective houses, which, of course, is little known and less studied. With a few exceptions the rulers belonging to any of these houses did not take prominent part in the political history of India. From the account that follows, it will be clear that much has yet to be known and said about the history of all these houses.

A. THE PARAMĀRAS OF MĀRWĀD

(i) Abū Branch

In view of what has been stated above, viz., that this house, which began its political career around Abū, gradually extended its sway in parts of Mārwād also, we prefer to designate it by this general heading, as done by D.R. Bhandarkar. This house commenced its career in the early years of the tenth century and continued to rule till almost the close of the 13th century for the same period as ruled by the imperial house of Mālava. In its inscriptions we find expressions like Arbuda-bhū-mandala, Arbuda-mandala and Arbuda-bhūmi-mandala-pati,1 to denote this region. Like the imperial Paramāra rulers of Mālava, these kings also claimed their origin from the sacrificial fire-altar of Vasishṭha on Mount Abū,2 though we have nothing to show that the two houses had any blood-relationship.

The capital of this house was at Chandrāvati, which is now a deserted place about 5 kms. south-southwest of Abū Road station on the Delhi-Ahmedābād line of the Western Railway.3 The rulers belonging to this house bore the feudatory title of Mahāmدادātēsvara, and owed their allegiance to the Chaulūkya house of Gujarāt, though a few of them are known to have professed their claim to the title Mahārājādhirāja.

In our records the name of the dynasty is also written in a slightly varying form as Pramāra, Pāmāra and Pāramāra, all these words apparently being used for metrical exigencies.4

The first historical ancestor of this dynasty was Sindhurāja, mentioned in a solitary inscription which belongs to a later period and is dated V.S. 1218 or 1161 A.C. It was found at Kirtijkī in the Bārmāl District.5 This ruler is called in it the Mahārājā of Marumandala. It is rather curious that this name does not figure in any other record of the house; it is known only from an inscription recorded nearly two hundred and fifty years

1. For example, in No. 62, v.9; No. 63, I.3; and No. 76, v.9, respectively. In No. 73, v. 3, it is called Aśātīdāatādīśvar and here the word dīśa is vaguely used. It is mentioned as a mandala in one of the Chaulūkya inscriptions. See P.O., Vol. III, P. 71.
2. See No. 62, v. 3; No. 76, v. 2, etc.
3. In No. 73 (v. 2) the kingdom is called Chandrāvati-dīśa-1800.
4. For example, in No. 62, v. 3; No. 73, v. 2; and No. 96, v. 2.
5. No. 94, v. 4.
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later and also from a distant region. The next ruler mentioned in this record is Dūsalā or Usalā, whose relationship with Sindhurāja cannot be definitely known, as the portion showing the same is lost. After him and two other names which are lost, the inscription introduces Dēvarāja in v. 10. The two names which are lost here are not to be found in any of the earlier inscriptions of the house. More about all these rulers will be discussed below, in our account of the Bhinmāl-Kirājū branch.

On the other hand, an inscription from Vasantagāth, dated V.S. 1090 (1042 A.C.), and an undated fragmentary copper-plate from Rōhēḍa begin the genealogy with Utpalārāja, whose son was Aranyārāja, and whose son again was Adbhuta Krishnārāja alias Vāsudēva. The last named ruler is also known from an inscription found at Varkānā in the Pali District of Rajāstān and dated V.S. 1024 or 967 A.C., recording the installation of an image of Mahāvīra in his reign. And counting back from this year and assigning about twenty years to each of the generations, we may hypothetically conjecture the following chronology for the early three rulers belonging to this house:

Utpalārāja, c. 910 to c. 930 A.C.
Aranyārāja, c. 930 to c. 950 A.C.
Krishnārāja (I), c. 950 to c. 970 A.C.

Here it is significant to note that the Rōhēḍa copper-plate uses a word meaning king with the name of each of these three rulers, showing that all of them actually ruled. But nothing further is known about any of them.

DHARANĪVARĀHA

C. 970 to c. 990 A.C.

The Rōhēḍa copper-plate informs us that Krishnārāja was succeeded by his son Dharanīvarāha. In the Vasantagāth inscription the portion showing his relation with his predecessor is lost, but it says that this ruler resembled the great Boar who rescued the earth, meaning his kingdom. The statement probably refers to his efforts in liberating the kingdom which had been annexed by Mūlarāja, who was on the Chaullīkya throne and whose known dates range between 942 and 995 A.C. The Bijāpur inscription of Dhalāla of Hastikundī informs us that the Rāṣṭrakūṭa king Dhalāla gave shelter to Dharanīvarāha who was deprived of his kingdom by Mūlarāja, and it may be held that when defeated and deprived of his kingdom by Mūlarāja, the Paramārā ruled received some aid from Dhalāla. This incident happened before 997 A.C., the date of the Bijāpur inscription.

1 Ibid., v. 5. Here the text is Prasūp-bhaja-vāndaregal, which, according to pada-chhēda, may be taken either ujjvalad Dilik or ujjvarna-Dīsulaḥ.
2 No. 62, v. 4; and No. 76, v. 2, respectively.
3 V.A.R., A.S.J., 1936-37, p. 122, where the ruler mentioned in the record has been identified with Krīṣhna-rāja. This record is said to have been the earliest known inscription of the family, but it could not be included here, as it is now not traceable nor is an impression available. Varkānā is about 20 kms. straight north by east of Piplēwā. For a still earlier record of the house, dated V.P. 744 (887 A.C.), see Ibid. The chronology is purely tentative, as it is not definitely known whether the Varkānā record was engraved in the earlier or later years of the reign of this ruler. It may also be stated here that after the mention of Sindhu-rāja and Dīsula (or Usala), the Kirājī inscription has a break, and while introducing Utpala-rāja, the Vasantagāth inscription and the Rōhēḍa copper-plate respectively use the expression aṣṭa-draugya and tādviṣayya, and therefore we hesitate to agree with Dr. Bhatia in taking Utpala-rāja as an immediate successor of Sindhu-rāja (see A.B.P., p. 164). But I agree with her so far as in rejecting the theory of D.C. Ganguly who identified this Utpala with Vākpatrāja of the Imperial Paramāra house of Mōlānā (see Ibid.).
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According to the bardic chronicles, Dharaṇīvarāha divided his kingdom among his nine brothers, viz., Maṇḍūvara to one brother, Ajmer to the second, Gadha Pīgala to the third named Siddhasuva, Laudrava to the fourth named Gajamalla, Arbuda to the fifth named Bhānabhuvā, Jālandhar to Bhōjarāja who was the sixth, Dharaṇīvarāha to the seventh brother Jāgarāja, Hānsī to the eighth and Kīrāṭī to the ninth. This statement is not supported by any epigraphic evidence nor do we know the relevant details in this respect, but it goes to show undoubtedly that this ruler had to a certain degree extended the territories of his kingdom.

DHŪRBAṬA

c. 990 to c. 1000 A.C.

This ruler is known from the copper-plate from Rōhēḍā, which mentions him as the son and successor of Dharaṇīvarāha. His name appears as Dhruvbhāṭa in two of the Arbuda praṣasti. No political incident of his reign is so far known. He appears to have enjoyed a short reign, after which he was succeeded by his younger brother Mahipāla.

MAHIPĀLA

c. 1000 to c. 1020 A.C.

Mahipāla was the second son of Dharaṇīvarāha and the immediate successor of Dhūrbaṭa. He is mentioned in the Vasantagad inscription and the copper-plate from Rōhēḍā, and D.R. Bhandarkar was of the view that this ruler was no other than Dēvarāja who issued a grant from Rōpi or Rōpsi near Bhīnīl. Bhandarkar based his suggestion about this identification on his observation that the father and grandfather of both, i.e., Mahipāla and Dēvarāja, must have been one and the same prince, as in inscriptions one ruler is known to have borne more than one name. This suggestion appears to have been justified from the fact that while describing Mahipāla’s son Dhandhuka, we find in our records the name of his father as Dēvarāja and as Mahipāla in others, which we shall presently see.

Mahipāla alias Dēvarāja appears to have been an ambitious ruler. His Rōpi plate gives him the title of Mahārāṣṭrādīṣṭa, which shows only that he was an illustrious ruler and not necessarily that he was a sovereign, for from the Kīrāṭī inscription we learn that his overlord was the Chaulikya king Durlabhāra, to whom he was most loyal. The same plate, has also the expression Śrīmālī-tvāṣṭhita alongwith svā-bhuṣyamāna-visghaḍ, for him, respectively in its ll. 3 and 4; this may perhaps indicate that to him was assigned this town either by his father Dharaṇīvarāha or his (Dēvarāja’s) elder brother Dhūrbaṭa, as a jāgīr, probably independent of the kingdom of Chandrāvati, and also that at the former place he founded his own line of rulers. We have already seen how far the bardic account may be taken as true in the absence of any epigraphical evidence.

This ruler had a maha-sāṃanta of the name of Pūrpa-chandra under him. From the mention of his spiritual teacher Maiyākad in the same plate, in 1. 19, he seems to have been devoted to religion.

1 Ibid., Vol. XXII, p.197; also quoted in P.B.P., p. 165, n. 5.
3 See A.S.I.R., W.C., 1907-08, p. 38. In his List of Inscriptions, No. 103, D.R. Bhandarkar stated that this grant was issued in (V.S.) 1009, whereas I follow V. Shastri, who edited it and whose transcript I have adopted, in taking the year as 1059. Neither the original plate nor its impression is now available for re-examination. See my remarks also in No. 91.
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DHANDHUKA

c. 1020 to c. 1040 A.C.

Mahipala's successor was his son Dhandhuka, as we learn from the Vasantagadhi inscription and the Roheda plate. He is also mentioned in the Kairu inscription, in which the portion giving some details about him are broken; and the mention of Devaraja immediately before him further strengthens the suggestion of Bhandarkar about the identity of Mahipala and Devaraja, as stated above.

The name of this ruler figures as Dhandhuva in the Varman inscription of V.S. 1099. He was a powerful ruler, as we find him mentioned in the Abu Paramara inscriptions and also in that which was found at Kiradu which pertains to the Bhinmal branch.

In the earlier years of his reign, Dhandhuka maintained cordial relations with the Chauhanka ruler Durlabhahara (1010-1022 A.C.) through whose favour he became ruler of Maru-mandala and whose sovereignty he appears to have recognised. But being displeased with Durlabhahara's successor Bhima I (c. 1022-1064 A.C.), he left the Chauhanka court and sought refuge with Parmara Bhoja. It is thus also possible that he was dethroned by Bhima, for we learn from an inscription that the latter appointed Vimala as the governor of Arbuda-mandala. Later on, Vimala managed to restore cordial relations between Bhima and Dhandhuka and subsequently the latter was restored to power.

The village Dhandhapura (modern Dhanpur in the Sirohi District) is associated with the name of this ruler.

Dhandhuka was a prince of great valour. The Kairu inscription describes him in a conventional way, as possessing irresistible force (durvara-vyaya); the Vasantagadhi inscription informs us that "he restored the royal fortune (of his house) by driving away his adversaries", and this statement is repeated in the Roheda copper-plate. Who these adversaries were is, of course, not known, but the statement goes to show that he had some border skirmishes with any of his neighbours. Dhandhuka married Amritadevi, whose family is not known. She gave birth to a son whose name was Purnapala, who succeeded him some time before 1042 A.C., the first known date of the latter's reign.

PURNAPALA

c. 1040 to c. 1050 A.C.

This ruler was the son and successor of Dhandhuka, as we have just seen. Three inscriptions of his time are known. The first of these, which was discovered at Varman (Pali Dist.) and is dated V.S. 1099 = 1042 A.C., records the restoration of a Siva temple at that place; the second comes from Vasantagadhi (Sirohi Dist.) and shows the same year; it mentions some repairs done to a temple by his younger sister Lahini-devi; and the third, which is dated V.S. 1102=1045 A.C. and is from Bhurundja (Pali Dist.), records the construction of a stepped well by some gopaliyas of that place. The first and the third of these documents which are not from Sirohi but from the adjoining district of Pali, probably go to show that Purnapala not only maintained the kingdom inherited by him but also extended it to some extent. In the first of these records he bears the

1 Respectively, No. 62, v. 5; and No. 76, v. 4.
2 In No. 94, vv. 9 ff.
3 Ep. Ind., Vol. IX, p. 148. It is also held by some that Dhandhuka probably revolted against his overlord Bhima once again. See C.G., p. 49.
4 It is mentioned as Dhandhapura in an inscription of V.S. 1347. See ASIR., W.C., 1916-17, p. 72.
5 Nos. 61 and 63, respectively.
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subordinate title of Mahārāja, but the third gives him the imperial title of Mahārājadhirāja, which probably indicates that this king not only relieved himself of the Chauḷikya yoke but also assumed independence some time between these two dates. Our conclusion is supported by verse 10 of the Vasantagadhi inscription which gives this ruler the credit of "killing a host of enemies and driving their elephants to his palace". These enemies were very probably the Chauḷikyas, by defeating whom he dared to assume independence. This is, however, only a surmise, not corroborated by any evidence.

DANTIVARMAN

c. 1050 to c. 1060 A.C.

Pūrṇapālā, who seems to have left no son behind him, was succeeded by his younger brother Dantivarman. No specific exploit of this ruler is so far known; the Rōhēḍa copper-plate, mentions that the first of the three brothers was Pūrṇapālā, the second Dantivarman and the third was Kṛśṇadēva, and adds that all of them ruled one after another. It also says that Dantivarman had a son named Yogarāja and the latter again had a son of the name of Rāmdēva. And the statement that Dantivarman was followed on the throne not by his son but by his brother Kṛśṇadēva leads us to conjecture that there was a war of succession in the family, as we have also shown below, while editing No. 187.

KRISHNARĀJA II

c. 1060 to c. 1090 A.C.

This ruler was the younger brother of Dantivarman, whom he is said to have succeeded. Two inscriptions of his time are known; one of them (No. 92) which is dated V.S. 1117 or 1060 A.C., records the restoration of a Sun temple at Bihīnmal, and the other (No. 93) mentions the gift of some drummas to a deity in a temple at the same place in V.S. 1123 or 1067 A.C. Both these inscriptions give Kṛśṇadēva the imperial title of Mahārājadhirāja, but the Kṛṣṇā inscription, which also mentions him, says that he was adorned with Mahāśabdas, which may probably mean that he was entitled to use the mahāśabdas, which of course shows that he was a subordinate to some imperial power. We have no evidence to finalise either of these views, though the following conjecture may be held in this respect.

As this ruler is mentioned in the records of the Ābū Paramāras and also in those from Bihīnmal, the question naturally arises if for the entire period of his reign he was on the throne of Chandravati or on that of Bihīnmal, or for parts of the time at either of these places. This problem cannot be solved at the present state of our knowledge. It is also possible that he may have been appointed viceroy to govern the region around Bihīnmal, either by his father or his elder brother, and taking advantage of the family strife, as we have guessed above, he declared independence.

The Sundhā hill inscription, referred to above informs us that Krishnarāja (II) was taken captive by his overlord, the Chauḷikya Bihmadēva, and was thereafter liberated with the help of Bāḷāprastāla, the Nājōḷ Chāhunāma ruler. Whether this event is in any way related to declaring independence by the Paramāra king, cannot be definitely said.

1 As his father Dhandhuka also is described, in No. 62, v. 7, as vanquishing his enemies, whether the son or the father succeeded in regaining the throne, with the help of Bhōja, remains uncertain in the present state of our knowledge. This victory, however, was short-lived, for from one of the Ābū inscriptions (L.N.J. No. 137) we know that in 1062 A.C. Ābū was under Bihīn.
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The period of the reign of Krisha-raja is highly conjectural, as he was the youngest of the three brothers.

KAKALADEVA,
c. 1090 to c. 1115 A.C.

Krisha-raja was succeeded by his son Kakaladeva, whose name figures only in the oft-quoted fragmentary copper-plate from Roheda, which gives him the title of raja. However, nothing more about the political events of his reign are known so far. It is also doubtful whether he occupied the throne at all. And next to him we have mention of his son Vikramasimha, who was on the throne.

VIKRAMASIMHA
c. 1115 to c. 1145 A.C.

Vikramasimha was a contemporary of the Chaulukya Kumara-pala, and of Arora, the Chahaman ruler of Saptalanka. The Dwadasyayakhyaka informs us that Vikramasimha sided Kumara-pala, as his feudatory, in the latter’s attack on Arora; and the Kumara-pala-prabhandha further says that at the time of the actual struggle the Paramara ruler went over to the side of Arora. For his disloyalty, Vikramasimha, however, had to suffer heavily, for we are further told that Kumara-pala defeated and threw him into prison, and replaced him on the throne by his nephew Yasodhavala. This event occurred some time between 1143 A.C., when Kumara-pala ascended the throne, and 1146 A.C., the first known date of Yasodhavala.

YASODHAVALA
c. 1145 to c. 1160 A.C.

Yasodhavala began to rule as a feudatory of his overlord Kumara-pala, to whom he was greatly devoted for favouring him with the throne. To show his loyalty to the imperial house, he accompanied the Chaulukya ruler in his attack on Malava and killed Ballala, its ruler, who had become hostile to the Chaulukya overlord. This event, which is of great political importance, has already been described above in the history of the main Paramara house.

Two inscriptions of the time of Yasodhavala are known. The first of them, which is dated V.S. 1202=1146 A.C., records a grant by his queen, Saubhagya Devi, who is said to have belonged to the Chaulukya family, and the second, which is dated V.S. 1207 or 1150 A.C., also registers some donations. Both these records were found in the Sirwah District.

---

1 Canto XVI, vv. 33-34. This is also mentioned by Jina Manjana and other writers.
2 Pages 40 ff. Also see Prabandhacharita (V.S. 1997), S.J.G., p. 202, vv. 576-580. Ganguly is of the opinion that the battle fought by Kumara-pala was not against Arora but against Ballala, for which see H.P.D., p. 303.
agastin; gurat-satvarum-eva Malava-patim Balkalam-elabhadavan.
4 Nos. 64-65. In addition to these, there is one more record (No. 66), which we have tentatively assigned to his time. He is also described in the Arbuda-prasasti. Still another stone inscription of his reign and dated V.S. 1208 was found at Koyalbh, a village in Godwara, Jodhpur State (now a district in Rjasthan), as mentioned in I.I., No. 263. For want of a transcript it could not be included here. Probably it is untranslatable now.
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DHARĀVARSHA.

c. 1160 to ć. 1220 A.C.

Yaśōdhavala was succeeded by his son Dhārāvarsha, who was the greatest and the most popular king of the dynasty. His inscriptions range from V.S. 1220 (1164 A.C.) to V.S. 1276 (1219 A.C.). The earliest of them was found at Kāyadrā in the Sīrōhī District, giving him the titles of Mahārājādhirāja and Mahāmaṇḍaladēśavara, and the latest one exists at Makkhāval in the same district. It is wholly mutilated but shows the year with its details very clearly. Thus this ruler enjoyed quite a fairly long reign, extending over at least about 55 years. His Hathal inscription gives him the title samasta-rājāvali-
samalakrītā, and calls him Arinādālīpāi and Mahālikēśvara-Sambhu. The Rōhēḍā copper-plate describes him as “the ornament of the Paramāra family, the foremost among the kings, well versed in the śāstras and skilled in wielding weapons, virtuous, popular among the subjects and possessed of great valour. He was extraordinarily fond of hunting expeditions. The Girvād stone inscription describes him as piercing three buffalos standing in a line in one shot, and compares him with Arjunā, the epic hero.

The same inscription adds that Dhārāvarsha repulsed the Mālāwa army on the banks of the Pūrām. The details of this feat of Dhārāvarsha are unknown; nor has the Mālāwa ruler whose army was forced to take to flight by this king has so far been identified. But we may probably connect this incident with the reign of Subhātavarman on Gujarāt, in the course of which he had suddenly to take to flight, as we have already seen. But while holding this view, the possibility that Dhārāvarsha may have participated, as prince, in his father’s warfare with Ballāla who had then penetrated into the heart of Gujarāt in his attack on the country, cannot be altogether ruled out. This is, after all, a mere conjecture, to be decided by additional evidence, whenever it is available.

From the Rōhēḍā copper-plate we also learn that about the time when Dhārāvarsha was occupied in repelling the attack of the Mālāwa army, Ranaśīrāna, the son of the deposed Vikramasimha, usurped his throne, and that the former obtained it again, after pleasing his overlord by means of his intellect, devotion and valour (vv. 10-11). We have seen how the Chaulīkya Kumārapāla had replaced his feudatory Vikramasimha by the latter’s nephew Yaśōdhavala on the throne, and in view of this, it is plausible that Ranaśīrāna, who was the son of the deposed Vikramasimha, may have captured his paternal throne in the absence of Dhārāvarsha from the capital. The period of Ranaśīrāna’s reign appears to have been extremely short.

Dhārāvarsha rendered active military service to his overlord Kumārapāla in some other wars also. The southern neighbour of his sovereign was the Śīlāhāra ruler Mallikārjuna, whose capital was at Thānsī, and two of his inscriptions, dated 1157 and 1160 A.C. are known. Pretending to be offended by the honorific title of Rājapītāmahā assumed by Mallikārjuna, Kumārapāla deputed his minister Āmbaḍa with an army to

1 Respectively our No. 68, 11. 2-4, and D.R. Bhandarkar’s List of Inscriptions, No. 473. For Dhārāvarsha’s inscriptions edited here, see Nos. 67-75 and 197.
2 No. 68, 11. 2-4. Both these titles are used in No. 67, 11. 2-3. His title of Mahārājādhirāja does not necessarily show that he assumed independence but only that he was a mighty ruler, as we have shown in the case of the Paramāra Sītaka, who too bore both these titles. Still another example of bearing both these titles is that of the Chahamāna Kālīhaṇa to whose name is attached the imperial title in one of his records (J.A.S.E., 1910, pp. 103 f) whereas the feudatory title is used in the Ind. Ant., Vol. XI, p. 222, 1, 22.
3 No. 76, v. 9.
4 No. 82, v. 15. In corroboration of this statement, we find at Achalagadh (Mt. Abhī) life-size marble statue of Dhārāvarsha standing and taking aim with a fully stretched bow at three stone buffalos standing in a line with a hole across the belly of all the three in a line.
5 Ibid., v. 10.
humble the pride of his adversary. Āmbāḍa lost the battle and returned broken-hearted; but he was again sent back with a fresh enforcement. This time the Chaullikya forces succeeded; Āmbāḍa won the field, killing Mallikārjuna, whose head he presented to his overlord. Dhārāvarsha’s participation in this battle has been inferred from an inscription at Mount Ābū, which states that “when he (Dhārāvarsha), enraged with wrath, held his ground on the battle-field, wives of the lord of Kōṭikaṇa shed drops of tears from their lotus-like eyes”.

After the death of Kumārapāla in 1172 A.C., the Gūjrāra empire began to decline and was subject to attacks from all sides. During the reign of his successor Ajayapāla (1229-32 A.C.), it was invaded by the Guhila Sāmantasimha, whose inscriptions dated 1172 and 1179 A.C., are known. In the struggle that ensued, Ajayapāla was wounded but was saved by Prahśādana, who was then sent by his elder brother Dhārāvarsha, with a strong force. The Mount Ābū prāśasti informs us that “Prahśādana, whose sword was dexterous in defending the illustrious Gūjrāra king when his power had been broken on the battle-field by Sāmantasimha, displayed on earth again the behaviour of the greatest enemy of the descendants of Daru”.5

Dhārāvarsha spent much of his time in warfare. His active participation in the Chaullikya-Chāhamāna struggle is indeed an achievement worth mentioning here. Soon after the accession of Bhima II in 1178 A.C., his kingdom had to face an attack of his northeastern adversary, Prithvirāja III (1179-1193 A.C.), the Chāhamāna king of Ajmer. In this encounter Dhārāvarsha, who accompanied his overlord, succeeded in repulsing a nocturnal attack, led by Prithvirāja on him, which is perhaps the same as described in the Pārīhuparākrama-vidyāya of his younger brother Prahśādana.6

The Sukritakirtikalôšini (v.75) of Jayasimha relates that Arṇāraja, the ruler of Bhimapalli, broke down the power of the lords of Mēdapāra and Chandrāvati. From Sāmēśvara’s Kirtikauṇḍa (II, v. 61) we also learn that the kingdom of this ruler (Bhima), who was (merely) a boy, was divided among themselves by (his) ministers and feudatories. Connecting both these statements, it has been concluded, by D.C. Ganguly that Dhārāvarsha was one of those who revolted against the Gujarāt sovereignty and was subdued by Arṇāraja.5 But as far as it appears to me, the conclusion is unwarranted, as it is based on unsound grounds, with reference to Dhārāvarsha; and we can only hold, as already suggested by P. Bhatia, that the chaotic state of affairs could not have allowed the Chandrāvati ruler to resist the temptation of remaining inactive in those days. What actually his action was, is not definitely known.

An inscription of 1193 A.C. and found at Pālaṇḍi in the Sīrōhi District refers to the Chāhamāna Kēḷaṇa, along with his heir-apparent Jaiti and the latter’s chief minister Vīḷahana; and in his notice of this record, V.S. Sukthankar presumed that “it is possible that the Yuvārāja had been enjoying the country around the village as his Bhūkita”.6 On the basis of this suggestion, which is merely tentative, P. Bhatia further guessed that before the date of this inscription, the Chāhamānas had penetrated into the kingdom of the Pārāmāras as far as Pālaṇḍi, which is not more than forty miles (sixty-four kms.) straight from (in the north of) Chandrāvati, the capital of Dhārāvarsha.7 This conjecture, which is based on another conjecture, has no definite proof in its favour, and thus it does

---

1 As recorded in Gujarāt chronicles, e.g., in P.C.M., pp. 122 ff.; Kirtikaunadi, Canto II, vv. 47-48; Sukritasamkīrana, Canto II, v. 43.
3 Ibid., v. 38.
4 G.O.S., No. IV, p. 3.
5 H.P.D., p. 312. Also see C.G., P. 155.
7 P.B.P., p. 177.
not necessarily lead us to the conclusion that the Chāhāmanā king had really succeeded in capturing the region around Pālaḍī from Dharavārṣha, who was his own son-in-law and was maintaining cordial relations with him, as is known from the battles in which they sided each other. Thus Bhāta's guess is possible but not certain. Subsequent to 1193 A.C. we find a number of inscriptions later than 1193 A.C. mentioning Dharavārṣha from this region,1 and not showing any loss of his territory.

Dharavārṣha was one of the most distinguished figures of the Indian history, who offered strong resistance to the Muslim invaders in their southward advance in Gujarāt. In 1178 A.C., which is also the year of Bhima's accession to the throne of Gujarāt, Muhammad of Ghūr, who had by this time strengthened his position in the Western Punjab, appeared in Rājāsthān, with a strong army. He at once captured Nāḍūl, the capital of the Chāhāmanās,2 but on reaching Abū i in his further march, he was opposed by the joint forces of Dharavārṣha, Kēlīṇaṇa, and the latter's brother Kērtīpāla. According to the Sundhā hill inscription, the battle was fought at Kāsahāvā, identified with the modern Kāyādrā, where we have an inscription of the reign of Dharavārṣha.3 The Prabhunadhakōṇa informs us that Dharavārṣha let the invaders advance unmolested into the pass and closed upon them from the rear, and in the front they were attacked by the Gūrjaras.4 In the struggle that ensued, the Muslim forces suffered heavy casualties; a number of their soldiers were killed and Muhammad was wounded. The Muslims thus lost the field and retreated to Guznī.5

The threat of the Muslim invasion, however, did not subside. In order to avenge the defeat sustained at the hands of the Hindus, they resumed their invasion of Western India, under Qutb-ud-dīn, in 1197 A.C., when they advanced as far as the foot of Mount Abū. To check their forces, Dharavārṣha again led the army, in co-operation with another leader named Bai Karaṇa, but in spite of this resistance, the Hindus had to suffer on this occasion. For we learn that in the encounter that ensued, they had to lose the field. Aṇāhilīpadāṇana fell in the hands of the invaders. But after plundering the country, they soon retreated, without making any territorial acquisition. It is perhaps the same battle which is alluded to in the Hamirmāramadamardana,6 which states that Dharavārṣha and his allies made up their differences with Viradhavāla and presented a united front when the Muslims reached the battlefield.

The foregoing account will goes to show that Dharavārṣha was not only a powerful ruler but also a courageous and astute military leader of the time, playing an important role in the politics of the country. His administration endeared him to his subjects.7 The title Mandalēvāra-sambhū, as noted above, reflects on his being a Śāivite in faith. He was also a man of religious temperament, as we know from his gifts to temples and Brahmāṇas. His Treasury Officer was Kāvīda (or Kōvīda?), who, under his order, made a donation on the festival (parva) on the eleventh day of the bright half of Kārttiḳa.8

---

1 For example, our Nos. 73-76.
3 Respectively, Ep. Ind., Vol. IX, v. 30; and our No. 67.
4 P. 117; D.C. Ganguly thinks this struggle as different from the one described in the Prabhunadhakōṇa, but I agree with P. Bhāta in holding that it was one and the same struggle. For her views, see P.B.P., p. 176, n. 8.
6 II, v. 8. D.C. Ganguly thought this battle as taking place in the time of Ilutmīsh (H.P.D., p. 316), but also see S.E., p. 121, in support of my views.
7 No. 70, v. 9.
8 No. 68, II, 5-8.
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Nāgaṭa was his representative then governing the village of Jhāḍāli. He his chief queen was Śringāradēvi.

Dhārāvarsha’s door-keeper was Haripāla, the son of Narapāla of the Vārivātra ḍa lineage. Haripāla’s son Sāhanapāla constructed the pavilion (mandapa) of the Vaidyanātha temple at Vaḍāli in the former Idar State in Gujarāt.

PRAHLĀDANA

Dhārāvarsha appointed his younger brother Prahlādana as his Yuvarāja, who was highly renowned for his great devotion to learning as well as for his achievements in war. He appears to have predeceased Dhārāvarsha, who was, therefore, succeeded by his son Sōmasimha, whose history is given below.

The Śomasaubhāgya, composed in the latter half of the fifteenth century A.C., mentions Prahlādana as the lord of Arbudāchala. On the evidence of this statement, scholars are inclined to hold that Dhārāvarsha was succeeded on the throne by his brother Prahlādana, who, in his turn, was succeeded by Sōmasimha. But the trustworthiness of this work of a late date has rightly been questioned, and even if it is held that Prahlādana occupied the throne, he must have reigned for a short period, say only for a few months. The statement of the Śomasaubhāgya may, of course, be justified in another way also, i.e., by holding that Prahlādana was associated in government as a Yuvarāja, with his elder brother who was then on the throne.

Prahlādanapura, the modern Pālamūr which is headquarters of a sub-division of the same name in Gujarāt, was founded by Prahlādana, as we learn from the Śomasaubhāgya, vv. 13-14.

SŌMASIMHA

C. 1220 to c. 1240 A.C.

Sōmasimha’s accession to the throne can be placed between 1219 A.C., the last known date of his father Dhārāvarsha, and 1221 A.C., the Dhāntā inscription of his time. In addition to the last mentioned inscription, we have four more records to reconstruct the account of his reign. One of them comes from Nāgaṭa and is dated V.S. 1290 or 1232 A.C., and the other, from Deokhētā, dated V.S. 1293, corresponding to 1235 A.C., both are included here (Nos. 78-79). Besides these, there are references about him in two of the inscriptions at Mount Ābū, both dated in 1230 A.C.

---

1 No. 73, v. 4.
2 No. 70, l. 33; No. 73, v. 3; and No. 76, l. 18. In the first two of these records she is mentioned respectively as pātarāni and pāta-pranāyāri. No other queen of Dhārāvarsha is mentioned in any other record, though G.H. Ojha in his Rajputana kā līlāsū, Vol. I, p. 177, says that this king had two queens named Gīglēdevī and Śringāradēvi, of whom the former was the chief queen. The source of his information is not given by Ojha. This view is partially followed by D.R. Bhandarkar and completely by Biwas (P.B.P., p. 178). But I agree with C.L. Suri in holding that it is possible that in one of these inscriptions Ojha read Gīglēdevī instead of Sīkōlīdevī (for Śringāradēvi). For details, see Ep. Ind., Vol. XXXVIII, p. 210.
3 List of Arch. Remains in Idar State (Gujarāt), 1926, p. 37.
4 No. 47, l. 6; No. 70, l. 3; About his achievements; see Ep. Ind., Vol. VIII, p. 210, vv. 38-39; and P.B.P., pp. 378 f.
5 H.P.D., p. 387.
6 See Ep. Ind., Vol. XXXVII, pp. 210 ff., where it is also shown how we have to be cautious in utilizing statements of this type, e.g., that of Haranātraśamadandara, which states that Dhārāvarsha and his son Sōmasimha jointly helped Vīshṇu-dācā in the invasion of Itumishi on Gujarāt. In this connection also see P.B.P., p. 176, n. 8.
7 See No. 197 and No. 77, respectively.
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The Dhanā inscription mentions his mother Śrīṅgāradēvi; and from the expression *kālē pravarantānē*, just after her name, it is tempting to suggest that she was connected not only with the consecration of the image mentioned therein but probably also with the administration of her kingdom,¹ and if so, her son was a minor who assumed regnal powers.

The Girvā inscription of the time of his grand son Pratāpasiṅhha, V.S. 1344 or 1285-86 A.C., describes Sōmasiṅhha as death to his enemies and compares him with Rāma on account of his bravery and endowments² made by him. This account is corroborated by the Mount Ābō inscription which states that Sōmasiṅhha inherited bravery from his father and learning from his uncle. No specific exploit of this ruler, however, is mentioned in any of these records. He remitted the taxes of the Brāhmaṇas, as we are informed by the Mount Ābō inscription, which has been referred to above.

The Nānā inscription gives Sōmasiṅhha the title of *Mahārājādhirāja*, and adds that the place where this record was found was then in possession of a favourite of his heir-apparent Kānhaḍadēva (Krishnadēva). This statement probably goes to show that the king had assigned the village to the heir-apparent for his personal expenses, and that the latter entrusted its administration to his own favourite, whose name is lost in the record.

Sōmasiṅhha had to face troubles from Udayasiṅhha, the Chāhamāna ruler of Jālōr, whose known dates range between 1205 and 1257 A.C. and whose kingdom touched the northwestern border of the Paramāra dominions. From the Sundhā hill inscription, referred to above, we learn that this ambitious Chāhamāna ruler succeeded in establishing his sway in the surrounding region, particularly to the east of his kingdom, and also appears to have appropriated some of the northern portions of the Paramāra kingdom, as we know from his inscription found at Bārlot.³ This place is not more than 18kms. from Sirōhī, situated in its northwest. The record is dated 1226 A.C.

KRISHNADĒVA III

C. 1240 to C. 1260 A.C. (?)

Krishnadēva, or Krishnarājadeva, as he is called in an inscription from Mt. Ābō,⁴ was the son and successor of Sōmasiṅhha. We have no inscription of the time of this ruler. The Girvā stone inscription of the time of his son Pratāpasiṅhha gives him only the conventional praise, stating that he resembled Krishnha in intelligence and bravery, but here it is significant to note that this record does not attach any royal epithet to his name, as it invariably does in the case of all the other rulers mentioned therein.

The period of the reign of Krishnadēva, calculated here, is highly conjectural; for it is not even certain when this ruler closed his reign. We have found an inscription at Kālīgarā or Kālījārā, dated V.S. 1300 or 1244 A.C., mentioning one *mahārājādhirāja* Ālhanadēva ruling over Chandraṛāti.⁵ This ruler has not so far been successfully identified, nor have we any definite information to show that he belonged to the family of the Paramāras of Ābō. From circumstantial evidence, it would however appear that this ruler

¹ The conclusion is only a probable one and not certain, as unfortunately two important letters after the name of the queen have been peeled off from the stone.
² No. 82, v. 16.
⁴ I.N.I., No. 487.
⁵ No. 80.
may either have been placed on the throne of Chandrāvati, as his deputy, by the Chāhāmāna Udayasimha, after conquering the place, or he may have been some other prince about whom we have no knowledge.¹

PRATĀPASIMHA

c. 1260 to c. 1285 A.C.

This ruler is mentioned as the son of Krishnadēva III in the Girvāḍ stone inscription, dated V.S. 1344 or 1285-86 A.C.,² which is the only record of his reign.

The time of the accession of Pratāpasilha is not definitely known. We have seen how the principality of this branch of the Paramāras began to decline during the reign of his grandfather Sāmasimha; and in addition to the Bārloō inscription, which shows that the Jālōr Chāhāmāna ruler Udayasimha had annexed the northern portion of the modern Sirōhi District, to his kingdom as seen above, we have, two more records of his son and successor, Chāchigadēva, from this region, one of which was found at Sundhā³ and the other at Sōmpur,⁴ both testifying to the penetration of the Chāhāmānas further in the south. Besides this, Pratāpasilha had also to lose some of his southern territory to the Guhilas of Mēwād. The political instability of the period does not enable us to give a clear picture of the situation of the time, but it is certain that the Guhilas had actually annexed Ābū to their kingdom, as we know from an inscription of Sāmantasimha, dated in 1285 A.C., referring to some repairs carried on by himself and a golden staff created in honour of the god Achalēśvara at that place.⁵

This situation, however, did not last long. For, as we learn from his Girvāḍ inscription, Pratāpasilha recaptured his ancestral dominions from Sāmantasimha with the help of Vīsala, the governor of the Vāghēla Sārangadēva, after defeating one Jaitrakarṇa, who may have been a regent of the Guhila ruler at that place. Verse 18 of the inscription says that he (Pratāpasilha) rescued Chandrāvati, which was then immersed in the ocean of the enemies who were overcome by him, as Karna was defeated by Arjuna”.⁶

After all, Pratāpasilha does not appear to have enjoyed a fairly long reign. He was surrounded by his two enemies, viz., the Guhilas in the southeast and the Chāhāmānas of Jālōr in the northwest. The Sundhā hill inscription of the Chāhāmāna Chāchigadēva, which we have often referred to above, makes it almost certain that much of the Sirōhi region was about that time annexed to the Chāhāmāna kingdom, and it would thus appear that the region around Ābū with its capital Chandrāvati, was finally conquered by them during the reign of Pratāpasilha himself or of his successor, who is so far not known.

Pratāpasilha’s minister was Dēliṇa, a Brāhmaṇa, who rebuilt the Paṭanārāyaṇa temple, as we learn from the Girvāḍ inscription referred to above. On that occasion the minister distributed food, clothes and some other objects among the Brāhmaṇas and also encouraged some other royal officers and private persons to make endowments.

The material for the reconstruction of history of this house, after Pratāpasilha is extremely scanty, being limited to two stone inscriptions, the details of which we shall presently discuss. The two records, however, leave no doubt that the house continued to

---

¹ G.H. Ojha, however, thinks that Ālhapadēva, who was probably a Paramāra king, may have ruled between Krishnadēva III and Pratāpasilha, but being a collateral, his name is omitted in the inscriptions. See Rājasimhaśaśāstra, p. 179, n. 4.
² No. 82, v. 17, which only says taravas tattat bhūt.
³ Ep. Ind., Vol. IX, pp. 70 ff.
⁵ Ind. Ant., Vol. XVI, pp. 345 ff.
⁶
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hold the region around Ābū, at least in some restricted form, till the end of the thirteenth century A.C. when it was finally overthrown, almost simultaneously along with that of the Paramāras of Mālwā.

ARJUNA

c. 1285 to c. 1295 A.C. (?)

The name of this ruler is disclosed by a short inscription from Dhandhapur, a village lying about six kms. west-southwest of Ajahari and about ten kms. southwest of Kāntal, in the Sirohi District which also are the find-spots of inscriptions dealt with here. The inscription from Dhandhapur is dated V.S. 1347, corresponding to 1290 A.C., and the relevant portion was read by V.S. Sukthankar as Paramāra-Pātala-sūta-Arjuna.¹ In course of his notice of the record, Sukthankar held that there is no sufficient reason for identifying this Paramāra Pātala with the Paramāra chieftain Pratāpasiṁha; but from the provenance of the record, and particularly finding its date to be only three years later than that of Pratāpasiṁha’s inscription, one is tempted to hold that Pātala may perhaps have been a popular name of Pratāpasiṁha himself; and if it was really so, this ruler may have been succeeded by his son Arjuna.²

The second of the inscriptions referred to above was discovered at Varmān, in the same locality.³ It is dated V.S. 1356 or 1299 A.C., and records some donations made by the wife of Vikramasiṁha, who is mentioned therein as belonging to some royal family and holding that place in his possession. The inscription does not give the name of the family to which this Vikramasiṁha belonged, but as shown by its provenance and the date, it is not unlikely that this ruler may have held a part of the kingdom and also may have been a Paramāra scion. After all, as we have already seen above, the region was finally captured by the Chāhāmānas towards the close of the thirteenth century A.C.⁴

(ii) Bhīmnāl-Kirāḍū branch

The history of this branch of the Paramāras is known from three stone inscriptions and a copper-plate. Two of the stone inscriptions were discovered at Bhīmnāl (Jālōr District), and the third at Kirāḍū (Bādmār District),⁵ and the copper-plate was found at Rōpi or Rōspi, a village lying about ten kms. southwest of Bhīmnāl.⁶ It is now not available for re-examination.

Of all these documents, it is only the Kirāḍū inscription, dated V.S. 1218=1161 A.C., that gives the genealogy of the house, as we have seen above; and while studying it, we find that the names of some of the early rulers given in it agree with those occurring in the records of the Ābū branch of the Paramāras, as will be clear from the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kirāḍū inscription</th>
<th>Rōbēdā plate</th>
<th>Vasantagad inscription (No. 62)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(No. 94)</td>
<td>(No. 76)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dharapīḍhara  Dharanivarāha

² Also see P.B.P., p. 181. The Sudhā Hill inscription describes Chāchagūḍa of Jālōr as chanchat-Pātuka-parāmāra-rasikah (v. 50), and I agree with D. Sharma in identifying this Pātuka with our Pratāpasiṁha of Ābū (E.C.D., p. 156). Both Pātuka and Pātala may have been variants of his name.
³ No. 189.
⁴ Also see E.C.D., pp. 175 ff., where D. Sharma summarises the evidence of Naiga’s Khyāt, Hindi Trans., Pt. I, pp. 120 ff.
⁵ Nos. 92-94.
⁶ No. 91.
It may also be observed here that Devaraja of our No. 94 has already been identified above with Mahipala of Nos. 62 and 76, and the rest of the names, which are the same and also in the same order, are found here only in their slightly changed forms. This clearly shows, as we have already concluded in the opening paragraph of the section, that the Paramaras of Bhirnmal and Kiradu constituted only a branch of the dynasty which ruled around Arbuda or Mount Abi, and was not an altogether a separate dynasty, as D.C. Ganguly was inclined to hold.1

The Kiradu inscription supplies the names of eleven rulers with their mutual relationship. Three of the names have been lost, but they can be supplied. As seen above, this record begins the genealogy with Sindharaja, who is not known from any other source and whose successor is said in it to have been Dushala (or Usala?), following the reading uvjaladitausala, as we have also often remarked. This inscription says that this prince was born in the lineage of Sindharaja; and thus he was only a successor of Sindharaja; and not his son, as taken by Ganguly.2

The same scholar identifies Sindharaja of this inscription with the Sindharaja of the imperial Paramara house of Matha, and on the basis of this identification, which is merely conjectural, he is inclined to hold that the latter ruler, after his conquest of Matha, appointed his son Dushala to govern that province.3 But besides the fact that we do not know Dushala as a son of Sindharaja (as he is not known from any other source), Ganguly’s theory also involves chronological difficulties; and in this respect we fully agree with P. Bhatia who has discussed the whole problem at length.4

The Kiradu inscription belongs to a very late period, i.e., to V.S. 1218 or 1161 A.C., and whether a correct account of the succession is kept in that distant period, is doubtful. And as this place is included in the Maru-margala, it is quite natural for the composer of the record to mention the province by this name in preference to Arbuda.

It is also possible that all the names up to Krishnaraja (II), in the Kiradu record, were merely copied from those of the Chandravati rulers, with some additions and alterations here and there. The separate off-shoot of the house holding sway over Bhirnmal and Kiradu, sprang only in the reign of Krishnaraja II, after whom we find three new names in the Kiradu inscription under review. The history of these kings will be related presently.

We have seen that the Rohida copper-plate mentions Kakaladeva as a son of Krishnaraja, whom we have identified with Krishnaraja of the Kiradu inscription, which mentions his other son by the name Sochchharaja. Thus taking Kakaladeva and Sochchharaja as brothers, the only suggestion that appears plausible is that the former of these rulers, who was ruling at Abi, may have appointed his (possibly younger) brother Sochchharaja as a governor at Bhirnmal when he extended his kingdom to that region; and in course of time, this governor may have made himself independent of his elder brother, as we know from his assuming the imperial title of MaharajaKiradu. In holding this view, however, the possibility that Krishnaraja II may have divided his kingdom into two parts,

1 H.P.D., pp. 344 ff. Differing from P. Ganguly and also from P. Bhatia, I prefer to call this branch after Kiradu and not after Bhirnmal, since the names of new rulers are mentioned only in the record from the former of these places. And hence I prefer to call it by the joint name as Bhirnmal-Kiradu branch.
2 H.P.D., p. 23.
3 Ibid., P. 345.
4 P.B.P., p. 183.
assigning Ābū to Kākaladēva and Bhinmāl-Kirāḍū to Sōchchharāja, as suggested by P. Bhatia, cannot be altogether precluded.¹

Coming to study the history of the rulers belonging to this house, we find that the names of only three new rulers are revealed to us by the Kirāḍū inscription of Sōmeśvara, issued in V.S. 1218 or 1161 A.C. The first of them was the founder of the line and brother of Kākaladēva of the Ābū house, as already seen; and soon after this inscription was recorded, the territory which was held by this branch passed under the control of the Chāhānamānas of Jālōr, as we shall see in the end. Thus it is not likely that any more rulers belonged to this branch.

SŌCHCHHARĀJA

c. 1100 to c. 1125 A.C.

The period of this ruler has been calculated on the usual average of assigning 25 years to each personage and also considering him a younger brother of Kākaladēva, who was on the throne of Ābū presumably from 1090 to 1115 A.C.

The Kirāḍū inscription compares him with kalpa-druma, the wish-fulfilling tree, without recording any of his endowments. Nothing more about him is known. He was succeeded by his son Udayarāja.

UDAYARĀJA

c. 1125 to c. 1145 A.C.

This ruler is stated to have been a feudatory (māndatika) of the Chaullīkya throne.² He is credited with the conquest of Chauḍa, Gauḍa, Karṇāṭa and the northwestern portion of Mālwā. Shorn of the panegyric boast, this statement appears to mean that Udayarāja participated in the battles of his overlord Jayasimha-Siddharāja, whose conquest of some of these territories is well known.

SŌMEŚVARA

c. 1145 to c. 1165 A.C.

Udayarāja was succeeded by Sōmeśvara, who may have been his son. The Kirāḍū inscription was recorded in his time. A portion of this record which introduces this ruler, is broken and his relationship with his predecessor can only be conjectured.

From the same record we also learn that Sōmeśvara, through the favour of Jayasimha Siddharāja, regained his ancestral kingdom of Sindhurājapura, in V.S. 1142 A.C. This place, which has not been identified so far, appears to have been founded by Sindhurāja, who is mentioned as the first ancestor of the reigning king in this record; and it may have been another name of Kirāṭapura or Kirāḍū, which too is mentioned in it.

Sōmeśvara was a brave prince. He liberated his kingdom, as seen above. The throne had been lost due to some unknown reasons. In V.S. 1198 = 1141 A.C., through the favour

---

¹ P.B.P., p. 183 f. The former of these views appears to be more probable for we have no instance in history showing that the region conquered later on is placed under a prince who is known as Mahārajadhiraj and the one controlling the main region is called only a Mahāraj.

² No. 94, v. 15-A portion of the verse giving the name of the overlord is lost but can be made out from the context. The word māndatika, however is fortunately preserved.
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of his imperial overlord Jayasimha, he again obtained the throne, in V.S. 1205 or 1148 A.C., meaning only that he was finally established by Jayasimha’s successor, Kumārapāla. The last of these statements appears to imply, as already suggested by A.K. Majumdar, that the new king Kumārapāla confirmed Jayasimha’s feudatory, the Paramāra Sōmēśvara, on the throne.

Subsequent to this ruler’s confirmation by Kumārapāla, the Bhūmāl ruler had again to face some troubles. We have an inscription at Kirājū itself, dated V.S. 1209, corresponding to 1152 A.C., informing us that Alhaṇa, the Chāhāmāna chief of Nāḍōl, was ruling at Kirātānapura, i.e., Kirājū, which he had obtained through the favour of the Chaullikya Kumārapāla. This statement may probably be taken to mean that Sōmēśvara, who may have incurred the displeasure of his overlord Kumārapāla, for some unknown reasons, was replaced by Alhaṇa; and on being able to please Kumārapāla again, he was still obscure, and what is more is that the political situation during all this period was changing so fast that we cannot say anything definitely on any of these points, until fresh material is available.

Sōmēśvara is also said to have inflicted a severe defeat on one Jējaka and captured from him the forts of Tānuḍōtā (Tānuḍō) and Navasara (Naunara), some time before V.S. 1218 or 1161 A.C. The first of these places is in the modern Jaisalmer District and the second in the Jōdhpur District, both situated side by side. After defeating Jējaka, Sōmēśvara snatched from him 1700 horses, including one, five-nailed and eight golden-crested. In the absence of details, this Jējaka cannot be identified; he may have been as the circumstances indicate, a subordinate of the contemporary Chāhāmāna prince, who was Sōmēśvara’s adversary in the northwest.

As to the extent of the Paramāra kingdom in the north, attention may be invited to an inscription found at Pōkarāṇa, the ancient Pushkarāṇa, in the southeastern part of the Jaisalmer District of Rājasthān. This record, which is dated V.S. 1070 (1012 A.C.), mentions the construction of a temple by Dhanapāla of the Pramāra (Paramāra) dynasty, in commemoration of his father Ghiṅghaka, who lost his life in a battle. Both these names, which are mentioned in the record without any regnal title, are otherwise unknown; but from its find spot and in view of the date falling in the reigning period of Dhāranīvarāha, or his son Dēvarāja, it may be suggested here that Dhanapāla may have been one of Dhāranīvarāha’s brothers among whom, as stated in the bardi account which we have seen above, he divided his kingdom, or as one who died in the battle of the Paramāras at that place. This suggestion, however, cannot be established in the absence of a corroborative evidence.

Not much of this branch of the Paramāras, subsequent to 1161 A.C. when Sōmēśvara issued his royal charter, is known. But the house does not appear to have long survived. An inscription found at Kirājū itself and dated V.S. 1235 = 1178 A.C. tells us that in that year the place was being governed by the Chāhāmāna Mahārāja Japura Madanabrahmadēva, who was a feudatory of the Chaullikya Bhima II. On the basis of this evidence, it has been suggested that Sōmēśvara may have died without any male issue or it may

1 Verses 19–20.
2 Verse 21.
3 Chaullikyas of Gujarāt, pp. 111 and 255.
5 A.S.I., A.R., 1930, p. 219. Pōkarāṇa is about 180 kms. due north of Bhīmāl, the capital of Dhāranīvarāha’s son Dēvarāja, and about 80 kms. straight northeast of Kirājū, where the inscription No. 82 was found. It is also possible that Kirājū itself, which is situated at a great distance may have been another seat of the branch and altogether distinct from Bhīmāl and Jālūr, which are quite near to each other, separated only by a distance of about 40 kms.
6 Ind. Ant., Vol. LXII, p. 42.
be that his descendants lost the confidence of the Chaulikya overlord. But we cannot here ignore still another possibility viz., that owing to his repeated revolts against the imperial house, as we have seen, Sōmēśvara may have been driven away by his overlord Bhima II and replaced by another of his subordinates who was Madanabrahmadēva.

The Sundhā hill inscription refers to one Āsala, as the ruler of Kīrtipāla; and from this statement P. Bhatia held that this Āsala may have been a descendant of Sōmēśvara. The Kīrtipāla of this record has been taken by D. Sharma as a Chāhamāna ruler of Jalōr. But there is hardly anything to show that Sōmēśvara had a son named Āsala. Moreover, the situation becomes more complicated if we agree with D. Sharma in maintaining Āsala as a successor of Madanabrahmadēva.

With the insufficient data now available, a keen controversy is bound to prevail as to the fall of this house, and the view of D.C. Ganguly, who makes a different observation on the point, may also be mentioned here. From an inscription of V.S. 1239 or 1182 A.C., found at Bhinmāl and mentioning one Jayatsirhha and his son Salakha, the learned scholar asserts that the Paramāra Sōmēśvara was succeeded by Jayatsirhha (whose relationship we do not know), and the latter by his son Salakha. In support of his theory, Ganguly draws attention to the tale of the Rājpiṭ bards describing Jaitiś (Jayatsirhha), as a Paramāra, ruling in Ābū and a contemporary of the Chaulikya Bhima (1178-1239 A.C.). But as Ganguly himself has admitted, the account of the bards is full of gross inaccuracies; and even admitting that it may have contained some truth, there appears to be no direct evidence to connect Jaitiś of the bards with the Jayatsirhha of the inscription. Moreover, whether Jayatsirhha and Salakha of the inscription were Sōmēśvara's descendants is also not known. While mentioning both these rulers, the inscription does not give the name of the family to which they belonged. And as far as our conjecture goes, this Jayatsirhha seems to have been the son of Kēlaṇa of the Nāgol Chāhamāna dynasty, as already suggested by D.R. Bhandarkar. Thus the theory admissible by Ganguly too is hardly convincing, though nothing can be definitely said on either side till fresh material is available.

(iii) Jalōr branch

This is still another branch shooting off the main stem of Ābū and called here the Paramāras of Jalōr. We have of course, no epigraphic evidence in support of establishing its relation with the Paramāra house of Ābū, and we have to rely only on Muhāpōta Naiṣṭhī who records a tradition, according to which, the Paramāras of Jalōr were the descendants of the Paramāras of Ābū. But we have no evidence in support of this statement.

Our main source of material for reconstructing the history of this house is confined to a stone inscription and a copper-plate. The first of these documents was found at Jalōr and belongs to the time of Visala, the last of the kings mentioned therein, whose queen Mallāradēvi adorned the temple of Sīndurājēśvara with a golden cupola in V.S. 1174 or 1118 A.C. The record gives the genealogy, beginning with Vākpatīrāja, the founder of the house and seventh in the lineal ascent from Visala, to whom it is brought down.
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The copper-plate, referred to above, is now lost; it gives the same genealogy in the same order, but it furnishes an earlier date for Visala, 1166 or 1109 A.C. This additional evidence pushes back the accession of this king at least by ten years, showing that he flourished about the beginning of the twelfth century A.C.

The genealogy given in these inscriptions is as follows:

Vākpatirāja
   Chandana
   Dēvarāja
   Aparājīta
   Vijjala
   Dharavarsa
   Visala

When and how this royal house began its career is only a matter of conjecture. Counting back from 1109 A.C., the first known year of Visala, and assigning a period of twenty-five years to each of his predecessors, we may hold that this house began to rule some time in the third quarter of the tenth century, with Vākpatirāja as its founder.

The Vākpatirāja of these inscriptions was indeed different from the homonymous ruler belonging to the Imperial Paramāra house, and who is known to have flourished earlier, towards the close of the tenth century, and who had no son; whereas the present inscription records that he had a son known as Chandana who succeeded him and who was the next known ruler of the house. Thus we are unable to agree with D.C. Ganguly, who upheld that after his conquest of Mārwād, Vākpatirāja, i.e., Muñja, allotted a portion of his kingdom in that region to his son Chandana.

According to the calculations made above, Vākpatirāja, the founder of this house, was a contemporary of Dharanivarāha who belonged to the Āhū branch and to whom we have conjecturally assigned the period from c. 970 to c. 990 A.C. We have also seen how the bardic chronicles state that Dharanivarāha divided Mārwād among his nine brothers; and if this tradition contains any historical truth, it may be presumed, as Bhatas has already suggested, that Vākpatirāja was one of these brothers. For the present, we have nothing more to state on this point.

Like the other two branches of the Paramāras of Mārwād, this branch also appears to have been under the suzerainty of the Chaulikyas of Gujārāt. The rulers of this house, also like those of the other branches, participated in the military expeditions of their overlords. This information is supplied from the Bijollā inscription which states that in

2 H.P.D., pp. 23 and 52. Also see P.B.P., P. 186.
3 In the account of Dharanivarāha, above.
one of his campaigns the Chāhāmāna ruler, Vīgraharājā IV, turned Jālōr into a city of flames. The reason of it is apparent that the contemporary ruler of the Jālōr branch participated in Kumārapāla's war with Vīgraharājā's father, Ārppārājā. Kumārapāla is also known to have built a temple called Kumārakūṭa at Jālōr.

Studying the history of the rulers belonging to this house, we find no details about the first five kings, viz., Vākpatārājā, his son Chandana, his son Dēvarājā, his son Aparājita and his son Vījala. Vījala's son was Dhrāravāsha, who is described as a great warrior, compared with Kārīkēya (Sēnānī), Pradyumna, and Daksā, all of them known as military leaders and respectively the sons of Śambhu, Hāri and Brahmā. None of the specific achievements of this ruler, however, is mentioned in the record. Dhrāravāsha's son, Vīsala, who set the record, is said to have shown in it the path of righteousness to other kings. This is only a poet's panegyric.

Vīsala appears to have been the last ruler of this line of the Paramāraś. We have evidence to show that subsequent to his reign we find the Chāhāmāna Kūrtīpāla holding sway over this region, as we know from the earliest inscription of his successor Śamarasimha, dated in V.S. 1239 = 1182 A.C. And presume that he must have begun his career some twenty years ago, we get approximately the same date for Kūrtīpāla as supplied by Vīsala's inscription.

M. Nainiś informs us that when Kūrtīpāla of the Śōṅgirā branch of the Chāhāmānas occupied Jālōr, the ruler at that place was a Paramāra chief named Kūntapāla. This prince may have been a son of Vīsala. But in view of the comparison of the dates of the two inscriptions, as seen above, he may have occupied the throne, if at all, only for a few months before the Jālōr branch of the Paramāras became extinct.

B. THE PARAMĀRAS OF VĀGAḌA

This house, which was an off-shoot of the Imperial Paramāra house of Mālwā, rose into prominence some time about the middle of the tenth century A.C., in the territory of Vāgaḍa, now comprised mostly in the district of Bāhswāḍa and Dūngarpur in the southernmost part of Rājasthān. This region forms the north-western boundary of Mālwā proper, from which it is separated by the Māhī river, flowing from its north-east to the south-west. The old name of Vāgaḍa, as found in our inscriptions, is Vīyāhradāra, or Vīyāhradāraka, some time later corrupted into Vāgīdrārā, which now stands for the chief town of a tehsil in the Bāhswāḍ District. It also appears possible that Vāgaḍa, whatever its origin may have been, was an older name which was later on changed to Vīyāhradāra and Vīyāhradāraka, with the desire to Sanskritise it. The region was also known as sthāta, which is called a vishaya, and vaguely also a dēśa, containing 750 villages (ardhaddharmasāta). The capital of this house was at Arthūnā, also figuring in our inscriptions as Utthapanaka, Utthūnaka and Ārathūnaka.
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The princes belonging to this house were all feudatories in status, owing their allegiance to the Imperial Paramāra house of Mālava, with which they claimed a common stock, and resembling the same, they also trace their origin from the altar of the sacrificial fire of the sage Vasishṭha on Mount Ābī.¹ Some of the members of this dynasty are known to have zealously participated in the warfare of their overlords, as to be seen below.

Nine stone inscriptions of the time of this house have so far been discovered. One of them, which is dated V.S. 1116 or 1059 A.C. and thus is the earliest in time, was found at Pānāhēḍa, which is now called Pārābēḍa, seven at Arthūṇa, both of the places now included in the Bānswādā District, and one very recently found at Chitri in the Dūngarpur District. According to the Pānāhēḍa inscription, the founder of this house was Dāmbarasimhā, a younger brother of Vairiśsinhā, who following the chronology proposed here for the first time, seems to have been on the throne of Mālava from c. 925 to c. 945 A.C.² The genealogical and chronological tables of this dynasty are given below, in the genealogical tables. The number of years assigned to each of the rulers of the house is purely tentative, calculated on the basis of giving 25 years to each of the generations and, in rare cases, making some alternations as necessitated by our study of the political circumstances of the time.

With these general remarks, now we proceed to study the history of the individual rulers belonging to this house.

DĀMBARASIMHĀ

c. 930 to c. 955 A.C.

One of the Arthūṇa inscriptions describes this king as a powerful ruler curbing his enemies, possessing a charming personality, and earning wide fame.³ This conventional praise only shows, although there is no evidence to prove it, that he sided his brother Vairiśsinhā in his warfare, and by the strength of his arms, acquired the region round about Arthūṇa, where he established himself as a ruler. This appears to have taken place some time about the second quarter of the tenth century A.C.

On the other hand, the Pānāhēḍa inscription of V.S. 1116, which is the earliest known record of the house, begins the genealogy with Dhanika, whose identity has long back been suggested by D.R. Bhandarkar, with Dāmbarasimhā himself.⁴ Bhandarkar’s suggestion is corroborated by the account that follows in both these inscriptions. For, whereas the first of them states that Dhanika was succeeded by his brother’s son Chitachha, in the second we find the mention of Dāmbarasimhā and then of Kanka or Kalkadēva; and when Chitachha or Kalkadēva (also Kalkadēva) appears to be identical from the description found in both the inscriptions, as to be seen below in the proper place, Dhanika and Dāmbarasimhā are also identical:

¹ See Nos. 84, 85 and 88, vv. 3 ff. in each of them.
² While editing the inscription in the Ep. Ind., Vol. XIV, p. 297 ff., Barnett thought that Vairiśsinhā seems to be Vairiśsinhā I, and in this respect he is followed by D.C. Ganguly and P. Bhatia, for which, see, respectively, H.P.D., p. 337, and P.B.P., p. 190. But considering the dates of the Pānāhēḍa and the Arthūṇa records (Nos. 83 and 84) and comparing them with that of Styaka II (Nos. 1-2), it appears more likely to hold that Dāmbarasimhā was the younger brother of Vairiśsinhā II, as has long back been suggested by Kiellhorn in his notice of the inscription in the Ind. Ant., Vol. XXII, p. 80, and also by D.R. Bhandarkar in his List of Inscriptions in the Ep. Ind. This question, however, does not arise in the present case as we have taken only one ruler of the name Vairiśsinhā and Styaka.
³ No. 84, vv. 15-16.
⁴ In the genealogical table accompanying his List of Inscriptions in the Ep. Ind., p. 398, n. 1.
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Dhanika built a Śiva temple near that of Mahākāla at Ujjain. This temple is called as Dhanēśvara, after his name.¹

CHACHCHA, OR KANKA,
c. 955 to c. 970 A.C.

Dambarasimha alias Dhanika was succeeded by his nephew, whose name is mentioned as Chachcha in the Pānāhēḍā inscription and as Kanka in the Arthūṇā inscription of V.S. 1136.² That he was a nephew of Dhanika is known from the former of these inscriptions, whereas the latter only uses the expression 'in his lineage' (tadānwaye). Again, the former of these records mentions him as a Mahāśripa, a brave warrior skilled in warfare, and adds that he actively participated in Siyaka's struggle against (the Rāṣṭrakūṭa king) Khōṭṭiga at Khalighaṭa on the Narmadā, where he died a hero's death. The same incident is repeated in the latter of these records, only with difference in names, putting Śrīharsha, the Mālava king, instead of Siyaka, and the king of Kṛṣṇaṭā for Khōṭṭiga. As we already know, it is one and the same incident referring to the well known battle that was fought between the Paramāra Siyaka and the Rāṣṭrakūṭa Khōṭṭiga, in 971-72 A.C. and this may be taken as the year of Kanka's death, which, probably, also cut short his career.

CHANDAPA
c. 970 to c. 1000 A.C.

Kakka or Kanka was succeeded by his son Chandapa, who is known to us only from the Arthūṇā inscription referred to above. The Pānāhēḍā inscription has a lacuna while mentioning him, in which his very name seems to have been lost. Nothing definite is known about this ruler; the Arthūṇā inscription states that he was glorious and his wide fame was sung by the Kinnaras.

SATYARĀJA
c. 1000 to c. 1025 A.C.

Chandapa was succeeded by his son, Satyaratā, in c. 1000 A.C. He was a contemporary of his overlords Sindharāja and the Illustrious Bhojadeva both of the house of Dhārā. The Arthūṇā inscription extolls him only in a conventional way, but the Pānāhēḍā record goes on to state that he received his fortune through the favour of Bhojadeva, in whose struggle with the Gūjjaras he is also said to have participated actively. This statement evidently refers to Bhoja's encounter with this contemporary who was on the throne of Gūjarat viz., Bhīmadeva I, in whose time the Mālava army is known to have sacked his kingdom.

Verse 23 of the Arthūṇā inscription of V.S. 1136 states in a poetic way that Satyaratā drove away his enemies into the forest. This statement may probably be taken as referring to his help to his overlord Sindharāja, who is known to have wrested the northern portion of Vāgada, which was then included in the kingdom of the Guhīlas.³

¹ This temple goes by the same name even to-day.
² Verse 27 and vv. 17-19 of the respective documents. In his genealogical table in the List of Inscriptions, D.R. Bhandarkar was inclined to think that both these names were synonymous and corresponded to the Hindi Kākti (for Kanka or Kakka,) and Chāchā (for Chachchatā).
³ H.P.D., p. 78. Also see N.S.C., Canto X, v. 15, where the name Vāgada is used.
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Satyarāja's wife was Rājaśri, a Chālamāna princess, who is compared in the inscription with Dēvati, the mother of Śrīkrishṇa. From her, Satyarāja had a son named Limbarāja, who succeeded him.

LIMBARĀJA

c. 1025 to c. 1040 A.C.

Nothing about the political incident of this king is known. The Pāñāhēḍā inscription describes him as a great warrior, without mentioning any specific exploit of his, and adds that he was well versed in politics (nīva-vinaya-mahā-pandita). He seems to have ruled only for a short period; and probably due to his short reign and also perhaps due to his being a collateral, he is passed over in the Arthūṇā record of his nephew, Chānumānāraṇa.

MANDALIKA, OR MANDANADEVA

c. 1040 to c. 1070 A.C.

Limbarāja was succeeded by his younger brother Mandalika, as the name appears in his Pāñāhēḍā inscription, dated V.S. 1116(1059 A.C.), or Mandanadēva, as in the Arthūṇā inscription. Both the records agree in stating that he was brave, valorous, learned and of handsome appearance, and the former of them supplies an additional information that he captured the great commander-in-chief Kanha, with his horse and elephant, in a battle, and handed him over to Jayasimha,1 who was evidently his overlord and the successor of Bhojadeva. The identity of Kanha still remains unestablished, though he appears to have been a Chaulikya or a Kalachuri general against whom Jayasimha is known to have waged war.

Mandalika's exploit in capturing Kanha is also repeated in another inscription from Arthūṇā, dated in V.S. 1166 or 1109 A.C.2 But the version in it is different; it says that Mandalika killed Kanha. This statement was recorded about fifty years later, and as such, appears to be worthy of less credence. This inscription also states that Mandalika killed one Sindhurāja. The identity of this enemy of Mandalika has not so far been established, like that of Kanha. But it is not possible to take him as the same ruler who was the father of Bhojadeva and who was on the throne towards the close of the eleventh century, for, besides chronological difficulties, here we have also to remember that the house to which this Mandanadēva belonged was throughout loyal to that of Dhāra, as we have been seeing.

As for the death of Sindhurāja, whereas the Arthūṇā record gives the credit of killing him to Mandalika, as just seen, in an earlier inscription from the same place and dated V.S. 1136 or 1080 A.C., this credit is given not to Mandalika but to his son Chānumānāraṇa.3 And to reconcile both these statements, we may hold that Chānumānāraṇa, as a prince, may have assisted his father in the latter's expedition against Sindhurāja. This is only how the discordant statements can be explained.

The Arthūṇā inscription of the time of Vijayarāja, dated V.S. 1166 or 1109 A.C., records an additional statement, viz., that Mandalika destroyed the army of the lord of Avanti, in Sthali, i.e., in Vāgaḍa.4 As seen above, the Vāgaḍa ruler was devotedly attached.

1 No. 83, v. 36 (37).
2 No. 90, v. 2.
3 No. 84, v. 55. The description is all figurative.
4 No. 90, v. 2. "Yo vanti-prabhu-sūdhārṇaḥ vibhūhiḥ hantīma deśī sthalaiḥ."
to his feudal lord Jayasimha, and in view of this, the statement of the Arthuṇā inscription has to be interpreted only as referring to the calamity befalling the main branch subsequent to the death of Bhūjaḍeva when the throne was claimed by some adversaries of Jayasimha, about whom we know nothing. The Avanti-prabhu who is referred to in the inscription may have been Udayāditya, who too was then contesting for the throne; or he may have been any other claimant.

The kingdom of Maṇḍalika seems to have been bordered on the north by that of the Chāhamānas of Nāḍōl, and he appears to have come into a conflict with Prithvīpāla, who was his contemporary on the Chāhamāna throne. This is suggested by D. Sharma while publishing a fragmentary grant of the latter dynasty. One of the verses of this grant states that “the subjects of Maṇḍalika, struck with spearheads by Prithvīpāla’s troops, left far away their shame, sons, wives as well as property, and fled away in all directions”.¹ This account, however, is not corroborated by any other evidence. It appears to have been a boundary skirmish.

Maṇḍalika built a Śiva temple at Pāṃsulākhējaka, i.e., Pāṇābēḍa. This place is about 15 kms. due northeast of the capital town of Arthuṇā. The king also made arrangements for the maintenance of the shrine. The end of his reign may conjecturally be placed in about 1070 A.C., when he was succeeded by his son Chāmuddarāja.

**CHĀMUNDARĀJA**

**c. 1070 to c. 1105 A.C.**

For the reign of Chāmuddarāja we have five inscriptions, all of which were found at Arthuṇā. Four of them are dated respectively in V.S. 1136, 1137, 1159 and 1159, and one, which is fragmentary, does not show any date.² The date of the earliest of these inscriptions is equivalent to 1080 A.C., and that of the latest to 1101 A.C. The period of this reign is only conjectural. For, whereas according to our calculations this king began his political career some ten years prior to the first of these dates, on the other hand, it also appears possible that his father, Maṇḍanādeva, may have continued to be on the throne for some years more than calculated here.

Of all the records mentioned above, it is only the first that furnishes some details as to the political career of this king. It states that he obtained glory by overcoming Sindurārāja (v. 55), who appears to have been a ruler of Sindh, as already seen above, while narrating the account of his father. From the same inscription we also learn that this ruler “established religion in an unprecedented degree and also displayed rich bounties to Brāhmaṇas” (vv. 62-65).

The Arthuṇā inscription, referred to above, devotes as many as twenty stanzas to extoll this ruler, but they are all figurative, giving him only the conventional praise which purports to say that he was a great warrior, a skilled Bowman vanquishing his foes in battles, handsome, etc., etc.

Chāmuddarāja was a devout worshipper of Śiva. He built a temple of Maṇḍanēśa (v. 66), apparently to commemorate his father’s name, and established some imposts for defraying the expenses of its worship.³ He also donated land in some of the neighbouring villages, rice-fields and a town, probably Pāṇābēḍa itself.

---

¹ E.C.D., p. 128; for text, see p. 190, II. 17-18. The battle was fought at Rāhōḍ, apparently identical with the same place, the name of which is variously spelt. It is not more than a hundred km. south west of Arthuṇā, the capital of Maṇḍalika, who thus appears to have taken the offensive.

² Nos. 84-86.

³ In this connection, see my remarks in the edition of the inscription.
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The Arthūṇā inscription of V.S. 1137 mentions under him an officer, whose name is lost, but we are told that he had three sons whose names were Āsarāja, Bhavyāsarāja and Anantapāla. The last of these persons also, who too was an officer, built a Śiva temple at that place. The first of these persons was the collector of taxes in the kingdom. From another Arthūṇā inscription we learn that Chāmūṇḍarāja appointed six members of a family to some important posts in his kingdom; they were all brothers.¹

VIJAYARĀJA

c. 1105 to c. 1110 (?)

Vijayarāja was the son and successor of Chāmūṇḍarāja. We have two inscriptions of his reign; one of them was dated in V.S. 1165 or 1108 A.C. and the other a year later. Both these records mention the performance of some pious deeds and refer to the name of the king only incidentally; the first of them, however, adds that Vijayarāja was a brave soldier who conquered his enemies, and also that he earned wide fame.² But none of the incidents of his reign is mentioned therein, with this vague praise.

As mentioned in the latter of these inscriptions, his minister for peace and war was Vāmana, the son of Rājapāla who was a Kāyastha belonging to the Valabha (from Valabhi) lineage.³

No political event of the reign of Vijayarāja has so far been known; nor do we have any information regarding the termination of his reign, or about his successor. In fact, we have no inscription of this house subsequent to his reign. We have, however, some means to enable us to hold that the career of his house came to an end soon after he closed his reign. A stone inscription, found at Thākardā in the Dūṅgarpur District of Rājasthān and dated V.S. 1212 = 1155 A.C., mentions the gift of some land by the prince Anayasirh, during the reign of his father, the Mahārāja Śūrapāla, who was the son of the Mahārāja Vijayapāla, the grandson of the Mahārāja Tribhuvanapāla and the great-grandson of the Mahārāja Prithvipāla, alias Bhartripāta.⁴ It is thus evident that in 1155 A.C. the region which was formerly under the sway of the Paramārās of Vāgada was being administered by one Śūrapāla whose family is not mentioned in the record, but which, from the genealogy given in it, was different from that of Vijayarāja. The names of the first three of these rulers also occur in the same order in the Ṭhunā inscription, with the same title of Mahārājaṭhunārāja applied to each of them; and while editing the latter of these inscriptions we find that this house, which appears to have formerly owed its allegiance to the Paramārās of Mālava, declared independence when the kingdom of their overlords was attacked by Siddharāja Jayasimha.⁵ Considering this situation, it does not appear altogether impossible that the contemporary Ṭhunā ruler, who appears to have been Vijayapāla who issued the record of V.S. 1190 = 1133 A.C., changed over to Jayasimha's side, on this occasion, and as his subordinate ally, he also participated in his warfare. It appears almost certain that after his conquest of the kingdom of the Paramārās of Mālava, Jayasimha also overran the territory of their kinsmen who were the feudatory chiefs of Vāgada, and he successfully proceeded up to Talvāḍa in the Bānswāḍa District, where we have his inscription.⁶ And as usually happens in such cases, in the course of

¹ No. 85.
² No. 90, c. 3.
³ Ibid., v. 29.
⁴ A.R.R.M., 1915-16, p. 3. Thākardā is about 7 kms. straight north by west of Sagwāḍa, now the headquarters of a tehsil in the district, and about 30 kms. south east of Dūṅgarpur itself.
⁵ No. 158.
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this venture the Ingnodā ruler, in his westward march, penetrated into the country of Vāgāda up to Thākardā, which is only about 125 kms. due west of Rūgnodā (Ingnodā), the find-spot of the inscription of Vijayapāla, and defeated Vijayarāja or his successor, seizing him the throne.

Thus we find that the Vāgāda house of the Paramārās met its tragic end in about the middle of the twelfth century A.C., almost at the same time when the kingdom of Malava was annexed to Gujarāt, during the reign of Siddharāja Jayasimha.1

THE CHANDELLAS OF JÉJĀ-BHUKTI

The Chandellas were one of the great Hindu dynasties that reigned in North India just prior to the establishment of Islām, as an imperial power in the country. Making an humble beginning as the feudatories of the Gūjāra-Pratiharās, they achieved sovereign status in course of time. They are known to have ruled from about the middle of the ninth to the end of the thirteenth century, and had often to bear the brunt of the incessant attacks of the Turks in which they fared gloriously though ultimately had to succumb to them, like the other royal dynasties of the time. But what is most remarkable about their contribution is that they gave to the country a well-organised political system, due to which their territory enjoyed a high level of prosperity.

The region over which the Chandellas ruled was known, according to the inscriptions, as Jējābhukti, Jējābhuktiaka or Jejakabhukti, which owed its origin to Jējā (Jayaśakti), one of the two grandsons of Namukha, the first known person of the royal house. He is also mentioned as Jējā and Jējāka in our inscriptions, which tell us that this ruler gave his name to the country, as Prithvi was known after Prithu.2

Cunningham has noted that Jējābhukti was called Chi-ki-to by the Chinese traveller Hieun-Tsang who visited India in the seventh century (641-42 A.C.), and that this name was changed to Jihōtī, after which the Jihōtīa Brāhmaṇas and Baniyas are known.3 He has also remarked that Jējakabhukti was shortened into Jihōtī in the same way as Tirabahu became modern Tirhut. This would mean that Jihōtī was an earlier name, current in the seventh century A.C. when the Chinese pilgrim visited the place, and thus it cannot be admitted that it came in use after the name of Jējā (Jayaśakti) who flourished later in the ninth century. However, as remarked by some scholars, it appears possible that the name Jējābhukti was a Sanskritised form of an older name like Jihōtī, Jajhauti, Jējhauti4 or Chi-ki-to of Hieun-Tsang.

The territory under the sway of the Chandella monarchs occupied more or less the same area which coincides with the modern Vindhya Pradesh or Bundelkhand. To be more precise, as V. Smith has already pointed out, it includes “the districts of Hamirpur, Bānda, Lalitpur (a sub-division of Jhānsi), with parts of Allahabād and Mirzāpur in the United Provinces (Uttar Pradesh), the Sāuger and Damōh districts in the Central Provinces, and a large intermediate space, which under the British rule, was occupied by a number of small native States”.5

The earliest capital of the house was Kharjurāhō (Lat. 25 N; Long. 75 E.), which is also mentioned as Kharjūravāhaka in our inscriptions.6 Some time later, the capital

1 E.C.D., p. 130.
2 No. 113, 16.
4 See A.R.K., p. 4.
6 No. 114, 11. 32-33. It is called Kajurahā by Abu Rihān, Kajurā or Kajurā by Ibn Batuța, and Kajarāha by Albīrīnī. See A.R.K., p. 3, n. 16. The first and the third of these chroniclers also mention it as the capital of the region. For the tradition in this respect, see A.S.I.R., Vol. XXI, p. 79.
was shifted to Mahōbā (Mahōtsavanagara), which was one of the strongholds of these rulers, along with Ajampagd (Pamā Dist.) and Kālaṇjar (Bāndā Dist.) in Uttar Pradesh. But these kings always took pride in calling themselves as the lords of Kālaṇjar (Kālaṇjar itihāsa).

Our inscriptions claim that the race of the Chandellas sprung from the Moon.1 In their copper-plate charters they are said to belong to the family of Chandrātrēya. The Bhāṣavara stone inscription which belongs to a later time, however, goes a step further to state that they are the descendants of the (mythical) sage Chandrātrēya, who was the son of the Moon.2 In some of our records, the earliest of which is the Khajurāhō inscription of Yāśovarman, the mythical origin of the Chandellas is described at length as having sprung from the Primordial Being, the Creator of the Universe (Viśva-śrīk Purāṇa-purasha), through Atri and other sages, down to the sage Chandrātrēya.3

Kielhorn read the name Chandrelī in one of the Dudāthī inscriptions of Devalabdi and took it to be a derivative by adding the Prakrit suffix iIta, to Chandra, the moon, giving another example of the type, namely, Bhāṭīlī from bhāṭī: and he suspected that the name Chandrātrēya is really its later Sanskritised form.4 The word also appears in its variants as Chundēlla, Chandēlla, etc., in the inscriptions.5

The tradition according to which this race was born from the Moon is recorded in the Mahōbā Khana of Prithvirāja Rāsò, by Chanda Barāthī, who was a friend and contemporary of Prithvirāja Chauhān (1180-1191 A.C.). It purports to say that Hēm-rāj, the parīkṣit of the Gāhājavāla king Indrajīt, had a daughter named Hēmavati, and one day when she went to bathe in the Rātī tālā, she was seen and embraced by Chandrāmā (the Moon), who favoured her with the boon: “your son will be born on the Karnavati river; then take him to Khajurāhō.... In Mahōbā (Mahōtsavanagara) be will reign and will become a great king. Thus shall your dishonour be effaced when you are without a husband”. But Shiyam Sunder Das, who edited the work, doubted the authorship of the Mahōbā Khana, and, as he held, this particular Khana was not composed earlier than the seventeenth or eighteenth century of the Vikrama era, much later in point of time than the other parts of the Rāsa.6 Reference to this legend has already been made by A. Cunningham and H.C.7 Ray, but V.A. Smith has rejected it as a “silly legend”.8 As it is not mentioned in any of the official charters that have come down to us, it appears to be a later fabrication. Considering the whole problem, it is safe to hold that the real origin of the ruling dynasty of the Chandellas fell into oblivion, like that of the many other Rājput dynasties, and its description as having descended from the Moon is merely a myth, devised to contribute to its greatness.

The homeland of the Chandellas is not mentioned in any of our inscriptions. It appears to have been Bundelkhand itself throughout which they had spread. The findspots of the inscriptions also indicate the same. The country was, however, later on known as Bundelkhand, after the Bundellas who inhabited it subsequently.

The first person mentioned in the genealogical list is Nannuka. He is said to have been the founder of the Chandella dynasty. No record of his time has so far been discovered. The Khajurāhō inscriptions dated V.S. 1011 = 953-54 A.C. and V.S. 1059 = 1002 A.C.

---

1 No. 113, v. 5; No. 145, v. 2.
2 No. 139, v. 3.
3 No. 98, vvs. 6-8; No. 114, v. 9.
4 No. 102. For Kielhorn’s remarks, see Ind. Ant., Vol. XVIII. For my reading, see the inscription.
5 Nos. 108 and 111, respectively.
mention him as king (*nripa*) and great king (*mahā-nripa*) respectively, without specifying any events of his reign. In the first of these records he is figuratively described as "a touch-stone to test the worth of the gold of the regnal order" and "one who playfully decorated the faces of the women who were the quarters, with the sandal of his fame". Another verse describes him as the conqueror of many hosts of enemies. The second of the inscriptions refers to him as a brave man whose skill in the use of bow and arrows in killing the enemies reminded people of (the Epic hero) Arjuna. These descriptions are all in vague terms, no specific exploit of his being mentioned therein.

The account preserved in the folk-ballads do not make any mention of Nannuka but refer to Chandravarman as the founder of the dynasty. This led H.C. Ray to suggest that from Chandrā, as it is used in the *Mahābā-khaṇḍa* of the *Rāsa*, Chandravarman might have been the *bīruda* of Nannuka. This suggestion is possible but not certain, as we have no evidence in support of it.

The first recorded date of the house is V.S. 1011 or 954 A.C. when the Khajurāho stone inscription of Yaśovarman was set up. Counting back from this date at the rate of 10 to 25 years per reign for six predecessors of this king, Cunningham held that Nannuka, the founder of the house, flourished in about 831 A.C. This view is accepted by V. Smith and H.C. Ray, and following it, we may conjecturally take the period of the founder, to be from *circa* 820 to about 840 A.C. Smith's assertion that this ruler must have enjoyed some sort of sovereign power, as indicated by the epithets *nripa* and *mahā-nripa* of the inscriptions, can hardly be upheld, since these epithets are used often to denote even feudatories and sometimes even minor chiefs and *jāgirdārs*. Similarly, we have no evidence to agree with the assertion of H.C. Ray that Nannuka was at best a petty feudatory of Nāgabhata II (815-33 A.C.). I therefore agree with S.K. Mitra in suggesting that during the time when the Pratihāras were busy fighting with their rivals, the Rasṭrakūtas and the Pālas, Nannuka, who was a brave and courageous man, appears to have carved out a principality for himself, somewhere near Khajurāho, which led down to the foundation of a mighty empire. It is, however, difficult to imagine that this ruler or his successor must have continued to rule as an independent king for long and therefore he must have been subjugated by any of the contending powers leading military incursions in one another's territories. More on this point will be stated below.

**VĀKPATI**

c. 840 to c. 860 A.C.

Vākpati was the successor of his father Nannuka. The Khajurāho inscription of V.S. 1011 represents him, as a powerful king (*kṣūpita*) and a skilled bowman, reminding us of Arjuna, and also as possessing power of speech like his namesake Vākpati or Brijhaspati (v.12). No specific exploit of this ruler is mentioned in any of the records. Verse- 13 of the same inscription states that "Vindhya became the pleasure-mount (*krīḍā-giri*) of Vākpati where he was entertained by the Kirata women". This statement is interpreted by H.C. Ray to mean that "Vākpati succeeded in extending to some degree the limits of his ancestral principality". But as some of the ranges of the Vindhyas actually fell

---

1 No. 98, v. 10; and No. 114, v. 14, respectively.
2 No. 98, vv. 10–11.
3 No. 114, v. 15.
in the territory under Vakpati in Bundelkhand itself the statement of the epigraph need not be interpreted as done by Ray.

In a later inscription Vakpati is said to have removed the apprehension of his subjects, by his heart polished by learning and political foresight. This statement appears to mean that he endeavoured to maintain peace in his kingdom and defend it against external dangers.

JAYAŚAKTI and VIJAYAŚAKTI

C. 860 to c. 890 A.C.

Vakpati had two sons Jayaśakti and Vijayaśakti, or Jijāka and Vijāka. The variants of these names are also found as Jējā and Vijā Jayaśakti and Vijayaśakti appear to have been the Sanskritised forms of the originals, as mentioned here. Both these brothers are always mentioned together and this may show that both were almost simultaneously engaged in consolidating their kingdom. Both are also said to have possessed matchless vigour.

One of the Khajuraho inscriptions tells us that Vijayaśakti rendered competent help to a friend of his in his campaign in the South. Out of the two great powers who were in the North at that time, the Pratihāras are not known to have launched any expedition in the South. On the other hand, we have evidence to show that Devapāla (c. 810-850 A.C.) of the Pāla dynasty, who was presumably a contemporary of Vijayaśakti, led his victorious arms as far as the extreme south of India, and it is possible to hold, as already suggested by R.C. Majumdar, that the Chandellā chief, Vijayaśakti, may have joined the Pāla king in the latter's campaign against the Rashtrakūta ruler Amoghavarsha. The same scholar further suggested that the Chandellās had helped Devapāla in his fight against Bhūja (Pratihāra) and were rewarded, after the latter's defeat, with the sovereignty of Devapāla. This view, though not supported by any evidence, appears to be plausible; and conjecturally it may be held as there is no other theory in the field. With the disintegration of the Pāla empire subsequent to the reign of Devapāla and with the consequent triumph of the Pratihāra kingdom, however, the Chandellās may have changed their allegiance from the former to the latter dynasty, and thus we find Vijayaśakti's great-grandson Yasovarman acknowledging his allegiance to the Pratihāra ruler Vinayakapāla, as we shall presently see. Be whatever it may, Vijayaśakti endeavoured to stabilise his kingdom by establishing peace and order in it, along with his brother, and this is why reference to both these brothers is made in the beginning of all the charters of the family.

RĀHILA

C. 890 to c. 910 A.C.

Vijayaśakti was succeeded by his son Rāhila, who is described as a brave king killing his enemies in battle, but nothing specific is mentioned in this respect. He appears

---

1 No. 114, v. 17.
2 No. 97, l.6.
3 No. 113, v. 11, and No. 98, v. 14, respectively.
4 No. 98, v. 15.
5 No. 114, v. 20.
6 His Bidal pillar inscription; Ep. Ind., Vol. XVIII, p. 305; also see A.I.K., p. 51.
7 H.B., Vol. I, p. 119, n. 4. This is not accepted by some scholars, for which, see E.R.K., p. 31. It is possible only if we assume that Vijayaśakti began a little earlier and also that Devapāla continued to rule over, after 890 A.C., which is not certain. See A.I.K., p. 56, n. 30.
8 No. 98, v. 17; No. 114, vv. 24-25.
to have been a man of pacific disposition. He is vaguely alluded to in the Khajurão inscription as a brave king whose very name does not allow his enemies to enjoy sleep. The historic events of his time are not known.

However, this peace-loving ruler took interest in public works. For example, he excavated tanks and constructed temples, the remnants of which are still visible at Ajayagadh and Mahódhá, a tank at the latter place which is still called the Ráhila-ságará, some old fortifications and the remains of a temple of the Chandélá type, as noted by A. Cunningham. Thus his kingdom extended from Ajayagadh in the east to Mahódhá on the west.

Ráhila’s reign terminated some time about 910 A.C. He was succeeded by his son Harsha.

**HARSHA**

_c. 910 to c. 930 A.C._

This king is described in an inscription from Khajuráho as “an abode of truthfulness, merits and valour, the most excellent ruler who was afraid to offend against law (dharma), repository of wealth (Sír) and learning (Sárasvati) and a fervent devotee of Vishnu (Mádhuripá).” According to the Nanyáru plate of his grandson Dhánga, he was a mighty comet boding evil to the host of his enemies and inspiring fear by his terrific arrays of troops who had made tributary (to himself other sovereigns). Another Khajuráho inscription tells us that he protected the whole earth after subduing his adversaries. None of these conventional statements contain any specific achievement of this ruler; but as we shall see below, he was really an important figure in the contemporary history.

It is from the time of Harsha that the Chandélás began to take part in the imperial affairs of the Pratiháras. A fragmentary Khajuráho inscription represents him as placing Kshítipáladeva on the throne. The latter was the imperial Pratihára ruler, generally identified with Mahipála, the son of Mahendrápála, whose last known date is 907-08 A.C., and following whose reign a war of succession broke out between his sons Bhöja II and his step-brother Mahipála. It was almost at the same time that the Ráshtrakútas renewed their invasion in which Indra III occupied Kanaúj, the capital city, and Mahipála “fled, as if struck by a thunderbolt, staying neither to eat, nor rest, nor pick himself up”. But soon after the return of the invading army, Mahipála succeeded in re-establishing the fortunes of his family; and probably this is the incident when the Chandélá ruler helped him in regaining the throne, as implied by the expression púnah in 1. 10 of the Khajuráho inscription referred to above.10

---

1 No. 98, v. 16.
2 See *A.S.I.R*, Vol. II, p. 441; ibid.,
3 No. 98, vv. 19-20.
4 No. 100, vv. 1-2.
5 No. 114, v. 24.
6 No. 97, 1. 10. Hoernlé took this achievement applicable to Yaśóvarman (*J.R.A.S.* 1904 p. 658), and the same view is held also by some other scholars who guess that still another name, which can be only that of Harsha’s son Yaśóvarman, may have been mentioned in the following lines and it is this ruler who is spoken of here (*S.I.H.C.*, p. 10). But it seems more correct to identify this ruler with Harsha, for which, see *H.K.*, p. 257, n. 1.
8 For the contrary view, see *C.I.J.*, Vol. IV, pp. 1xxii f., where it is also held that this Bbója must be identified with Bbója I and also that there is no sufficient evidence to show that there was a war of succession.
10 See *A.I.K.*, p. 54; *H.K.*, p. 257, n. 1. Tripathi’s ingenious suggestion that the word púnah here means “further or besides or now” is rather far-fetched, in view of the tenor of the verse which is fragmentary. For details and for the contrary view, see our edition of the inscription (No. 97).
The same view is expressed by R.C. Majumdar,1 but it has been questioned by R.S. Tripathi, stating that "the passage in the Khajurâhô inscription referred to above, does not refer to Mahipâla's restoration, but merely to his accession to the throne with the help of the Chandella princes." The reason for this, according to the learned scholar, was to seek "the support of the Chandella king Harshadleva as a counterpoise to the alliance between his rival and the Chhedi ruler Kûkalla.3 But this view goes contrary to the fact that when Kûkalla himself sided Bhoja, as we shall see now, he cannot be taken as siding Mahipâla who was his rival for the throne.

The Benares grant issued by the Kalachuri Karnâ in K. year 793 = 1042 A.C. has a verse which must be interpreted to mean that Harsha, the lord of Chitrakûta, was one of those princes who had received help from Kûkalla (850-890 A.C.). Kielhorn has identified this Harsha with his namesake of the Chandella dynasty4 and this view is generally accepted. However, it has been urged against this view that when according to the Khajurâhô inscription of V.S. 1011 (954 A.C.), Kalâñjara was acquired for the first time by Harsha's son, Yasôwarman, Chitrakûta, which lies about 25 miles (40 kms.) north east of it, seems to have been held at that time by the Gûjrâras.5 Accordingly, it has also been suggested by D.C. Ganguly that the Harsha who received protection from Kûkalla was the Guhila prince of that name whose rule might (naturally) have extended to Chitrakûta, i.e., modern Chitor in Mêwâd. And this suggestion is taken as quite plausible by V.V. Mirashi.6

Ganguly's theory is based on the assumption that the Chandella king could capture Chitrakûta only after his occupation of Kālanjara and in no case prior to it. But why should it be presumed that in the course of capturing it he should have marched only from the west to the east or from the southwest to the northeast? He may be taken as penetrating into the region and going up to the fort from any other direction, as well, leaving Kalanjar altogether untouched.

The Kalachurî Kûkalla is known to have advanced a policy of making matrimonial alliances with his contemporaries, as he did with the Râshtrakûta king Amôghavarsha I and also with the Pâla king Vigrâhapâla, the successor of Dêvapâla. The Benares grant of Karnâ referred to above, also tells us that Kûkalla married Nañjadevi who was born in the Chandella family.7 The inscription does not mention her parentage, but she may have been a daughter of a near relative of the Chandella king. If so, it is quite possible to infer that Kûkalla rendered help to the Chandella Harsha who had then occupied Chitrakûta, of course before the occupation of Kâlanjar by his son Yasôwarman.

That Harsha helped Kûhitipalâdeva in the latter's endeavour to regain the throne probably goes to indicate that from this time the Chandellas may have acknowledged the authority of Kanaûj and may have changed their subordination from Pala suzerainty, as we have presumed above. This view, as already stated above, is indeed tentative and we have no material to ascertain it. However, it is almost certain that the Râshtrakûta blow, as seen above, must have enormously weakened the imperial Praithâra power by this time, and Harsha's obedience to the contemporary Pratihâra ruler may have been only nominal. He is given the title Mahâthîrîjhîtrâja in the Nanyaurâ grant of his grandson Dhañga.

2 H.K., p. 261.
3 Ibid., p. 286.
6 See C.I.I., Vol. IV, p. 1xx. Also see ibid., p. 288, where Mirashi held that this Harsha was the well-known Chandella king, and also ibid., p. (xxviii), Additions and Corrections, where he reverted to his former view.
7 Ibid., No. 48, v. 8.
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YAŠÖVARMAN alias LAKSHAVARMAN

c. 930 to c. 950 A.C.

The fragmentary Khajurāho inscription,¹ which is the earliest known record of the dynasty was probably engraved during the reign of Yaśōvarman. Next in order of time is another inscription from the same place and dated V.S. 1011 (953-54 A.C.), which calls this ruler also as Lakshavarman, extolls him in the usual panegyric style, signifying that he was a great warrior who destroyed his adversaries, that his war fame spread in all the quarters and that he equaled Karna in munificence, Yudhishthira in truthfulness and Arjuna in valor, carrying his victorious arms to distant regions.² This is no doubt a vague conventional praise; but we have a definite statement in this respect in another inscription from the same place,³ which has a verse alluding to his specific exploits. It states that "he was a sword to (cut down) the Gaudas as if they were pleasure-creeper, equalled the forces of the Khasas and carried out the treasure of the Kōsals; before him perished the Kāshmiri warriors; he weakened the Mithilas, (and) he was, as it were, the god of death to the Mālavas; who brought distress on the shameful Chēdis and was to the Kurus what a storm is to trees, and a searching fire to the Gūrjaras" (v. 23).

The historical significance of this verse, along with that of v. 28 which repeats his victory our Chēdirāja, has been discussed in our edition of the record; and here a reference is invited to the same. The description of the warlike activities of this ruler, however, describing his military campaigns over a vast area from Mālava to the Himalayas on one side and from Kashmir to Bengal on the other, looks like a dig-vijaya, as this word is actually used in verse 39 of it. It goes to show, nevertheless, that from the time of this ruler the kingdom of the Chandellas began to grow in power, exercising its influence more or less in all directions, though the statements of the record that "the forces of his armies marching on either banks of the Yamunā and the Ganges made their water muddy by the bathing of his furious and mighty elephants" (v.39) and also that he reached up to the Himalayas look like hyperbolic expressions.

We have no definite knowledge of the territorial acquisition of this ruler, except that he snatched Kālānāja, an impregnable fort in the Bandāl District, situated about 70 kms. due northeast of Khajurāho.⁵ The capture of this important hill-fort is indeed a great military achievement of Yaśōvarman, though scholars are not unanimous in holding as to from whom it was conquered by him. Up to 836 A.C., it was certainly held by the Prāthāras,⁶ and the Asiatic Society's plate,⁷ dated 931 A.C., also shows that till that year at least they continued to hold their sway over it. The Deōli and the Kārbād plates of Krīṣṇa III inform us that "on hearing of the conquest of all the strongholds in the southern regions simply by means of his angry glance, the hopes about Kālānāja and Chitrakūṭa vanished from the heart of the Gūrjara."⁸ From this statement, R.S. Tripathi, of course with some hesitation, held that Krīṣṇa III was successful in occupying Kālānāja and Chitrakūṭa.⁹ H.C. Ray was inclined to think that it is not unlikely that Yaśōvarman may have captured the famous hill-fort not from the Gūrjara-Prāthāras, "as was so long believed", but from the Rāṣṭhaṅkas.¹⁰ Differing from them both, D.C. Sircar suggested that it was probably held before by the Prāthāra house represented by Harirāja, a feu-

¹ No. 97.
² No. 98, v. 39.
³ No. 114, vv. 31-38.
⁴ No. 114, v. 30.
⁵ For the history and importance of this place, see C.I.E., Vol. IV, p. 1xxxvii f.
⁹ H.C., p. 267 and 271.
¹⁰ D.H.N.I., Vol. II, p. 674. All this also is of the same view; see R.T.T., p. 113.
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datory of the Gürjara-Pratihāras and holding the Jhansi-Guna region with the fort in it and from this house he may have snatched it. But here I share the view of R.C. Majumdar who holds that "possibly the two forts were conquered by a third power (Kalachuris or Chandellas) allied to the Rāshtrakūṭas, and the Gürjara-Pratihāras gave up all hopes of recovering it." 

For want of evidence nothing can be definitely said on this point, and the view expressed above is merely tentative. It is, however, certain that the capture of this important hill-fort along with the surrounding area was indeed a great achievement which must have made Yaśōvarman virtually the master of Bundelkhand proper. Thus we see that this ruler, who was a successful military leader materially contributed to the destruction of the sovereign power of the Gürjara-Pratihāras though he and his successor Dhāṅga continued to show a nominal allegiance to them. The description of his exploits shows that he extended the bounds of his kingdom and thus he became almost a menace to the house of his overlord of Kanauj.

Studying the military exploits of Yaśōvarman, we also note that equally vague and grandiloquent claim of conquest has been ascribed to two of his contemporaries, viz., the Rāshtrakūṭa king Kṛṣṇa III (929-947 A.C.) and the Kalachuri ruler Yuvārāja I (c. 915-945 A.C.). Moreover, from the figurative style of the description it is also highly doubtful whether his conquest of all these territories should be taken to represent historical facts. It is not improbable, of course, that he defeated the Cādri (Kalachuri) ruler who is mentioned twice in the inscription and who was his elderly contemporary, Yuvārāja I; and he may also have come into a clash with the Paramara king Siyaka alias Śrīharsha who too was following an expansionist policy, as we have already seen in the history of his house above. Yaśōvarman also seems to have acquired some parts of Siyaka's kingdom as is evident from the fact that he placed the region bordering the Mālava territory in charge of his son Kṛṣṇarāja, as we know from the latter's Duddhī inscriptions. But his success in the other directions, particularly against Kāshmīr, the region of the Khasas and also in those lying at the foot of the Himalayas, which were all far distant from his kingdom, is not corroborated by any substantial evidence.

Yaśōvarman was a devout worshipper of Vīṣṇu. He constructed a splendid temple of Dāiyāḍrāti, the enemy of the Daitys, i.e., Vīṣṇu, at Khajurāḥo, which "rivals the peaks of the Himalayas and the golden pinnacles of which illumine the sky". This temple, which is now called as that of Chaturbhujas, is near a big tank which too is said to have been excavated by the same ruler. He also appears to have had a leaning towards a special manifestation of the deity, as we know from the introductory stanza of one of the Khajurāḥo inscriptions which invokes the blessings of Vaiṣṇava in the form of the combination of the Boar and the Maṇi-lion.

The history of the image installed in the temple is given in verse 43 of the same record. It says that the lord of Bhuṭa obtained it from the Kailāsa, and from him the Sāhi, the king of Kira, received it as a token of friendship; from him it was obtained

1 Ep. Ind., Vol. XXXI, pp. 310 f. However, it appears to be hardly possible for a ruler of the Jhānd-Guṇal region to have extended his sway to the east so far as Kāḷāṭīgar which is not less than 250 kms. and also intervened by a part of the territory of the Chandellas who were his foes.

2 J.O.R., Vol. XVI, pp. 155 ff. From prastāri of Kṛṣṇa III inscribed on a stone slab at Jura in the former Mahārāṣtra State (now in Sainī District of Madhya pradesh), Dr. Allekār conjectured that Kṛṣṇa's conquest of the fort of Kāḷāṭīgar is "well founded". See R.T.T., p. 113. But this assumption can hardly be justified when we consider that this fort is not less than 90 kms. farther from Mahārāṣtra, to its north-northwest. Moreover, this ruler's claim to the imperial titles in the prastāri also shows that he may have conquered this territory in his subsequent career as king, and not as a crown-prince, as presumed by Allekār.


4 Yuvārāja was defeated towards the close of his reign, for which see C.I.I., Vol. IV, p. 2xxiv.

5 Nos. 101-106.

6 No. 98, v. 38.
by Hérambapāla, for a force of elephants and horses, and ultimately Yaśövarman received it from Dēvapāla, who was the former’s son.¹

Yaśövarman married Puppā (Pushpā), whose parentage is unknown. From her he had a son named Dhaṅga, who succeeded him in circa 950 A.C.

**DHÅNGA**

c. 950 to c. 1002-03 A.C.

Yaśövarman’s reign terminated some time before 953-54 A.C. when the stone bearing his Khajurāhō inscription was set up by his son Dhaṅga. For the latter of these rulers we have three more records. Two of them are stone inscriptions found at Khajurāhō itself, dated respectively in V.S. 1011 = 955 A.C. and V.S. 1059 = 1002 A.C; and the third is a copper-plate found at Nanyaurā in the Hamirpur District (U.P.), recording his donation in V.S. 1055 or 998 A.C.³ The plate mentions Dhaṅga with the imperial titles of Paramābhūtṝayukha, Mahārajādhirāja and Paramēśvara, indicating his openly declaring independence and throwing off the yoke of his erstwhile imperial overlords.⁴ The grant was issued from Vārānasi, perhaps lending colour to the view that his region extended up to that place.⁵ We have seen above that Yaśövarman is said to have taken his forces up to the Gaṅgā-Yamunā Doab.

The Chandēla kingdom grew in power under Dhaṅga, who, as we are informed by the fragmentary Mau stone inscription of the time of Madanavarman, attained to “supreme lordship after inflicting a defeat over the king of Kānyakubja”.⁶ This adversary of Dhaṅga, according to R.S. Tripathi, was Vijayapāla, whose death occurred in about the end of the ninth or the beginning of the tenth century A.C. and in whose reign the Pratihāra kingdom declined further.⁷ The statement of his defeat at the hands of the Chandēla king is supported by a Khajurāhō inscription, stating that he (Dhaṅga) ruled the earth “as far as Kālānjara and as far as Bāhāswat, (situated?) on the banks of the river of Mālava; from here to the banks of the river Kālindī (Yamunā), and from here also to the frontiers of the Chēdī country, and even as far as the mountain called Gōpa (Gōpādh or Gwāllaur) which is the unique abode of marvel”.⁸ Thus we find that the supremacy so far enjoyed by the Pratihāras in North India was snatched by Dhaṅga, who was the most powerful ruler of the region during this period, though he retained in the Khajurāhō inscription set up by him a formal and only nominal recognition of the imperial power.

The conquest of the strategic fort of Gwāllaur was indeed a marvellous achievement, speaking highly of the valour of the Chandēla king, and in our account of the

---

¹ I am unable to agree with Tripathi in his suggestion that it was Yaśövarman’s growing strength and independence that compelled Dēvapāla to surrender to him the celebrated image of Vaikuṇṭha (H.K., p. 272. Moreover, it is also doubtful as suggested by V.V. Mirahē that the word sīru used in the inscription (No. 98, v. 13) to state the relation of Dēvapāla to Hērambapāla, is employed in the wider sense of a nephew, just as tila (father) sometimes denotes ‘an uncle’.

² No. 114, v. 40.

³ Nos. 99, 114 and 100, respectively.

⁴ Agreeing with R.C Majumdar, I presume that the early Chandēla rulers were feudatories of the Pāla (Dēvapāla) and some time later they had to yield to the Imperial Pratihāra power.

⁵ For a contrary view, see E.R.K., p. 61. It is, however, not certain that Vārānasi was included in his kingdom which, according to his inscription extended only up to Kālānjara; see No. 98, v. 45. Vārānasi was a bone of contention and was lost to the Pāla king Mahāpāla who built many temples at Sarnāth, near it, before 1026 A.C. See Ind. Ant., Vol. XVI, pp. 139 H.

⁶ No. 125, v. 3.

⁷ H.K., p. 276.

⁸ No. 98, v. 45.
Kacchhahapaghātus we have seen that the fort was acquired by him by inflicting a defeat on the king of Kānyakubja, with the help of Vajradāman who accepted his vassalage.1 This event appears to have occurred about 977 A.C. when Vajradāman began his career, and the conquest of the hill of Gwalior made Dhāṅga an important figure in the history of North India. We have already seen that he possessed another hill-fort, that of Kalaṅjara, which was acquired by his father Yaśovarman.

The Mau stone inscription makes a bold claim for Dhāṅga, in its verse 3, which states that he "obtained exalted sovereignty after defeating in the battle-field the king of Kānyakubja" i.e., Kanauj. This incident must be placed after 954 A.C., the date of the Khajurāhō inscription in which he expresses at least his nominal subordination to the sovereignty of Kanauj.

No other definite achievement of Dhāṅga has been known so far, though a verse of one of the Khajurāhō inscriptions poetically describes how his door-keeper (chamberlain) instructed the ruling princes of Kōśala, Kratha, Śīnhalā and Kuntalā, 2 meaning thereby that the outer chamber of his court was surrounded by kings and noblemen. Another verse of the same record informs us that his royal prison was thronged with the queens of Kāñchi, Āndhra, Rādha and Aṅga. From these hyperbolic expressions of the court-poets, it is vain to conclude that Dhāṅga raided some portions of the peninsular and eastern India, though some of them may be taken to have been "fanciful expressions of his pious wish."3

Unfortunately we have no reference as to Dhāṅga's internal administration; but we have some details indicating how he made arrangements to guard the western part of his kingdom, stretching from Lalitpur sub-division of the Jhāński District in the north to Vidiśā in the south, against the Paramāras and the Kalachuris whose territories adjoined to his kingdom, respectively, in its west and south west, and who too were endeavouring to extend their dominions in this region at that time. Dhāṅga placed this region under his nephew Kṛṣṇa or Kṛṣṇapāpa, born of Dēvalabdhi and Āśarvā, as it appears from the Duddāhi inscriptions.4 Another inscription found at Vidiśā tells us that Kṛṣṇapā's Chief Minister, Vṛčaspati of the Kaṇḍinya gotra, who led some other military campaigns, conquered the lord of Chēdi;5 and still another inscription found at Māsēr, about 30 kms. northwest of Vidiśā, tells us that Narasimha of the Śūlpī family vanquished and also killed a Kalachuri king at the command of Kṛṣṇaraṇa, who has been identified with Kṛṣṇa of the Duddāhi inscriptions.6 Collecting all these references, V.V. Mirashi has shown that the Kalachuri king defeated by Kṛṣṇapā's general was probably Śakharaṅgāpa III, who had a short reign of about ten years from c. 970 to c. 980 A.C.7 These accounts speaks highly of the statesmanship of Dhāṅga.

It is during the time of Dhāṅga that the country had to face a new danger in the form of the Turkish invasion. Sabuktigin (977-997 A.C.), the founder of the Yaminī.

---

1 For the view held by H.C. Ray, that the Kacchhahapaghātus were the feudatories of the Imperial Pratiharas, see D.H.N.I., Vol. II, pp. 822-23. But we have no evidence in support of this conjecture.
2 Nos. 114, vv. 45-46.
3 Also see E.R.K., pp. 61 ff., and A.I.K., p. 86.
4 Nos. 101-106.
5 This inscription was found by F.E. Hall J.A.S.B., Vol. XXXII, p. 31., n. 2. It appears to be the same as transcribed in Ep. Ind., Vol. XXIX, p. 21., n. 1. For another achievement of Vṛčaspati, see my note in the Journal of the Bihar Res. Soc., Vol. LVIII(1970), pp. 81 ff.
6 For Mirashi's view, see C.I.L., Vol. IV, pp. 156-157, and p. lxxxvii. On the other hand, M. Venkataramanaya, who edited the Minoč inscription in the Ep. Ind., Vol. XXXIX (1953), pp. 18 ff., suggested Kṛṣṇarāja's identification with the Rādhikrtrik śrī Kṛṣṇa III (939-967 A.C.); but it appears less possible that the king of Rāḍapati mentioned in the N.S.C., XI, v. 89, was defeated by one of the Rādhikrtrik subordinates, Sūjaka II, and restored by another Vṛčaspati, as contested by him. Venkataramanaya's views have also been controverted by Mirashi in C.I.L., Vol. IV, p. xxi (Additions and Corrections).
7 Mirashi, op. cit.
dynasty of Guzni, appeared at the gates of India in 990-91 A.C., and to confront his ferocious and devastating forces, Jayapala, the contemporary Sahi chief, who, according to Minhal-US-Siraj, was "the greatest Raja of Hind",1 "appealed to the neighbouring Rajas for assistance; and considering it to be a common danger to the safety of the Motherland, as we learn from Firishta, the rulers of Delhi, Ajmer, Kalañjar and Kanauj responded to his call by sending money and troops to his aid.2 But after some resistance, the Sahi chief lost the war and his united forces fled in utter confusion, as we are informed unanimously by the Muslim historians.3

From our point of view it is relevant only to note that the Kalañjar king who assisted Jayapala on this occasion has been generally identified with Dhañga who was on the throne in 990-991 A.C. when the Sultan appeared in India. We have no means to check the account of the Muslim writers which is one-sided. But fortunately here comes to our aid a verse of the fragmentary Mahoba inscription of the time of Kirtivarman, which avers that "he (Dhañga), by the strength of his arms, equalled even the mighty Harivra who had proved a heavy burden to the earth".4 Harivra of the afore-mentioned inscription is the Sanskritised form of the Arabic word Amur, and as already pointed out by scholars, it was applied as a royal title to the Yamini kings of Guzni and some provincial governors and others.5

Hultsche, who edited the Mahoba inscription, expressed that the battle was not in favour of Dhañga.6 S.K. Mitra, on the other hand, emphasised the use of the root tud and its various shades of meaning, and took the verse to mean that Dhañga proved himself "equal to the Sultan".7 H.C. Ray, who would give no credence to the evidence of Firishta, doubted the veracity of the evidence. He writes that "to compare Dhañga's prowess to that of the terrible Harivra may have appeared to a late praśastikāra, writing at least a hundred years after that prince's death, to be deserving of the highest reward. If Dhañga really fought and was defeated by the Harivra, we should expect a discreet silence from the poets living at the court of his successors".8 Thus the use of the expression stārṇa yah sva-bhujayor in the verse need not be taken to show Dhañga's direct participation in the war fought against Sabuktigin in Lamhātan, and the view of the Muslim historians, which is one-sided, has to be taken as not wholly true, nor does the statement of the Mahoba inscription deserve full credit.9 It appears to have been a drawn battle.

As we are informed by the Khañurāh inscription set up by his descendant Jayavarman, Dhañga had a long life extending over one hundred years and he ended it by throwing himself alive in the confluence of the Gangā and the Yamunā at Prayāga, while meditating on Rudra (Siva), to whom he was devoted.10 His devotion to the deity is also known from his erecting a magnificent and charming temple in honour of him, at his capital, Khañurāh, with installation of a linga of emerald in it and by establishing

1 T.N.R., Vol. I, p. 82. Dhañga was a contemporary of Yamini Sultans Sabuk-figlin, Ismail and Mahnna (998-1030 A.C.).
3 For example, see Briggs, Vol. I, p. 18.
4 No. 113, v. 17.
7 Also see I.H.Q., Vol. XXV (1949), p. 213.
9 For the details, see Infūtā-Chayavatā (Dr. Sampuranananda Felicitation Vol.) Pt. II, pp. 54-55, where R.K. Dikshit has considered the question in detail. For the contrary view stating that there was no direct fight between Dhañga and the Yamini invader, see E.R.K., pp. 66-67. I.H.Q., Vol. XXXIII (1957), pp. 133 f.
10 No. 114, v. 55.
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learned Brāhmaṇas in its precincts, which also shows his benevolent activities.1 His charitable disposition is evidenced from his gift made to Brāhmaṇas at Kāśi, on a lunar eclipse on the full-moon day of Kārtika, which is generally taken to be a holy day, and also by performing tīrātīrṇa.2 To show his catholicity in the different forms of religion, we may cite the instance of Pāhlila, a Jaina devotee, who was highly honoured by him.3 The praśasti recording the construction of a Śiva temple pays obeisance in its end, to Vāsudeva and the Sun, as already seen above.

In the administration of the kingdom, Dhaṅga was assisted by his Chief Minister, Prabhāsa, born in the family of Akshapāda. This person was meritorious, possessed good qualities and high learning, and was also proficient in statesmanship.4 The religious functions of the kingdom were looked after by the purūshita Yaśādhara who was also the Chief Justice (dharmanāthikārin).5 We have already seen how the outlying and strategically important region of Dudhā was put in charge of the king’s brother, Krishnapa. That Dhaṅga used to honour learned persons is known from the instance of the poets Mādhava and Śrīśūrma (or, the illustrious Rāma?), the composers of the praśasti. The latter of these persons also enjoyed the title Sāhityarājāntakara,6 probably awarded by the king himself. Karanika (scribe) is another officer mentioned in one of the Khajuraḥo inscriptions.7

The name of Dhaṅga’s queen is not known from any of the records found so far. But according to the Mau and the Mahābā inscriptions,8 his son was Ganḍa, who succeeded him some time after 1002 A.C., which is his latest known date when he had already enjoyed a long life of more than one hundred years by that time.

GANḍA

C. 1002 to C. 1018 A.C. (?)

The period of Ganḍa’s rule has to be placed between 1001-02 A.C., the latest known date of his father Dhaṅga, and 1019 A.C., the earliest known date of his son, Vidyādhara. The date of his accession is a matter of dispute, as may be related here in brief. In 1008 A.C. the Turks renewed their invasion against the Śhīṣas, the guardians of India, and the leader of their forces in this campaign was not Sābuktīgin as on the previous occasion, but his son Mahmūd who succeeded him in 999 A.C., and who had taken a vow “to wage a holy war against the infidels of India, every year”. Mahmūd’s object this time was to subjugate the Śhīli chief Anandapāla, the son and successor of Jaipāla. On an earlier occasion, in his expedition against Maltān, in 1005-06, this chief refused to comply with the request of Mahmūd to allow him a passage through his kingdom, as the Sindh was flooded due to rains, which he refused; and this is why the Sultān directed his attack against the Śhīli ruler, who was helped this time also by the rājā of Ujjain, Gwalior, Kālanjār, Delhi and Ajmer and the king of Kanauj.9 As to the identity of the rājā of Kālanjār, there is no certainty, for, whereas Smith and Vaidya identify him with Ganḍa, H.C. Ray held that it is not unlikely for Dhaṅga to have lived up to 1008 A.C. which saw the downfall of the Śhīli dynasty.10 But this view cannot now

1 Ibid., v. 50 and 53
2 No. 100, 1.8, and No. 114, v. 52, respectively.
4 No. 125, v. 20-21.
5 No. 114, v. 56.
6 Ibid., v. 88.
7 No. 99, v. 48.
8 Nos. 113, v. 19 and 125, v. 4, respectively.
9 Briggs, Firishtha, Vol. I, p. 46. As R.S. Tripathi has pointed out, there is no mention of the second confederacy either in Ulris or in Ibn Asir, for which, see H.K., p. 283, n. 3.
be held in the light of the lately found Kundēśvara copper-plate which shows that Vidyādhara was on the throne in 1004 A.C.\(^1\)

No inscription of Gānda has so far been known. His name is found in three of the later records of the house, viz., the Mahōbā fragmentary inscription of the time of Kirtīvarman, the Mau inscription of the time of Madanavarman, and the Ajayagadh stone inscription of the time of Bhōjavaran.\(^2\) In the first two of these records his description is only conventional, but the last one furnishes an additional information, viz., that Jājūka, who belonged to the Vāstavya race of the Kāyasthas and was endowed with the title of Thakkura was entrusted by the invincible king Gānda with the work of superintending all the affairs (of the State), and (for this) he was to enjoy the village of Dugaudā, which was granted to him. From the Mau stone inscription we learn that Prabhāsa, the Chief Minister of Dhaṅga continued to be so under Gānda also.\(^3\)

**VIDYĀDHARA**

**c. 1018 to 1030 A.C.**

Gānda's successor, according to the Mahōbā and Mau stone inscriptions referred to above, was his son Vidyādhara. We have no inscription of this ruler, except the Kundēśvara copper-plate mentioned above; and the limit of his reign, which is not definitely known, is calculated here on the evidence of contemporary sources.

The reign of Vidyādhara witnessed two important political events giving a turn to the history of North India, viz., the collapse of the Śāhis who were the guardians of north-west India, and the fall of the empire of the Gūrjara-Pratihāras, so far constituting the imperial power in North India, both of them facilitating further penetration of the champions of Islam in the region. Both these events will be referred to here only in brief as our main purpose is to know the role played by the Chandālla ruler, who is said to have been "the greatest ruler of India in territory and as one who had the largest armies".\(^4\)

The first of these events, namely, the breakdown of the Śāhis, in the form of the defeat of Trilōchanapāla, has already been described above. Emboldened by his success and with his iconoclastic zeal, Mahmūd again set out in 1018 A.C., with "the intention of conquering Kanauj", as the same authority tells us. He directed his forces in the Gāngā-Yamunā valley, when he crossed the Yamunā, without any opposition, and proceeded to the imperial city of Kanauj. On his approach, the Gūrjara-Pratihāra ruler, Rājyapāla, who was struck with panic, took to flight\(^5\) and the premier city of Hindustan was left to the mercy of the invaders, playing havoc in the form of massacre, imprisonment and plunder, and laden with rich treasures, Mahmūd returned to Gazni, with an enormous amount of booty.\(^6\)

For his ignominious escape, Rājyapāla was rebuked by the Chandālla ruler, Vidyādhara; and at his instance he was slain by Arjuna, who was the latter's feudatory,

---

1 See No. 200.
2 No. 113, v. 19; No. 125, v. 4; and No. 130, vv. 5-7.
3 No. 125, v. 21. Since all about Gānda was written here and elsewhere, my attention was drawn to the lately found copper-plate, belonging to the time of his son Vidyādhara and dated V. 1060 (1004 A.C.). It is edited here under No. 200. It shows that Gānda either did not come to the throne, or, if at all, he may have ruled only for a very short time extending over a few months.
5 This is according to the Kithā Zaim-ul-Akbar, for which see D.H.N.I., Vol. I, p. 604, n. 4. The Tabqāt-Akbari, on the other hand, says that Rājyapāla had submitted and rendered allegiance to Mahmūd. See T.A.D., Vol. I, p. 12.
as will be narrated in the history of the Kachehphargahā dynasty. The same incident is referred to in the Mahobā inscription of the time of Kirtivarman, which says that Vidyadharā caused the destruction of the king of Kanyakubja. Thus we see that Vidyadharā is the first Chandella ruler who openly discarded his vassalage to the imperial throne of Kanauj.

Reverting to Mahmūd, we find that he again set out for India in the autumn of 1019 A.C., "with larger preparations than before". Scholars are not unanimous in their opinion as to the Sultan’s aim in planning this expedition. For example, Smith, on the authority of Nizāmuddīn, held that becoming furious on account of Vidyadharā’s and his followers’ action of inflicting punishment on a prince whom he regarded his feudatory, Mahmūd “resolved to take speedy vengeance on the audacious confederates”. On the other hand, H.C. Ray was inclined to suggest that the cause of this expedition was not Vidyadharā’s attack on the Kanauj prince but the Chandella prince’s intention of attacking the territory conquered and annexed by Mahmūd. Utbi, however, attributes this expedition only to Mahmūd’s ambition and love for plunder.

Viewing all these different statements which are expressed on the motive leading to Mahmūd’s expedition, I am tempted to hold that possibly the last one of these may have been the main intention of the Sultan, and the other two may have followed it, after his approach to India and getting the information of the affairs taken place here during the time when he was at Gazni. Whether or not, this was indeed his first expedition directed against the Chandellas, Proceeding through Kanauj and its neighbouring places, Mahmūd came to the border of the Chandella kingdom. To oppose the alien aggression, Vidyadharā went out to meet him, with 36,000 horsemen, 145,000 foot soldiers and 390 elephants, according to Nizāmuddīn. The same authority also informs us that “when the Sultan encamped in front of Nanda’s (mistake for Bidā, i.e., Vidyadharā’s) army, he first sent an envoy to the Chandella ruler, inviting him to submit and to accept Islam. But the latter refused to place his neck under the yoke of subjection. 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 (Vidyadharā’s) army. Then, when he saw what a vast host it was, he repented of his coming; and placing the forehead of supplication on the ground of submission and humility, prayed for victory and conquest from the Giver of all Mercies”.

We have no knowledge of where the battle took place, except that it was on a river, which is not named. The account of the conflict between the two forces is not the same between the Muslim chroniclers. Nizāmuddīn and Firishta give a different version of the encounter, stating that Vidyadharā stealthily fled away, on night, at on account of the fear of the invader, leaving behind his army and the munitions of war, to be plundered by the Muslim forces. However, taking into account all the diverse records of the Muslim chroniclers, I am led to believe with the other scholars that what we find in the Muslim

---

1 No. 113, v. 22. I do not agree with Smith and others who held that Vidyadharā was the crown-prince when he marched against Bālyapāla. For this view, see E.H.I., p. 395; Ind. Ant., Vol. XXXVII, pp. 128, 142; H.K., p. 286, n. For if we agree with V.V. Mirashi who suggests that the Paramā Bbōṣa and the Kalachuri Gāngīyadvē also seem to have fought under the leadership of Vidyadharā in this expedition (C.I.T., Vol. IV, p. 1000s), their dates would suggest that Vidyadharā was king at that time. Mirashi’s suggestion is now confirmed by the lately found plate of the time of Vidyadharā (No. 200), telling us that he was on the throne in 1004 A.C.


4 Kyīr., p. 468.

5 Firishta gives the number of infantry as 45,000 and that of elephants as 640. The number again varies according to some other authorities.


sources is all partial and one-sided. That Mahmūd had to undertake another expedition against Vidyādharar in 1022 A.C. evidently shows that this battle was not decisive and the Chandella ruler's retreat may have been only strategic.1

In 1022 A.C., Mahmūd again came down to India, but his route this time was different, i.e., via Gwālior, where he laid siege to the fort. He held out the siege for four days; and after concluding peace with the local ruler, advanced towards Kālañjar, situated on a lofty crag of a precipitous rock of hard stone. He surrounded the fort, and the siege was raised when the Chandella ruler, as we are informed, sued for peace, promising to pay an annual tribute and to surrender 300 elephants.2 Vidyādharar is also said to have sent to the Sultān some verses which he himself had composed, in Hindi, in praise of the latter. They were highly appreciated and Mahmūd expressed his pleasure by issuing a farīdān confirming the Chandella king in the possession of fifteen forts, including Kālañjar. There was also an exchange of costly gifts and presents between the two rulers, and Mahmūd left for Gauzī, "with victory and triumph".3

Considering the whole situation, we find that Mahmūd launched two expeditions against the Chandellas, but in both of them he was far from achieving his aim. In the first of them he failed to enforce Islam on Vidyādharar, to whom he had sent a message, or to annex any of his territories. And, if we are to believe the statement of Nizāmuddin, viz., that the Sultān's mission was to punish the Chandella ruler, there is no reason to comprehend why with his heart full of nervousness on seeing the vast Chandella forces he had an occasion to repent of his coming there and praying for victory from the "Giver of all Mercies". And above all, if the next morning he found the Chandella camp abandoned, there is no reason why he should have retraced his steps only after looting it. Whether Vidyādharar left the field, or not, and whether there was actually a struggle or not, he should have pursued Vidyādharar and destroyed him. All these considerations go to indicate that Mahmūd, "who had no hopes of victory, only took advantage of the situation and withdrew".4 His ambition in the second invasion against Vidyādharar was again foiled, since we learn that this time too he raised the siege of the fort only on the exchange of gifts and presents, after which he returned to his country.5

On the other hand, estimating Vidyādharar's activities on both these occasions, we find that he made a supreme effort to resist foreign attacks, as we are informed by Ibn-ul-Áhir.6 We have epigraphic evidence in support of this statement. The Dēṅgādh inscription of the time of his grandson, Kirituvārman, states that his (Vidyādharar's) fame spread far and wide and "his lotus-feet were bowed down to by the multitude of princes".7 The latter of these statements is specified in the Mahābā inscription of the same king, which avers that he (Vidyādharar) "gathered the flowers of the fame of his enemies".8

---

1 As already suggested by R.K. Dikshit in Sampurnananda Felicitation Vol. Pt. II, p. 62. How all these accounts are partial is shown by S.L. Katara in I.H.Q., Vol. XXXV, p. 343. Among other examples cited by him, one is that Vidyādharar started with 300 elephants, as already stated, "How could Mahmūd find according to the same source, as many as 380 elephants while plundering the former's camp after he had left?" See ibid.
2 See Elliot, Vol.II, pp. 467 ff. According to K.Z.A., pp. 79 ff, jātāya was also imposed upon Vidyādharar; but in fact the exchange of gifts and presents came to be depicted as tribute, as already shown by S.K. Mitra in E.R.K., p. 82.
4 For details, see I.H.Q., Vol. XXXV, pp. 354 ff.
5 Taking both these expeditions against Gauzī, Cunningham conjectured that in the first of them Mahmūd did not follow his enemy probably because "the spring in 1022 A.C. was already too far advanced to justify his entering upon a long campaign at so great a distance from Ghazī", and in the second invasion the Chandella ruler submitted to him. See A.S.I.R., Vol. II, p. 432. But we have nothing to corroborate this asumption. Besides, as seen above, Vidyādharar, and not Gauzī, was the king at the time.
7 No. 111, v. 1.
8 No. 113, vv. 21-22.
which probably signifies his victory against the foreign invasion, probably with the help of some of the rulers as implied by another verse of this record, telling us that “this master of warfare (samara-guru) was worshipped by Bhōjadēva (the Paramāra) and the Kalachuri-chandra (Gāndēya).” The efforts that Vidyādhara made for protecting the country against foreign invaders appear to have been also alluded to in the Mau stone inscription, which compares him with Vāsava (Indra) against the forces of the demons. From an inscription of the time of Jayavarman, which is unpublished, we learn that Vidyādhara “churned the wide ocean of the valiant Muslim prince.” The accumulated references show that Vidyādhara, whose kingdom extended up to Yamunā in the north, was indeed the greatest ruler in North India and one of the leading monarchs of the time.

From the Mau stone inscription often referred to above, we learn that Vidyādhara was assisted by a capable Chief Minister whose name was Śivaṇāga. He was the son of Prabhāsa, who served Dhanga and Gpāḍa in the same capacity and made other rulers tributary to him by his strength and warfare. By his intelligence and learning he is compared with Bṛihaspati. Vidyādhara’s chief queen was Satyabhāma.

VIJAYAPĀLA

c. 1030 to c. 1051

Vidyādhara was succeeded by his son Vijayapāla, as we learn from verse 6 of the Mau stone inscription, referred to above. No inscription of the reign of this ruler has so far been found; nor are we able to fix the limits of his reign definitely. The last known date of his father Vidyādhara is 1022 A.C., when Mahmūd launched his second attack on Kālaṇjar, as seen above; and the next certain date is V.S. 1107 or 1052 A.C. when his son Dēvaraman issued the Nanyaurā gram. During this period of thirty years which elapsed between these two dates, we have to accommodate Vijayapāla and give some years at least to his father, Vidyādhara and also to his son Dēvaraman. Thus it may be presumed that Vidyādhara continued at least up to circa 1050 A.C. when he was succeeded by his son Vijayapāla, and the latter may have been on the throne till about 1050 A.C., when he was succeeded by his son Dēvaraman.

The Mau inscription and some other records of the dynasty have only a conventional praise to describe Vijayapāla. He is said to have possessed wide-spread fame and also to have been a man of virtuous conduct, who exterminated the wicked. And though he is endowed with the imperial epithets in the grants of his successors, a study of the contemporary political circumstances goes to indicate that this ruler lacked the military genius of his father, and during his reign the influence of his house began to lose its glory, as stated below.

The Turkish invasion must have told heavily on the resources of the Chandellā kingdom, and probably its integrity was also impaired. The Kachchhaphāṭa rulers of Gwailor, who had so far owed their allegiance to the Chandellā house, appear to have began raising their heads; Mūladeva, who was Vijayapāla’s contemporary, is described in the Śāls-balāṛ inscription in such expressions as led scholars to think that he might have
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disowned his allegiance to the Chandella house. That Mahipala's son Padmapala of the same house practically became independent of the Chandella house is also shown by his designation as "the foremost among the imperial rulers" (chakravarti-tilak), in its verse 16. And possibly the Narwar house of the Kachchhapaghata, all the three rulers of which are endowed with the same imperial titles, may have started its career almost at the same time, quite independently.

On the immediate south of Vijayapala's kingdom was the territory of the Kalinga Ganga (1015-1041 A.C.), who, as we have already seen, had participated with Vidyadhara, as his feudatory, in his struggle against the Turks; but soon after he too threw off his yoke and is known to have assumed imperial titles of Maharajadhira and Paramesvara and also of Vikramaditya. With his imperial ambition, this ruler succeeded in conquering Orissa and some of its neighbouring countries, and also fixed his residence in the holy Prayag, which may have been under Dhanga, who made a gift at Kashi or Varanasi, in V.S. 1055 or 998 A.C., as we have already seen. This doubtless shows that Vijayapala's quondam feudatory, Ganga, not only overthrew his allegiance to him but also encroached upon some of the eastern portions of his territory. In the light of this, the statement of the Mahoba stone inscription of the reign of Kiritvarman, viz., that "when Ganga, who had conquered the whole world, perceived before him the terrible one..... the lotus of his heart closed the knot (i.e., the flower?) of pride in battle", has to be taken as nothing but a boast, or, at the most, that Ganga submitted to him, only temporarily, as we know from the subsequent events.

Vijayapala's queen was Bhuvana-devi, from whom he got a son of the name of Dhevavarman, as we learn from the latter's Nanyaura plate. His Chief Minister was Mahipala, the son of Sivanaga, who was in charge of administration under Vidyadhara and who is also said to have become "the standard of comparison" among efficient ministers.

To the north-east of the town of Mahoba lies a large deep lake known as Vijaya-tara, and from this name its construction has been ascribed, by Cunningham, to Vijayapala. But it is equally probable that this lake may have been built by his seventh ancestor, Vijaya-sakti, who too bore a similar name.

DEHAVARAN

C. 1050 TO C. 1060 A.C.

Vijayapala appears to have ended his career in c. 1050 A.C., when he was succeeded by his son Dhevavarman, as already stated above. This prince is known to have issued two copper-plate grants, one in V.S. 1107, on the occasion of the anniversary of the death of his mother Bhuvana-devi, and the other in V.S. 1108, on a lunar eclipse. In both these records he bears the titles of Paramesvara-raka, Maharajadhira and Paramesvara, signifying sovereign status and that of the sole lord of Kaliyug. His description in both these records is merely conventional, but it is worth noting that the latter of them mentions that he had some feudatories under him, who are, however, not named (11. 9-10).

3 C.I.I., Vol. IV, Nos. 56 and 57, v. 11 (sa Vikramaditya iti prastidah).
4 For details, see C.I.I., Vol. IV, pp. sc ff.
6 No. 107, t. 8.
7 No. 125, v. 26.
9 Nos. 107-108.
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We have no historical information about this king, who seems to have been a weak ruler. We have observed how Varanasi had slipped out of the hands of his father Vijayapala, and the weakness of Devavarman facilitated the task of his adversary, the Kalachuri Karna (1041-1073 A.C.), son of Gagyeadeva, who was his contemporary. On account of his ambition, Karna is called Hindu Napoleon, and in the first eight or ten years of his reign, he achieved remarkable victories in the east, south and west. His Rewa stone inscription, dated K.Year 800 or 1048-49 A.C., states that he invaded Eastern Bengal, overran the district of Kanchi, when he encountered with the Chola and Chalukya kings, and in the west he struggled with the king of Gujarat. Subsequent to this date, he was occupied in invading Malwa, when, in alliance with Bhima of Gujarat he captured Dhara and dethroned Jayasinha, the successor of Bhaja, as already stated in the account of the Paramaras. Soon after, Karna turned his attention to his northern neighbour. We have no means to know how far he pressed himself in his invasion of the Chandella dominions and whether there was any encounter between him and the Chandella Devavarman, but as we know from the Prabodha-Chandrodaya, a drama written in the reign of his younger brother Kiritvarman, we have evidence to show that the career of Devavarman was cut short and his kingdom was annexed by the conqueror. This account is corroborated by the Vikramatikadeva-chaturita, which avers that Karna was dead to the lord of Kaliajar. The tenor of the verse under reference shows that Devavarman was supplant and his kingdom was incorporated into that of the Kalachuris. Probably this is the reason why the name of this inglorious ruler is omitted in most of the later Chandella records.

The defeat of Devavarman appears to have taken place some time in the sixth decade of the 11th century A.C., after Karna was free from his contest in the other directions, as already referred to above, but prior to circa 1060 A.C., which, according to V.A. Smith, is the date of the accession of Kiritvarman, whose exploits in liberating the kingdom will be narrated presently. The fate of Devavarman remains unknown.

In the light of what has been stated above, Devavarman's description in his Nanyuara grant, dated 1052 A.C., viz., that "by the fire of his prowess he had devoured the whole circle of the regions, and became the spiritual guide to initiate into widowhood the wives of the enemies slain by him on the field of battle", may probably be interpreted as giving him some initial success in his struggle with Karna; but ultimately the kingdom of Jajabhuiki was absorbed into the dominions of the Kalachuris, as just seen.

Devavarman was a zealous follower of Siva (Parama-Mahesvara). We have, however, not even one spectacular example which may be shown as an outcome of this zeal.

KIRITIVARMAN

C. 1060 to C. 1100 A.C.

Devavarman was succeeded by his younger brother, Kiritvarman, who regained his ancestral dominion from the Kalachuri Karna, as has been seen above. As in many other instances, it is difficult to fix the initial year of his reign with any amount of accuracy. V.A. Smith dates his accession approximately in about 1060 A.C., and this view is generally

1 C.I.L., Vol. IV, No. 51, vv. 21-32. For details of his conquest, see ibid., pp. xxiii f.
2 p. 19, l. 6.
3 Canto XVIII, v. 93.
5 No. 107, l. 1, 3-5.
6 For Smith's view, see Ind. Ant., Vol. XXXVII, p. 149. V.V. Mirashi accepts it with hesitation; see C.I.L., Vol. IV, p. xxviii. According to some scholars this date is 1070, for which, see E.R.K., p. 100.
accepted. Smith's approximation of this date appears to be justified in consideration of the circumstances related above, viz., that Karna annexed the Chandella kingdom after about 1050 A.C. or even later by four or five years; and only subsequent to that date Kiritvarman was busy liberating it for at least some two or three years.

The earliest known year of Kiritvarman's reign is V.S. 1132 or 1075-76 A.C., furnished by an inscription discovered at Darbat, near Mahoba in the Hamirpur District, the aim of which is to record the installation of a statue of Damnittha at that place. Besides this, three more inscriptions of his reign have been so far known. One of them was found at Kalañjar and is dated V.S. 1147 = 1090 A.C.; another, which comes from Deogadh, bears the date V.S. 1154 or 1098 A.C.; and still another, which is undated, comes from Ajayagadh. The find-spots of these records along with one discovered at Mahoba, and ends with the name of Kiritvarman, are indicative of the fact that this ruler succeeded in regaining practically the whole of his ancestral dominion which had been lost by his brother.

The actual steps taken by Kiritvarman to vanquish Karna are nowhere indicated, but he had naturally to endeavour hard in the struggle as is suggested by verse 26 of the afore-mentioned Mahoba inscription in which he is represented "to have acquired (royal) fortune just as Purushottama (Vishnu) had obtained Lakshmi by churning by his mountain-like strong arms the stormful ocean in the form of Lakshmikarna who had swallowed several kings (mountains)". Lakshmikarna has been identified with the Kalachuri Karna and, stripped of its metaphor, the verse means that the Chandella king inflicted a crushing defeat on Karna, and as a result of that, snatched back from him the royal fortune. The same event is also reported by the Ajayagadh stone inscription of the time of Vitravarman, dated V.S. 1317 = 1262 A.C., which mentions Kiritvarman as a pitcher-born (Agastya) who swallowed the ocean in the form of Karna. This statement is also to be found in the Kalañjar inscription of the time of the same king. This event appears to have been referred to also in the Deogadh inscription dated V.S. 1154 = 1098 A.C., which describes him as a new Vishnu recovering fortune from other princes as he (Vishnu) recovered Lakshmi. This record further states that Kiritvarman's Chief Minister, Vatsaraja, son of Mahidhara, wrested the whole region (mandala) by his good counsel and valour. This statement, if taken as referring to Kiritvarman's struggle with the Kalachuri Karna, shows how a united and well-organised effort must have been made by the Chandella prince on this occasion. The afore-mentioned Ajayagadh inscription also asserts that Maheshvara, who was born in the Vastavaya family (of the Kanyakus), in recognition of his service rendered to Kiritvarman, who was in distress at Pitadri, earned for himself the grant of a village and the title of Visukha of Kalañjar. This statement, though it does not mention the exact type of distress falling upon the king, may also be taken, perhaps, as signifying Kiritvarman's attempts in recovering the lost glory of his house by regaining the throne, after the Kalachuri debacle, and also probably taking advantage of Karna's preoccupation in Malava, against Bhöja.

The statements of the epigraphs noticed here are also corroborated by some literary evidences. The Prabodhachandrodasya, a drama on philosophical topics composed by Krishnamisra, has a number of expressions giving the credit of the victory to one Gopala
who was a Chandella feudatory. In the prologue of the work, Gopala is said to have been the Great Boar who brought up the earth which had emerged in the great ocean of world-destruction in the form of a multitude of kings. In another passage in the main body of the drama, he is said to have obtained the goddess of victory by vanquishing the army of Karna; in still another passage he is described to have re-established the sovereignty of the kings of the lunar race, which had been destroyed by Karna in the form of Rudra; and, in the end, Gopala is described as causing the rise of the illustrious Kritivarm, after subduing Karna, as discrimination leads to right knowledge after dispelling delusion. All the references indicate the magnitude of the task performed by Gopala, and thus we know that it was mainly due to his exertion and valour that Kritivarm regained the throne. The part played by the other officers, as seen above, may also have contributed to the victory of Kritivarm.

After his success in regaining the throne, Kritivarm assumed the imperial titles of Paramabhanjaruka, Mahibhajadhiraja and Parameshvara, as we find attached to his name in the Augis grant of his great-grandson Madhavaran.

The Ajayagaha stone inscription intimates that he “created anew the kingdom”, which probably means that he took measures to establish the kingdom on sound footing by appointing efficient persons to look after all its functions well. The Mahu stone inscription (v. 8) informs us that he introduced the seven elements (saptangau) in the government of the kingdom.

Vatsaraja, whose name has been mentioned above and who was the son of Mahidhara, was the Chief Minister under Kritivarm. He constructed the hill-fort known as Kirtigiri-durge, evidently in honour of his master, and a flight of steps (ghatta), after his own name. Another officer under Kritivarm was Maheshvara, born in the family of Jajuka, who had served Gaunda. He was a door-keeper at Kalaifjar. Still another minister under the king was Ananta, a learned Brahmana who had studied the Vedas and who also knew how to control the forces of elephants and horses. He was the Superintendent of the forces of the town. By religion, he was a Saiva. Still another officer under the king was Lakshmidhara of the Gauda lineage, who is said to have established Kritivarm's kingdom. The office that this person held is not mentioned. The king's spiritual preceptor was Vasudeva alias Shrimgiri who constructed the pavilion of the Nilakantha temple at Kalaifjhar.

Lastly, we may note Kritivarm's attention to works of public interest, as is apparent from local traditions recorded by V.A. Smith, who writes that the Kirati Sagar lake (Kiriti-sagar?) to the west of Mahoba and 11 miles in circumference, was excavated by Kritivarm. Another lake of the same name and existing at Chandern in the Gunah District is also associated with his name. Cunningham also recorded a tradition, according

---

1 Hultesch, and following him, V. Smith, took Gopala to be a Brahmana general of Kritivarm. We have no reference to him as a Brahmana, and on the other hand, his description in the drama as one "on whose lotus-like feet were reflected the crest jewels of the circle of the feudatory princes", along with his adjective rajah (I. 3 and p. 12, n) leads me to agree with S.K. Mitra that he was at the head of the feudatory princes. See E.R.K., p. 96.
2 p. 11.
3 pp. 18 f. and 21-22, respectively.
4 No. 118, 11. 2-3.
5 No. 145, v. 3.
6 See n. 8 to the text of the inscription referred to here.
7 No. 111, v. 7.
8 No. 112, v. 8.
9 No. 125, v. 30.
10 No. 147, v. 3.
11 No. 140, v. 3.
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to which, the tank known as Budhiya-Tal in the fort of Kalanjar is associated with the name of this king.¹

That Kritivarman patronised men of letters is known from the drama Probodhachandradaya, referred to above. It was written during his reign and staged in his presence, and as we know from the work itself, he took great interest in its performance.

SALLAKSHANAVARMAN

c. 1100 to c. 1110 A.C.

After establishing the kingdom on a sound footing and introducing a well-organised machinery of administration, Kritivarman passed away some time towards the close of the eleventh century, and was succeeded by his son Sallakshanavarman.

The last known date of Kritivarman, according to the Deogadh stone inscription which we have referred to above, is V.S. 1154 or 1098 A.C., and as he had by this time enjoyed the throne for about thirty-eight years, we may assume that he died two or three years later, roughly to say, about 1100 A.C. The next known date supplied by an inscription at Khajuraho, is V.S. 1173 (1117 A.C.), when his grandson, Jayavarman, was ruling; and the still next date we know is V.S. 1186 (1129-30 A.C.), when Madanavarman, the grandnephew of Jayavarman, was on the throne. Thus, during the period of thirty-two years which elapsed between Kritivarman and Madanavarman, we have to fix three rulers in close succession, following the genealogy mentioned in the inscriptions, viz., Kritivarman's son Sallakshanavarman and grandson Jayavarman, and the latter's uncle Prithivivarman, with some margin on either side. Relying on this assumption, we may well suppose that each of the three rulers enjoyed a short reign; and we may agree with Smith² who has proposed the approximate dates 1100-1110 A.C. for Sallakshanavarman and 1110-1117 A.C., say 1120 A.C. for Jayavarman.

We have so far no inscription of Sallakshanavarman,³ whose name figures as Hallakshanavarman on his coins, as we shall see in the relevant place. The Mau stone inscription of the time of his grandson Madanavarman describes him as "a leader of those versed in the sacred lore, a kinsman of the virtuous, a store of art and an abode of good conduct, and a tree of paradise to all suppliants for support".⁴ This description, though eulogistic, doubtless shows that he at least continued the efficient system of government introduced by his father, an idea of which has already been given above. The next verse describes in a figurative way the court of this ruler, which was full of kings doing homage to him, which also signifies that he was attended by numerous feudatories (sāmanta-chakra), a system organised by Gopāla during the reign of Kritivarman, as mentioned in the drama Probodhachandradaya.

As for the military achievement of this ruler, the Ajayagadh inscription of the time of Viravarman, dated V.S. 1317 = 1261 A.C., informs us that "his sword took away the fortune of the Mālavas and the Chēdis".⁵ In our narration of the history of the Paramāras of Malvā, it has been noticed that the western boundary of the Chandellā kingdom was coterminous with that of the Paramāras on its east, and also that Sallakshanavarman

1 Ibid., p. 125.
2 Smith, op. cit., p. 127.
3 A fragmentary stone inscription in characters of about the 11th or 12th century was found in the ruined fort of Jhānī. It appears to mention the names of Kritivarman and Udayāditya. But it also contains the name of Sallakshanavarman, Kiidelorn, who edited the record in the Ep. Ind., Vol. I, pp. 214 ff., did not see 'any cogent reason' for identifying this ruler with the Chandellā prince Sallakshanavarman. The stone is now in the Provincial Museum, Lucknow.
4 No. 125, v. 9.
5 No. 145, v. 4.
had a struggle with his contemporary Naravarman, who was being troubled by his enemies on all sides. However, the struggle, of which we have no details, does not appear to have extended the limits of his dominions on this side.

Sallakshaṇavarmaṇa’s contemporary on the throne of Tripuri was Yaśākärma, whose accession has been placed in c. 1073 A.C. He was a weak ruler, lacking the military dash of his father, Kārṇa; and there is nothing to his credit except his successful invasion of the Andhra country, as recorded in the Khaṭṭārtha and the Jāvalpura plates.3 The northern portion of his kingdom, comprising the regions of Kanu, Vārānasa and the Gāṅgā-Yamunā Dōḍh, was lost to the Gahadvālas who came into prominence in the latter part of the eleventh century A.C.2 and Yaśākärma failed in his subsequent attempt to regain his lost portion of his kingdom.3 The defeat he had sustained at the hands of the Paramāra Lakṣmιnāyaka had already been noticed above, in the history of the Paramāras.

It is possible to assume that taking advantage of Yaśākärma’s weakness, and also of the situation prevailing in the surrounding-country, Sallakshaṇavarmaṇa invaded the Kālchurī kingdom, though we cannot definitely say that this expedition resulted in annexation of any part thereof. Or, it may be that Sallakshaṇavarmaṇa enmey to a clash with the Kālchurī forces when they were on their campaign in the Gāṅgā-Yamunā Dōḍh to regain their lost territory, as seen above. And this is perhaps how we can interpret Sallakshaṇavarmaṇa’s victory in the Antar-vēdi-vishaya, the only expression that remains in verse 38 of the Mau stone inscription referred to above.4

In his Ratanpur inscription, Jājalla (1090-1120 A.C.), the Kālchurī king of South Kōsala, boasts that he was honoured as an ally by the rulers of Kāṁyakūba and Jējābhukti, with presents of wealth, “because he was valiant”.5 Mentioning that three Chandella kings, viz., Kirtivarman, Sallakshaṇavarmaṇa and Jayavarman ruled contemporaneously with Jājalla, V.V. Mirashi held that “Sallakshaṇavarmaṇa was probably Jājalla’s ally”.6 This is an example of how this Chandella ruler strengthened his relations with the contemporary political powers by seeking their alliance.

We have some information about the administrative structure of the State under Sallakshaṇa. The Mau stone inscription informs us that Ananta, who was the Chief Minister under Kirtivarman, continued under this ruler also in the same capacity. Ananta’s sons, Vatsa, Vishnu, Gāḍāhara, Vāmana and Pradyumna, were also appointed by Sallakshaṇavarmaṇa, after they had been properly tried, to suitable posts, as found proper. It was probably Gāḍāhara who “cleared the country of thorns, dissipated the fears of the subjects, and, in an unparalleled manner, increased the royal treasure and power”.7 Here it is significant to note how the king interviewed persons for appointment and at the same time also considered heredity. The Ajayadh inscription of Sallakshaṇavarmaṇa’s successor Vīravarman mentions the name of Yaśāpāla, another officer under him.8 The verse mentioning his name is fragmentary and the name of the office that this personage held is lost. Perhaps he was Chief Minister succeeding Ananta.

1 C.I.I., Vol. IV, Nos. 56 and 57.
4 No. 125, S.K. Mitra interpreted this verse so as to guess Sallakshaṇavarmaṇa’s attempt to recapture Kanu, for which see E.R.K., p. 108. The verse is completely lost but from what remains it can also be conjectured that the Chandella king went to the Dōḍh to help the Gahadvāla Gōvindaśundara, who, as prince in the time of his father Madanapāla, who was Sallakshaṇa’s contemporary, fought a number of battles. For the account of both the Gahadvāla rulers, see H.K., pp. 305 ff. But Mitra’s suggestion is after all a conjecture which need not be stretched far.
6 Ibid., p. cxxiv.
7 No. 125, vv. 38-39.
8 No. 146, v. 3.
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JAYAVARMAN

C. 1110 TO C. 1120 A.C.

From the Mau stone inscription of the time of Madanavarman we learn that Sallakshanaavarman was succeeded by his son Jayavarman.1 This statement is corroborated by the Ajayagadh rock inscription of the time of Viravarman.2 That Jayavarman had a very short reign is already been seen above. His name is omitted in the Augasi grant of Madanavarman, which supplies three names - Kirtivarman, his son Prithivivarman and the latter's son Madanavarman.3 The reason for the omission of the name of Jayavarman along with that of his father Sallakshanaavarman, who were respectively the grandson and son of Kirtivarman, is evidently due to the fact that both these rulers belonged to a collateral line.

We have no epigraph of Jayavarman himself, except that he got "re-written, in clear letters," the Khajuraho stone inscription of V.S. 1173 = 1117 A.C., of the time of Dhanga, and set it up.4

The afore-mentioned Mau inscription describes this ruler as "an abode of generosity, truthfulness, policy and heroism, whose majesty, like the rising Sun deprives other princes of their lustre." The Khajuraho inscription which we have just referred to above, also says that his fame spread in all directions. But we have nothing to verify these vague hyperbolic statements. This ruler is not known to have led any military expedition. That he was a man of pacific nature and religious temperament will be shown presently.

As to the administration of this ruler, we learn from the Mau inscription that subsequent to the death of Ananta who was the Chief Minister under his father Kirtivarman and who abandoned his body in the confluence of the Ganges and the Yamuna, his son, Gadbhirasa, was appointed by Jayavarman, 'near his own presence', as his door-keeper (prithivaryel niyuktal). This person was well versed in sciences, military tactics and secret counsel. Another officer under this ruler was the Kayastha Jayapala of the Gauda lineage, who wrote again the Khajuraho inscription, a reference to which has already been made above.

PRITHIVVARMAN

C. 1120 TO C. 1125 (?) A.C.

Jayavarman, as we are informed by the Mau stone inscription, was succeeded by Prithivivarman, who was Sallakshanaavarman's co-uterine younger brother (sodar = varajah)5 and thus an uncle of Jayavarman. In the light of this information, the statement of the Ayagadh inscription, which uses the word tasmad after Jayavarman to introduce Prithivivarman, should be taken not in the sense of "his son" but to mean 'after him' (tasmad = anantaram). The procedure of an uncle succeeding his nephew appears to be rather unusual though not altogether unknown to history and here we may cite another example from the history of the Yadavas of Dēvagiri when the sons of Kāliyaballāla were superseded by Bhillama V.6 though it leads us to the assumption of some family struggle or war of succession. But here the Kālanjar stone inscription of the time of Viravarman comes to our aid. It clearly states that Jayavarman was devoted to Nārāyaṇa, and being wearied of shouldering the responsibilities of government, he placed the burden on the shoulders

---

1 No. 125, v. 11.
2 No. 145, v. 4. This account is supported by the Ajayagadh rock inscription of the time of Viravarman.
3 No. 118, 11. 3-5.
4 No. 114, v. 63-64.
5 No. 125, v. 12.
of......, and proceeded to the Ganges. Here the name of the person whom Jayavarman entrusted with the government has unfortunately peeled off but it was evidently that of Prithivivarman. Thus we may conclude that Jayavarman, who possessed religious bent of mind and who had no male issue, abdicated his throne in favour of his uncle, Prithivivarman.

No historical event of the reign of Prithivivarman is known so far. The Mau inscription describes him as "hating the ill-behaved (and) greatly delighting the worthy people, desirous of taking lawful wealth (and) then expanding it according to prescript of sacred objects, carefully protecting all beings and wholly intent on securing prosperity of conduct." This description is no doubt conventional but it is indicative of his peaceful rule and also shows that he maintained the boundaries of his kingdom intact.

We have seen that Gadādhara, the son of a former minister, Ananta, was appointed by Jayavarman in the office of the royal door-keeper; the same person, who was found intelligent, clever, bold and a hero able to control elephants, horses and chariots, was raised by Prithivivarman to the high office of his Chief Minister.

Gadādhara was an able administrator as well as a warrior, and he made the kingdom prosperous in all its constituent parts (savaī = an̄gaś samriddhām), and it was due to the administrative ability of his Chief Minister that Prithivivarman succeeded in governing the kingdom efficiently in those troublesome times when the neighbouring rulers were struggling with each other for supremacy and pre-eminence.

**MADANAVARMAN**

_c. 1125 to c. 1163 A.C._

As we are told by the fragmentary Mau stone inscription, Prithivivarman was succeeded by his son Madanavarman, the known dates of whose reign range from 1129-30 to 1157-58 A.C. Nine stone inscriptions and two copper-plate records of his time have been included here, besides some others which are only referred to. The inscriptions were discovered at Kālañjar, Ajayagāth, Mahōtā, Khajurāthō and Mau (Jhānsī Destr.), indicating that his sway extended to the whole of the Chandēla kingdom, including the strongholds of Ajayagāth and Kālañjar. Of the copper-plate charters, one was found at Augasi (Banda Dist.); it was issued by him in V.S. 1190 or 1134 A.C., from his camp at Bhilasa (Bhūlāsavāmī-samip-Tvāsā), and the find-spot of the other, which is dated V.S. 1192 = 1136, is not known.

From the account of the house given previously it will be seen that following Kirtivarman, who succeeded in regaining the kingdom from the mighty Kalachurī Karpa, none of his successors was ambitious enough to undertake any expedition, though holding intact the dominion in his charge. And we find that Madanavarman, who inherited the military spirit of his grandfather Kirtivarman, emulated him in embarking on a career of conquest. The aforementioned Mau stone inscription of his time states that he possessed strong arms and it also makes a bold statement in his favour by saying that "before whose name even, ever quickly flees the Chēdi king, vanquished in fierce flight; (and) through dread of whom the king of Kāli always passes his time in friendly behaviour; by whom moreover, that ruler of Mālava, full of arrogance, was quickly exterminated, while other monarchs, paying homage to him, have enjoyed supreme comfort" (v. 15).

---

3. Ibid., v. 14.
4. The Śemū grant of his grandson, Panmardin, states that the donation was made by Madanavarman in V.S. 1219 = 1163 A.C., showing that he was on the throne in that year.
5. For stone inscriptions, see Nos. 115-117 and 120-125, and for copper-plate, Nos. 118-119.
Making allowance for the expressions of the courtly panegyrist, we now proceed to study Madanavarman’s campaigns. As to his expedition against the Chédís, the name of the ruler who entered into a clash with him is not given, but here we have to recall what we have stated above, namely, that the Kalachuri Yaśākarna has suffered a defeat at the hands of Madanavarman’s uncle, Sallakshanavarman. Yaśākarna’s son and successor, Gayākarna (1123-1153 A.C.), was not only unable to retrieve the situation but during his reign the prestige of his house went further down. Ratnadēva II of Dakshinā Kōsala (1120-1135 A.C.), whose forefathers were the feudatories of the Tripuri rulers, openly renounced subordination to Gayākarna. Taking advantage of the situation, Madanavarman appears to have made an encroachment on some of the Kalachurī territories bordering on the Chandella kingdom. The discovery of a hoard of Madanavarman’s silver coins at Panwār in the Tebhālī tehsil of the former Rewā State (now a district in Madhyā Pradesh) in 1910 A.C. has been taken by some scholars to indicate that it was this part of the country that was annexed by the Chandella ruler from Gayākarna.

According to the testimony of the above-mentioned Mau inscription, Madanavarman incorporated into his dominion some of the territory of Mālavī also. We have already seen that the region on the eastern side of the Bētwā comprising Dūdāi and Dēogadh was already in the possession of the Chandellas even before Madanavarman; and taking advantage of the weakness of the Paramārā house, which was then occupied in a long-protracted war against its western adversaries, the Chaulikya of Gujarāt, against whom all its military resources had to be directed, Madanavarman appears to have encroached further upon some of the Mālavī territory which lay on the western side of the river. This is evidenced by the Augasi grant, dated V.S. 1190, which he issued near Bhīllāvāṃti (Bhīlā or Vīdīshā) and also by the situation of the villages mentioned in it, which are all on the western side of the river.

The Mau inscription does not give the name of the Mālavī ruler who is said to have been defeated by Madanavarman, and he is generally identified with Yaśōvarman. A study of our records enables us to say something definitely on the point. The grant in which the Paramārā Yaśōvarman proclaims himself as an independent sovereign was dated in October or November of 1135 A.C., and the Augasi charter of Madanavarman bears a date which corresponds to 12th January, 1134 A.C., which was the last year of the reign of Naravarman. A comparison of both these dates shows that it was some time earlier in the last year of the reign of Naravarman or the first year of that of Yaśōvarman that the Chandella ruler succeeded in establishing his authority on the region from Bhīlā in the south to Lalitpur in the north, on the western side of the Bētwā, and in the upper valley of the river. Some time subsequently, Madanavarman succeeded in extending his sway in parts of the lower valley of the river also, as we know from the Sēmarā grant recording his donation of some villages in the vishayas of Vīkaūra, Dūdhai (Dudai) and Vājāvārī from his camp at Vāridurā, in V.S. 1219 or 1163 A.C. This grant was confirmed by his grandson Paramārdin, in V.S. 1223 = 1167 A.C. This extension appears to have been made at the cost of the Kalachuris who were then holding this region.

After establishing his sway over the Bētwā valley, Madanavarman seems to have entered into a clash with the Chaulikya Jayasimha, who had during this time succeeded
in incorporating the country of Mālwa into his dominions, imprisoning its ruler, Yaśōvarman. The fragmentary Kālañjar stone inscription of the time of Viravarman states that he (Madanavarman) "in an instance defeated the king of Gūrjara, as Krishna defeated Kanśa". The Gūrjara king must evidently be taken as Jayasimhara Siddharāja; and if Madanavarman had really defeated him, the victory would have been recorded in glowing words in some other Chandella inscriptions also, which is not really the case. At the most, therefore, what may be assumed is that desiring to capture some portion of the falling kingdom of Mālwa, he may have penetrated further into it but all his efforts appear to have been foiled by Jayasimhara.

On the other hand, the Gujarāt chroniclers refer to Jayasimhara's invasion on the lord of Kālañjar. The Kuññapālacharita (I, 42) records Jayasimhara's success over Madanavarman and also states that peace was ultimately concluded between them. In view of all these statements it would appear that in their advance both the parties may have encountered each other and ultimately entered into a sort of truce, the details of which are not known. The reason why Jayasimhara entered into a treaty with Madanavarman is not known but may be conjectured: it appears that possibly he could not spend more time in Mālwa, since soon after his success in that region, his intention may have been to proceed against the Paramāras of Vāgadha who were the kinsmen of the main branch ruling in Mālwa. The details of his expedition in Vāgadha have been discussed above, in the history of that branch.

To the north and east of the Chandella kingdom stretched the great territory of the Gahadavālas of Kanauj, with their second capital at Kāśi or Vārānasi. Madanavarman's contemporary on the Gahadavāla throne was Gōwindaehandra whose accession has been placed between 1109 and 1114 A.C., and he is known not only as extending his hereditary dominion by annexing portions of Magadh and defeating the Kulachuri Yasālkarna but also in particularly succeeding in hurling back the Muslim expedition sent by Masūd III (1098-1115 A.C.), against Kanauj, "the capital of Hind". And therefore the statement of the Mau inscription, namely, that Madanavarman maintained cordial relations with the Kāś-ṛāja, has to be interpreted to show that both these mighty rulers, viz., Madanavarman and Gōwindaehandra, realised each other's power and strength, and entered into an alliance of friendship.

Madanavarman was one of the greatest Chandella kings. His military skill along with his administrative ability not only raised the power and prestige of his house at its meridian, but also extended the bounds of his realm on the west, beyond the other side of the Betwa, and on the south in the region of Teṇothar, as already seen above. The Mau inscription which we have often referred to above, describes him as a brave general leading expeditions, in its usual hyperbolic expressions. The Bāṭēsvāra stone inscription of the time of his grandson Paramardin, dated V.S. 1252 = 1195 A.C., describes him in a conventional way, which at least shows that he defeated and curbed his enemies in battles. The Ajayagadh stone inscription of V.S. 1317 = 1261 A.C. records that "he

---

1 No. 148 v. 33.
3 For the details of this second capital, see H.K., pp. 324 ff.
4 Respectively see Ind. Ant., Vol. XVIII, pp. 16 f., and Ep. Ind., Vol IV, p. 102. Also see H.K., p. 307, and n. 3.
5 Tāthāgati-Nātrī, Raverty's trans., Vol. I, p. 107; and Elliot, Hist. of Ind., Vol. IV, p. 526. Also see H.K., pp. 308 f. Also see ibid., pp. 323-24, where a statement of the Rambhānāthar (Act I, pp. 5-6) viz., that "Jayachandra's arms were like pillars to tie down the elephant-like goddess of Madanavarman's royal fortune", is shown to be baseless and not to be relied on.
6 No. 125, v. 16.
7 No. 130, v. 57.
ever wrinkled (as a thorn) in the minds of his foes. Much of his success was due to his Chief Minister Gadādhara, who was in charge of his administrative machinery and who served Madanavarmman's father, Pṛthvīvarman also, in the same capacity, as already seen, and who made him an absolute monarch of the whole earth (Chandēla kingdom). This inscription testifies to the ability of this minister by saying that "he made the government of this king proper in all its constituent parts... having gradually reduced all princes to the state of dependency by applying to six expedients (shatāguminīdāt-prayāgai) and so forth, each in due season, he made (the king's) sovereignty over the earth characterised by a single umbrella."2

The same inscription also tells us that Gadādhara constructed a temple in honour of Nārāyaṇa, excavated a tank at the village Dēdu and a stepped well at the village known as Kēndi (vv. 46-49).

Madanavarmman also took interest in excavating tanks. The Madanastīgara at Mahōbā still preserves the memory of this ruler; and another tank bearing the same name and existing at Aḥūr is mentioned in the inscription from that place.3

We find that Gadādhara served the house for three generations, under the kings Jayavarmman, Pṛthvīvarman and Madanavarmman, and therefore he must have been a very old man at the time of the last named ruler. He was succeeded by Lāhaṇa, as Chief Minister. The latter was a Brāhmaṇa, well versed in the Vedas.4

Madanavarmman had three queens, viz., Lakhama (Lakhaml)-ēvī, Vālhanapādēvī and Chāndāla (or Chandēla)-ēvī, as we learn from the Bharat-Kalā-Śravan grant of V.S. 1192 (1138 A.C.)5 An inscription discovered at Kālāṇjar informs us that he had a younger brother of the name of Pratāpavarmman.6 It is the only record mentioning this prince and the latter half of the verse giving all the information about this person has unfortunately peeled off, leaving us in dark as to what was recorded about him in it. Presumably, he was entrusted with some administrative functions.

YAŚÖVARMAN (II)

The latest known year of Madanavarmman is V.S. 1219 or 1163 A.C. when he made gifts recorded in the Sēmṛa plates, as seen above, and the earliest known date of his grandson Paramardin is V.S. 1223 =1167 A.C., when the same gifts were confirmed.7 During this short span of four years, we have to fix the reign of Yaśövarman, who was Madanavarmman's son and whose existence is revealed only by the Baṭēśvara (Baghātri) stone inscription which was registered during the reign of Paramardin, in V.S. 1252 =1195 A.C.8 Thus we see that Yaśövarman, who succeeded his father Madanavarmman some time after 1163 A.C., reigned for an extremely short period, the duration of which cannot be precisely known. It is also possible that on account of his short career in which nothing worth mentioning was achieved, his name does not figure in any other inscription, or, to hold, that he may not have even ascended the throne.

H.C. Ray has suggested that verse 9 of the Baṭēśvara record hints at an untimely end of the career of Yaśövarman, which indicates that there might have been some sort

1 No. 145, v. 5.
2 No. 125, v. 42.
3 No. 133, v. 3.
4 No. 139, vv. 19-20.
5 No. 119, II. 23 and 27-28.
6 No. 148, v. 36.
7 See No. 126, II. 12-13. In his A.S.I.R., Vol. II, p. 448, Cunningham enlisted a pedestal inscription from Mahōbā, dated V.S. (1163 A.C.), in the reign of Madanavarmman. According to this, the king appears to have continued at least up to this year.
8 No. 139, vv. 8-9.
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of dynastic troubles and that Paramardin achieved the throne at the cost of his father. This suggestion which has no base to stand upon can hardly be accepted, as also noticed by some other scholars.

The bardic lists given in *A.S.I.R*. Vol. II, p. 449 insert a Kirtivarman between Madanavarman and Paramardin; and following this, V. Smith has drawn our attention to the point that the name of Yasovarman may have been intended here, since the word kirti is synonymous with yasus (*J.A.S.B.*, Vol. I, p. 158). But this does not necessarily show that this prince actually came to the throne. That Madanavarman was the grandfather of Paramardin is also known from the Sêmā grant (No. 126, l. 13), using the expression *asmat pītāmahena* on the part of the latter-mentioned ruler.

PARAMARDIN

c. 1166 (?) to 1202 A.C.

Paramardin, as shown above, was the son of Yasovarman, whom he succeeded in the normal course of events, some time before 27th April, 1167 A.C. when he issued the Sêmā grant. For the history of this king we have eight stone inscriptions and seven copper-plate records showing the dates ranging from V.S. 1223 (1167 A.C.) to V.S. 1258 (1201 A.C.). The stone inscriptions were found at Mahōbā, Ajayagadh, Ahār (Tikamgadh Dist.), Baijāvara (Agra Dist.) and Kālañār, indicating that this ruler held under his sway the region inhabited by him; and the copper-plate grants were all issued by him from his camps outside the capital, showing that he passed most of his time in expeditions. Five of them were found, one each, at Sêmā (Chhatarpur), Ichchhāvar (Bāndā), Mahōbā (Hamirpur), Pachhār (Jhānsi) and Charkhāri (Hamirpur), and the find-spots of the remaining two are unknown. But none of the grants mention any historical event.

From the Ajayagadh stone inscription of the time of his grandson Viravarman, dated V.S. 1317 = 1261 A.C., we learn that Paramardin came to the throne when he was still a child. This statement is corroborated by the *Paramāl Rāsā*, stating that he became king at the age of five.

The period of the reign of this king has been split up in three distinct phases, namely, (a) his accession and early career; (b) the hostility between the Chandellās and the Chāhmānas; and (c) the Muslim invasion.

In our study of the first of these phases, which roughly extended from his accession to 1181 A.C., covering the first fifteen years of his reign, as already remarked above, we find him ruling over the entire dominion effectively and peacefully. The second phase of his reign begins in 1182 A.C., when we find that the Chauhān ruler Prithvirāja III, who assumed the reigns of administration in V.S. 1237 = 1180 A.C., marched against the country of Jējakahubkriti in the course of digvijaya. The Chandellā sources are silent on this episode, but the description of the Chauhān ruler's march and his struggle with Paramardin is given in the bardic tales recorded in the *Prithvirāja Rāsā* of Chand Bardālī, *Parnāl Rāsā* (Mahōbā Khaṇḍa) and *Ālha Rāsā* by Jaganika, of course, with the free

2 For example, by S.K. Mitra; see *E.R.K.*, p. 118. For all these details, see our remarks in No. 139, below.
3 No. 126.
4 Nos. 126-140.
5 For the uncertainty of the find of the stone, see our remarks in the edition of the inscription (No. 139).
6 No. 145, v. 6.
7 P. 28, v. 102.
8 As rightly suggested in *E.R.K.*, p. 119.
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mixture of facts with fiction and exaggerations. According to them, the motive of the raid is as follows: Some of the soldiers of Prithviraja, while returning to Delhi after his marriage with the daughter of one Padmaśena, lost their way and came to Mahōbā, where they entered the royal garden, and being prohibited by the gardener, they struck him down. This information soon reached Paramardin (Parmāl, as he is mentioned in them), who became enraged and sent some forces to punish the Chauhān soldiers; and knowing this, Prithviraja became provoked and decided to curb the pride of his adversary, by taking hostile steps. He ordered his troops to march against the Chandella king. A stiff fight ensued between the two armies, in which the forces of Paramardin, led by the Banāphara heroes Ālhā and Üdala, suffered heavier losses and casualties.1

It is true that the bardic tales depict the story in their own way; but we may well believe that the general outline stated in them may be fairly correct. The defeat of Paramardin at the hands of Prithviraja is corroborated by the latter’s inscriptions at Madanapur,2 accord to which, he laid waste the country of Jejakabhukti, after defeating Paramardin, in V.S. 1239 or 1182 A.C. Indication to the same is also found in a stray verse in the Sārangadharaśpadāthi, and the Prabandhachintāmāni also informs us that Paramardin saved himself by putting a piece of straw in his mouth, when attacked by Prithviraja.3

The Prithviraja Rāṣā and the Ālhā Khaṇḍa also state that Paramardin obtained some succour from an army of Kanauj. This appears to be not unlikely in view of the Chandella king maintaining cordial relations established by his house with the rulers of Kanauj, as already seen above. But this statement is not corroborated by any epigraph.

Prithviraja’s intention in leading this campaign against Paramardin was not to annex any part of the latter’s kingdom but only to curb his pride. And soon after this victory he returned to Delhi. We are therefore unable to agree with H.C. Ray who, from the title of Dasārnādhipati in the Kalañjar inscription of 1201 A.C. given to Paramardin held that he succeeded in recovering a substantial portion of his lost territory.4 In fact, no territory was lost.

The bards further state that Prithviraja appointed Pajuna Rāï, one of his generals, as a governor of Mahōbā, and also that Parmāl, who was made captive by Prithviraja, managed to release himself but out of sense of shame voluntarily put an end to his life at the Gajrāj temple, or, according to still another tale, retired to Gayā where he died.5 All these statements appear to be later fabrications, in view of the epigraphic evidences that we possess. For we have an inscription from Kalañjar and another from Mahōbā, both dated in 1184 A.C.6 i.e., in two years of the time of the struggle; and both of which were discovered at the Chandella strongholds evidently show that Paramardin who was on the throne at that time survived his defeat. His latest known date is furnished by another Kalañjar stone inscription, dated in 1201 A.C.,7 this is indeed an evidence in favour of the view that he continued to live for twenty years after his contest with Prithviraja. This view is corroborated by Muslim accounts.8

---

1 See ibid., pp. 120 ff.
3 Also see P.C.M., p. 118, where Paramardin is referred to as king of Kuntala even though his adversary is mentioned as Prithviraja of Satpādalakaka. So the actual Paramardin meant by the verse of the P.R. as also observed by D. Sharma, is the Chandella Paramardin, a contemporary of Prithviraja. See E.C.D., p. 75, n. 17.
5 See J.A.S.B., 1881, Pt. I, p. 29. Some of these statements may probably be connected with Paramardin’s defeat at the hands of Albaq.
6 Nos. 135 and 136, respectively.
7 No. 140.
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The Kālañjar stone inscription, which we have just referred to, describes Paramardin as the supreme lord (adhiraja) of Daśārṇa, evidently the Western Daśārṇa situated in the valley of the Dhasan and comprising the Jhansi-Tikambad region. The Sēmra grant of his grandfather Madanavarman, which was confirmed by him in 1167 A.C., mentions some places which are included in the same territory; and, as shown by the title, he appears to have continued his hold of this region to the end of his reign. He also seems to have subdued the Kalachuri king Jayasimha (1163-88 A.C.), as concluded from v. 6 of the fragmentary Mahōbā inscription dated V. 1240 (1184 A.C.).

Paramardin is known to have entrusted his Chief Minister Sallakshana with the government of the kingdom, but his over-indulgence in licentiousness with women, as we are informed by vv. 22-23 of the Bātēsvara stone inscription, appears to have been the cause of his failure in defending the kingdom against the more formidable foes, namely, the Turks, who had by this time conquered the Northern Dātth and the surrounding country touching the north western border of the Chandella dominions. These enemies first began to raid the outposts of his kingdom, and in 1202 A.C., as we learn from Tāj-ul-Ma’aśir, Kithu-dīn, accompanied by Sāhibkiran and Shamsuddin Altamash and others, invaded Kālañjar and besieged it.\(^1\) Paramardin closed himself in the fort, but in spite of offering a strong resistance, he was defeated and constrained to surrender. Aibāq welcomed this opportunity. But while arrangements for paying the tribute were being made, Paramardin died, and his minister Aj Deo resolved to hold out, reorganising his forces. Firishta, however, would have us believe that the minister caused his master to be assassinated,\(^2\) but this story is not accepted by all. As the reservoir of water in the fort, which the minister held to serve the purpose, dried up due to a severe drought, in spite of the strong will and all efforts, the fort ultimately fell to the Muslims in April, 1203 A.C. This was followed by pillage, ruthless massacre and demolishing temples and raising mosques from their material. The government of the place was conferred on Hazalbaruddin Hasan Arnal.

After he occupied Kālañjar, Aibāq proceeded towards Mahōbā and subdued it. We have reasons to agree with S.K. Mitra in disagreeing with H.C. Ray, who thinks that Mahōbā and the surrounding regions were no longer parts of the Chandella dominions.\(^3\)

Paramardin was the last great king of the Chandella dynasty. As already stated above, we have as many as fifteen inscriptions of his time, the number exceeding those of the time of any other ruler of his house. He was virtuous and bountiful,\(^4\) and was also esteemed by his subjects. We find in him a queer combination of bravery and licentiousness. In his own composition of the Kālañjar stone inscription which aims at paying homage to Śiva, he takes pride in calling himself a śringārā-virā-vrat-acharya.\(^5\) He was a devoted worshipper of Śiva, as also shown by the expression Parama-Māhēśvara attached to his name in each of the charters issued by him.

Paramardin's warlike spirit and literary attainments are poetically described in the Bātēsvara inscription (v.11), which says that he "brought about the union of both fortune and the goddess of Learning (in his own person)". The same record also reports that his court was crowded with feudal princes (v.10).

\(^1\) Ibid.
\(^2\) T.F., Vol. I, p. 197. The contemporary writer Tāj-ul-Ma’aśir says that Paramardin died a natural death, which is supported by the P. R. C. stating that he retired to Gaya. The testimony of Firishta is a later fabrication.
\(^3\) See E.R.K., p. 127. For Ray's view, see D.H.N.I., Vol. II, p. 722. Ray's observation is based on the statement of Firishta who mentions Mahōbā as 'the capital of the principality of Kālipi'. But, as we have often seen, Firishta's statements are not always to be taken quite correct.
\(^4\) No. 136, v. 3.
\(^5\) No. 140.
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As to the administrative machinery of this king, we have already seen that his Chief Minister was Sāllakshanā. His chamberlain (kaṇṭhukin) was Gaṅgādhara of the Vāstavya family. Another officer under him was Mahiḍḍha, who is mentioned in an inscription from Ajayagadh; the portion showing the duty of this officer is lost. The department of Dharmā (Judiciary) under the king was being supervised successively, by the Vāstavya Kāyaśthā Prithvīvarṇa, his successor Subhānanda and the latter's successor Thakkura Vīṣhuka. The first of these persons drafted three grants, the second, two, and the third, only one.

TRAILĪKYAVARMAN

C. 1205 to 1240-41 A.C. (or 1247?)

Paramardin was succeeded by Trailīkyavarman whose relationship with his predecessor is not definitely known but who may have been his son. He was also known as Trailīkyamalla.

We have already referred to the statement of the Prithvirāja Rāṣṭrīya, viz., that the Chālamāna king captured Mahōbā and placed his general Pājuna Rāy as the Thānāpati of that city. The same authority also informs us that this city was recaptured by Samarjit, a son of Paramāl, with the help of Narasinha, an officer of Rājā Jai Chand of Kanauj, and he ruled over the whole territory between Kālañjar and Gayā. H.C. Ray may be right in discarding the whole account since the genealogical lists in the Chandella inscriptions do not contain the name of this son of Paramardin, and on the contrary, they seem to mention Trailīkyavarman as his immediate successor. But we have no definite evidence either for accepting or rejecting the whole account of the Rāṣṭrīya, and I therefore feel inclined to hold that Prithvirāja, though he had not proceeded up to Mahōbā in his invasion, may have captured a part of the Chandella kingdom around Madanpur, the find-spot of his inscriptions, and may have placed the portion acquired by him in the charge of Pājuna Rāy, who was subsequently driven away by Samarjit.

As to the objection that the name of Samarjit does not occur in the genealogical lists in the Chandella inscriptions, it may be pointed out that the name of Madanavarman's brother, Pratāpa is given only in the fragmentary inscription from Kālañjar (No. 148), and that of Paramardin's father, Yaśōvarman, is found only in the Bhāsvar inscription (No. 139). Some more examples of the type may also be cited. We also know that Samarjit was ultimately killed by Binu-ud-din, a Musalman, and the inscriptions may not have referred to his inglorious name, as that of the Paramāra Jayasinha, Bhōja's immediate successor who is known to us only from his Māṇḍhāti grant (No. 18) and mentioned in no other record of the house.

In all, five inscriptions of the reign of Trailīkyavarman have been so far known. Four of them are all on copper-plates. The first two of these, both of which are dated in the same year V.S. 1261 (1205 A.C.), are royal charters issued by Trailīkyavarman bearing the imperial titles Paramabhāṣṭrāka, Mahārājādhirāja and Paramāṣvara, along with that of Kālañjarādhipati, i.e., the sole lord of Kālañjar; they register the grants of the villages of Kādōhā in the Pāñjūli vīśaya and of Lōhāshāṇī in that of Vikraunī, respectively, to Rāuta Sāmanta, whose father Pāpē was killed in an encounter with the Turushkās, i.e., the Turks. The gifts were made for the maintenance of the family of the deceased.

1 No. 150, v. 10.
2 No. 147, v. 7.
3 Nos. 126, 129, 130, 131, 132 and 134, respectively.
5 Ibid.
6 Nos. 141 (A and B), 142 and 143, and No. 191 which is on stone.
7 No. 141 (A and B). In B the name of the donee figures as Sāvanta.
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Of the remaining two of the four records referred to above, one is a royal grant dated V.S. 1264 (1208 A.C.), and the other, which registers a mortgage business, was dated in K. year 967 = 1212 A.C.¹

In the account of Paramardin we have seen that after occupying the fort of Kālānjār in 1203 A.C., Qutb-ud-din appointed Hasan Arnal as its governor. But the epithet of Kālānjārākhānidhīpāli applied to Trailokyaavarman in his grants is distinctly indicative of his recovery of the fort from the Muslim governor. The first two of the grants made by this ruler with the explicit mention of Mrityuka-vritti, i.e., maintenance of the family of a deceased warrior and also that of the encounter with the Turks (Turushka-yuddha) are explicit enough to show that shortly after the catastrophe of the loss of the fort, Trailokyaavarman re-organised his forces, attacked the Muslim governor and the other officers at Kālānjār, and not only drove them away from there but also pursued them up to Kakaṣadaha (in Jhānsī Dist.) where an encounter appears to have taken place, in which they were defeated and in which Pāpe also lost his life. It is significant to note here that the fortress was recovered by the Chandella forces within the time of two years, in 1205 A.C., when both these grants were made.

Confirmation to this claim may further be had from the Ajayagad inscription of Vitavarman, dated V.S. 1317 (1251 A.C.), which says that “Like Vishnu he (Trailokyaavarman) was dextrous in lifting up the earth, immersed in the ocean formed by the streams of Turushkas”.² The same verse also avers that “he was a creator in providing strong places”, and this expression signifies that he strengthened those fortresses which already existed and probably also built new ones, realising their importance in that age.

Here we may also examine what is stated in the Tabqāt-i-ṽasrī, viz., that in the year 631 A.H. (1233 A.C.) Malik Nusrat-ud-din Tāl-shi led an army from Gwallyur towards Kālānjār, causing discontinuity to the Rae of Kālānjār who had not the courage to face his enemy and who fled away.³ This statement, though not verified from any other source, clearly indicates, at least, that the fort was held by the Chandella ruler in 1233 A.C. And in view of it and in the light of the above-quoted evidence of the Ajayagad inscription, viz., that Trailokyaavarman was “a creator in providing strong places”, it may probably be held that owing to the repeated disturbances, the capital may have been temporarily shifted to Ajayagad, which, may have been the starting point of Trailokyaavarman’s attack on Kālānjār, then under a Muslim governor.⁴ That this ruler particularly strengthened this fort, as we shall see below, lends colour to the view of his shifting the capital to that place.

From the discussion given above, we gather that Trailokyaavarman succeeded in recovering the whole of his ancestral dominion, along with the fort of Kālānjār, and thus we do not find any cogency in the statement of V.A. Smith who observed that “the history of the Chandella dynasty, as one of the powers of Northern India, ends in 1203 A.D., and that Trailokyaavarman succeeded his father as a mere local chieftain, holding the eastern part of the ancestral kingdom of Jējakahukti”.⁵ We know that the Garh grants were made by him from his encampment at Vavāvād, which has been identified with a place in the Lalitpur sub-division of the Jhānsī District on the west of his kingdom, and both the places mentioned in them were scattered all over the eastern part of his kingdom.

---

¹ Nos. 142 and 143, respectively.
² No. 145, v. 7.
⁵ Ind. Ant., Vol. XXXVII, p. 146. Also see C.H.I., Vol. III, p. 314, where it is said that "after the death of Paramardin, the Chandella as an important dynasty, disappeared and the tribes also disappeared..."
Subsequent to his recovery of the entire ancestral dominion, this brave and aspiring leader carried his arms eastward and waged a successful war in the region around Rēwā in Baghelkhand. The territory then formed a part of the kingdom of the Kalachuris of Tripuri whose power was on its wane at this time. Verse six of the Mahōbā inscription, dated V.S. 1240 or 1184 A.C., probably shows that the Kalachuri ruler Jayasimha (1163-1188 A.C.) submitted to Paramardin. Jayasimha's son and successor was Vijayasimha (1188-1210 A.C.), whose reign, besides this decline, was also marked by disturbances in the eastern part of his kingdom. As we know from the Rēwā stone inscription, dated K. Year 944 = 1193 A.C., his vassal, Salakshana, the ruler of Kakrudī, near Rēwā, revolted against him and was subdued by another of his feudatories, Malayasimha. Taking advantage of the situation, Trailōkyavarman invaded this part of the country, and as we are informed by the Dhuṛēti plates, dated K. Year 963 = 1212 A.C., he succeeded in wresting this portion of the Kalachuri kingdom. The contemporary Kakrudī ruler, who owed his allegiance to the Kalachuris before this event, was of course obliged to acknowledge his supremacy.

Alurā, the village which was mortgaged by the Śaiva ascetic Śastīśiva in favour of the Rāyaṇaka Dhārēka, as we are informed by the Dhuṛēti plates just referred to, appears to be the same as Laur, which is about 48 k.m. north by east of Rēwā; and this record also mentions that it was then included in the kingdom of Trailōkyamalla, who has been identified with the Chandella Trailōkyavarman. The exact date when Trailōkyavarman acquired this territory is not mentioned anywhere, but it can be inferred. Vijayasimha's latest known record is the Rēwā stone inscription dated K. Year 96x, the reading of the first two digits of which is probable and the third, which is altogether effaced, has been conjectured to have been 0, 1, or 2; its corresponding English date thus ranges between 1208-9 and 1210-11 A.C. The earliest next date which mentions Trailōkyamalla, identified with the Chandella Trailōkyavarman, is supplied by the Dhuṛēti plates as equivalent to 1212 A.C. Thus the region around Kakrudī appears to have been stripped out of Vijayasimha's control sometime between these two dates.

It is significant to note here that with the appropriation of this region by Trailōkyavarman, not only the Kakrudī chiefs who were the erstwhile feudatories of the Kalachuri house, but also Malayasimha, mentioned in the Dhuṛēti plates as a Mahājñānakarika Māndalika and a minister, had to transfer his allegiance, as we know from the Kalachuri records of the K. Years 944 and 96x.

It is not known when Trailōkyavarman's reign came to an end. The latest certain date for him is supplied by the Rēwā copper-plate grant of the Mahārāṇaκa Kumārapālaśiva of Kakrudī, who acknowledged his sovereignty in V.S. 1297 or 1240 A.C. Cunningharn,
however, refers to a passage in the *Tabqāt-i-Nasiri*, according to which, a *Rānī* named *Dalaki wa Malaki* was ruling in a mountainous tract not far from Kara (Allahābād Dist.), which was raided by Ulugh Khān in the reign of Sultan Nāsiruddin, in 645 A.H. (1247 A.C.). According to Firishta, *Dalaki Wa Malaki* (and not two *Rāfīs*, Dulky and Mulky, as translated by Briggs) resided at Kālaṇjar. Combining these evidences, Cunningham held that the real name is Trailōkyavarmanmadēva (Tilaki wama Deo), and its corruption into *Dalaki wa Malaki* is due to Persian calligraphists. If Cunningham's contention is accepted, it shows that Trailōkyavarman lived at least up to 1247 A.C., retaining his hold on the fort of Kālaṇjar; and in view of this, it may also be held that Tūshi's attack on it in 1235 A.C., as stated above, resulted only in plundering it.

The next certain date for a member of the Chandēlla royal house, as we shall presently see, is V.S. 1311 or 1254 A.C.

Trailōkyavarman's interest in making proper arrangements for guarding forts in his kingdom has already been referred to above; and that may now be supplemented by some remarks. From the Ajayagdhi inscription of the time of Bhōjavarma we know that he appointed Vāsē, a son of the Chief Minister Vidana, to the high office of guarding the principal street of the fort at that place, and also that the younger brother of this officer was appointed to be in charge of the fort itself. Vāsē, or Vāsēka as he was also called, made Trailōkyavarman's kingdom firm by killing in battle the irresistible Bhōjuka, who, seized with the frenzy of war, was then distorting the kingdom, as we learn from verse 9 of the same inscription. The identity of this enemy is not certain, though Kielhorn suggested that he may have been the same person as the father of Abhayādīva of the Ajayagdhi stone inscription of the time of Viravarman. Nothing more in this respect is so far known, though this enemy appears to have been an internal one.

Vāsē's younger brother was Ānand, who is said to have been a great warrior who was skilled in the use of weapons and who brought under control the aboriginal tribes of the bhīlās, sābaras and pālinas residing in the fort.

Another officer under Trailōkyavarman was Madhava, who is said "to have gratified the king". The verse describing this officer is fragmentary and the portion showing his precise duty is lost.

In course of making all these appointments, as we have often seen, Trailōkyavarman is found to have observed the family tradition of bearing in mind not only the heredity of the officials but also testing their ability in a proper way.

**VIRAVARMAN**

C. 1250 to c. 1286 A.C.

Trailōkyavarman was succeeded by his son, Viravarman, whose known dates range between V.S. 1311 (1254 A.C.) and V.S. 1342 (1286 A.C.), from the records mentioned below. Two copper-plates and seven stone inscriptions of the time of this ruler have been so far known. The copper-plate records are both royal charters issued by the king and

---

4 No. 150, pp. 17 and 21–22, respectively. The distinction between the duties of both the brothers is made here in view of the expressions used, viz., *dugē vīkīhādhihāre* and *dugādhihāre*, respectively, to describe them.
6 No. 150, v. 22.
7 No. 147, v. 8.
one of them was found with the Darbār of Charkhāri (now in the Hamirpur District) and the other at Dāhā in the Chhatarpur District. The definite find-spot of the first of these charters, which supplies the earliest known date for the king, as referred to above, is not known; and the second, which was found by Colonel Ellis and dated V.S. 1337 (1280 A.C.), is now lost. Of the stone inscriptions, only four are included here. Three of them were discovered at Ajayagāth and one at Kālañjar. Those from the first of these places are dated respectively V.S. 1317 (1261 A.C.), 1325 (1264 A.C.), and 1337 (1281 A.C.), and the date of the one found at Kālañjar is lost as the record is fragmentary. Some other inscriptions of the time of this king, which are known only from Kielhorn's List or from Cunningham's writing, are either lost or, at least, no information as to their whereabouts is now forthcoming.

Still another stone inscription mentioning the name of Viravarman and dated V.S. 1372 (1315 A.C.) was found by Cunningham at the fort of Ajayagāth. But as we have another inscription from that place and mentioning the year V.S. 1345 = 1288 A.C., and Bhōjavarmān as the reigning king, H.C. Ray doubted the reading of the date by Cunningham; and if the reading is to be taken correct, we have to assume the existence of a second Viravarman succeeding Bhōjavarmān.

The earliest known year of Viravarman is 1254 A.C. when he issued the Charkhāri grant, and the latest known date of his predecessor Trailokya varman is 1233 A.C. when Malik Nāṣiruddin Tāishi invaded the fort of Kālañjar, as we have seen above. Thus he may be taken to have ascended the throne between these two dates. The upper limit of his reign, may however be taken to have been subsequent to 1247 A.C., if we accept Cunningham's identification of Dalakī Wa Malakī with Trailokya varman, as we too have noticed above. The reign of this king must have terminated between 1285 and 1288-89 A.C., the first of which is his latest known year and the second is the earliest known year of his successor Bhōjavarmān.

Viravarman was a brave and ambitious prince. The Ajayagāth stone inscription of V.S. 1317 describes this victorious ruler as "of spotless bravery who has delighted the damsels of heaven by sending them, as lovers, the hostile heroes whom he cut down on the field of battle." It further states that "he is worshipped by all men" and "when he strikes down the wicked (and) disperses crowds of opponents, people gaze awondering whether he is Vishnu riding on Garuda, or Śiva roaming about on his bull." The description is no doubt poetical, but it appears to contain a kernel of truth in it, though not mentioning anything specifically.

---

1 The first of these records is our No. 144; and for the second, see A.S.I.R., Vol. XXI, pp. 74–75. It is not included here, as the plate is lost and no impression is now available. The record was noticed in Ind. Ant., Vol. XLVII, p. 241, and commented on in I.H.O., Vol. XXXII, pp. 404f.
2 Nos. 145 to 148, respectively, Vol. XXI.
3 Kielhorn's List in Ep. Ind., Vol. V, Nos. 560, 604, 608; and one in Cunningham's A.S.I.R., Vol. XXI, p. 82, No. 53. In A.R., A.S.I., 1935–36, p. 92, N.P. Chakravarti mentions another inscription found by him at Ajayagāth on the pedestal of a colossal image of Śāntinātha and dated (V.) S. 1335, Chaitra u. 13 Sonth corresponding to 26th March, 1279 A.C., in the reign of Viravarman. The epigraph records the installation of an image by the sādhana Sādhana, the son of the sādhana Sādhana and Devakī, residing at the Jayapura-durga. The contents of this record, as given by Chakravarti, are for the preliminary portion the same as of No. 112, above, which is undated; and from its contents it also appears to be an exact copy of it. We are further informed by Chakravarti that this record "ends abruptly." It is however, somewhat curious that an inscription recording the installation of a Jaina image should begin with paying obeisance to Chandīkā, as the same scholar also informs us. For Viravarman's latest known date, V.S. 1342, see Kielhorn's list in Ep. Ind., Vol. V (app.), p. 35, No. 242.
6 No. 149.
7 No. 145, vv. 8–9.
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The Charkhtri plate records the gift of a village in the Dāhi vishaya in favour of the Rūta Abhi who was the son of Rāusa Haripāla and who performed a deed of valour by vanquishing one Dabhyuḍāvarman.¹ The identity of this adversary cannot be established for want of details, but as the name ends in varruṇa, he may have been a member of the Chandēla dynasty and may also have been a usurper, or a rebel, as suggested by Hiralal. This suggestion, however, is not accepted by other scholars.² The battle in which this adversary is said to have been defeated by Abhi was fought at Sōndhi, which has been identified with Seondhā in the Datia District of Madiya Pradesh. It is thus evident that Viravarmman, who had inherited the entire ancestral domain, as indicated by his title Kālaṇjaratrādhipati in the inscriptions, succeeded in extending it in its north west where this place is situated.

The occupation of the fort of Seondhā appears to have emboldened Viravarmman to push his conquest further in the north west, where lay the territory of the Yajvāpālas of Narwar. His contemporary on the Yajvāpāla throne was Gōpāla. The details of the struggle that Viravarmman had against Gōpāla, have been given by us in the history of the Yajvāpāla dynasty. We have shown that the forces of the Chandēla king took the offensive by launching an attack on the Yajvāpāla kingdom, and in their march they penetrated up to the village of Bāṅglā on the river known as Bālūvā or Barūvā, flowing not far from the Yajvāpāla capital, but they were ultimately repulsed. That the battle took place at this village is indicated by some memorial pillars discovered there; they bear inscriptions recording the names of warriors who were killed in it,³ and the date of the struggle has been calculated to be 28th March, 1281 A.C. Here we have also to take into account another evidence. The Dāhi copper-plate bears the date V.S. 1337, Vaishākha 15, Sunday, and it records the gift of Viravarmman in favour of a Brāhmaṇa named Balabhadra Mallaya of the Kātyāpaja gōtra, who is said to have distinguished himself by conquering the lord of Narwar (samaru-vag-pati-nalapura-pati), the ruler of Mathurā (Madiya-nalapura-pati) and Harirāja of Gwalior (Gōpādrī).⁴

D.R. Bhandarkar suggested long ago that one of the adversaries of the Chandēla king Viravarmman mentioned in the Dāhi grant was the Yajvāpāla king Gōpāla of Nalapura (Narwar).⁵ Kiethorn equated the date of this grant with 4th May, 1281 A.C.,⁶ and this date, as rightly observed by D.C. Sircar, is a little over one month later than the date of the Bāṅglā inscriptions, which corresponds with 28th March, 1281 A.C.⁷ From the combined testimony of both these records we know that they mention the same event and also that both the parties lost some warriors in the battle. But the fact that Viravarmman had ultimately to lose the battle is supported by the observation that there is no reference to this event in any of the subsequent Chandēla records.

From the Muslim accounts we learn that the Delhi Sultan Nāṣir-ud-din Mahmūd (1246-66 A.C.) subjugated Bundelkhand and appointed his governor there in 1251 A.C. Almost about this time he is also known to have subdued the regions of Gwalior, Chandēri and Malwā.⁸ But in spite of it, the fact that the Hindu dynasties not only maintained their existence but also carried on warfare among themselves subsequent to this date, clearly indicates that the Muslims did not still succeed in completely eliminating indigenous powers in these principalities.⁹

---

¹ No. 144, II, 13-14.
³ Nos. 162-174.
⁴ Notice by Cunningham in A.S.I.R., Vol. XXI, pp. 74 ff. For the other references, see n. above.
⁵ See his List of Inscriptions, No. 600.
⁹ See E.R.K., p. 137.
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From the Ajayagadh stone inscription of V.S. 1317 we learn that Viravarman's Chief queen was Kalyānadēvi, who was the daughter of Mahēsvara of the Dadhich family, from his wife Vēsaldēvi, who was the daughter of king Gōvindarāja. Kalyānadēvi built a well with "never-failing water course", a hall for the supply of water and also donated a pot for its supply. She also built a tank at Nandipura, which has been tentatively identified by Kielhorn with Ajayagadh itself.¹

Another inscription from the same place and dated V.S. 1337 mentions an officer of the name of Jagadvira under this king.² But the verse describing him is fragmentary and the details are lost. From an inscription at Kālañjar, which too is fragmentary and supplies no date, we know that Viravarman (?) constructed temples, plantations and excavated tanks and wells.³

BHÖJAVARMAN

C. 1286 to 1289 A.C.

This ruler is known from five stone inscriptions, all discovered at Ajayagadh. The earliest of them, which is dated V.S. 1344, mentions the consecration of some Saiva images; and the second, which is dated V.S. 1345 = 1288-89 A.C., records the installation of an image of Vishnu in a temple at that place by his minister Nāna, and another, which appears to have lost its date, also mentions the construction of a temple by an officer.⁴ The fourth is a sāti stone showing the date V.S. 1346 = 1289 A.C.; and the unit figure of the date of the last one is lost.⁵

Bhöjavarmar's relationship with his predecessor, Viravarman, is not disclosed by any of these records. He may have been his son or his younger brother. Nor do we know any political event of his reign. He was on the throne for a very short period and was succeeded by Hamiravarman in V.S. 1346, the details of the date being equivalent to 11th September, 1289 A.C.⁶

As all his inscriptions noted above were found at the same place Ajayagadh, it is evident that this fort was then in the possession of Bhöjavarmar. But we have no evidence to show whether he retained his hold over Kālañjar and some other strongholds in the neighbourhood, under the growing influence of the Mohammedan rulers in North India. It has been urged that his successor, Hamiravarman, actually held the fort of Kālañjar under him, as indicated by a sāti stone inscription which was found in the territory held by a feudatory prince, Mahārājaputra Vāghadēva, who uses the title Kālañjarādhipati, for Hamiravarman in 1365 A.C.; and that the fort, along with its surrounding territory, did not cease to be held by the Chandellās in the intervening period is clear from the Chañkārī grant of this ruler.⁷ But under the growing influence of the Muslim ruler in North India it appears less probable that during the reign of Bhöjavarmar and his successor Hamiravarman, the Chandellās continued to hold Kālañjar. As we have shown above, Sultan Nasir-ud-din had by this time subjugated Bundelkhand and he was also appointed

---

¹ No. 145, vv. 18-20.
² No. 147, v. 10.
³ No. 148, l. 22. The record is fragmentary and hence it cannot be definitely known whether these pious deeds were the works of Viravarman himself or of any other person during his reign.
⁴ Respectively, Nos. 149 and 150.
⁵ See respectively Nos. 193, 149, 150 and 195 (for the one mentioned last); for the fourth one, see Ep. Ind., Vol. XX, p. 134, n.2.
⁶ N.P. Chakravartī is perhaps right in assuming that Bhöjavarmar was a younger brother of Viravarman, and reigned only during the minority of Hamiravarman. See A.S.I., A.R., 1935-36, p. 92.
⁷ E.R.K., p. 139.
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governor by the royal authority in about 1251 A.C.1 He is also known to have led expeditions in the neighbouring regions; and in view of the whole disturbance, it is not possible that he may have spared this fort, one of the most important strongholds in the entire region of Bundelkhand, which he may have made a base for his inroads. If this view is accepted, the title of Kātiājaṟāṭādhīpaī attached to the name of Hammiravārman in the inscriptions appears to have been only conventional, and fails to indicate his actual possession of it. The view expressed here is, however, tentative and it is difficult to pronounce a final judgement on the point until further evidence is available. It is, however, no doubt certain that the Chandêla kingdom may have been circumscribed in Bhôjavarman's time.

From the first two of the Ajaygaḍh inscriptions mentioned above, we have some glimpses of the administrative organisation of the kingdom under this ruler. His minister was Nâna, born in the Vâstavaya Kâyaśtha family, which served the Chandêla kings for some generations. Nâna is stated to have been learned (vijñânâ-nidhi) and was an efficient statesman.2 The officer in charge of the fort at Ajaygaḍh, along with the great highway leading to it, was Thakkara Ayau.3 And lastly, Subhâṭa whose ancestors too had served the Chandêla kings for some generations and who is said to have been the leader of the eloquent, was the Chief Superintendent of the king's treasury. He was also the Counsellor of the king and the officer in charge of the storehouse.4

HAMMIRAVĀRMAN
1289 to 1309 (or 1311?) A.C.

Bhôjavarman was succeeded by Hammiravārman some time in 1289 A.C., which is the latest known year of the former and also the first known year of the latter ruler. He is known from one copper-plate record and two sati stone inscriptions.5 The copper-plate was found with the Durbar of Charkhârī near Mahôbâ in Uttar Pradesh. Its original find-spot is not known. It records the donation of the village Kôkâda (or Kikâda?) in favour of two Brâhmanas named Śrîdharma and Abhâ, who seem to have been brothers, by Hammiravārman, who is styled in it as Paramabhâṭâraka, Râjâvâlitrāyôpēta, Kâtiājaṟāṭâdhīpaī and Mahârâja. This ruler is also mentioned in it as the successor of P.M.P. Viravarman, and the latter as the successor of P.M.P. Trailôkýavarman.6

Hiralal, who edited this charter in the Ep. Ind., Vol. XX, pp. 125 ff., observed that in his own case Hammiravārman “has left out the grandiloquent title of the Mahârâja Parameśvara, which he duly attached to his elders.” From this omission it is inferred by the same scholar that this ruler “was fully conscious of his reduced position” and therefore he was content with the humble title of Mahârâja. But here it may be pointed out that when the title Paramabhâṭâraka has also been attached to his name in the record and when the other two of the whole group are already signified by the expression Râjâvâlitrāyôpēta, which also appears with his name in it, the question of the omission of the ‘grandiloquent title’ does not at all arise. The subordinate title of Mahârâja attached to his name with the imperial titles does not lead us to any conclusion, since we find both these titles used also by some other rulers in their records.7

2 No. 148, v. 25.
3 Ibid., l. 20.
4 No. 130, vv. 28-29.
5 The first two of these are our Nos. 151 and 152, respectively, and the third one is noticed in Ep. Ind., Vol. XX, p. 134, n. 2.
6 No. 151, l. 11. 5-7.
7 For example, in the case of the Paramâra Sêyaka II and Dîhâravarsha, each one of whom bore the Imperial and the subordinate titles in the same record. See Nos. 1-2, and 67, respectively.
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Here we have also to bear in mind what Hiratal himself has observed, viz., that the composer or the writer of the record was "no Sanskritist, as he has committed many spelling as well as grammatical mistakes." And in view of this observation, the expression used with the name of Hammiravarman in this record need not be taken very seriously.

Hammiravarman's relationship in the house is not definitely known. He may have been a younger brother of Bhōjavarmavar. That he may have been a son of Viravarman may perhaps be inferred from the expression ṭatt-pādānudhyāta attached to his name just after the mention of Viravarman, which, of course in most of the instances though not in all cases, signifies the relationship of father and son. The omission of the name of Bhōjavarmar in the Charkhari plate probably leads us to the same conclusion, presuming him to have been a collateral. Thus there was no war of succession, as also has been suggested by Hiratal.

No historical event of the reign of Hammiravarman has so far been known. But from the Bāhmni Satī stone inscription, dated V.S. 1365 or 1308-09 A.C., we know that a Māhārājaputra Vāghadēva was his feudatory, holding his sway in a part of the Damoh District, as we have also seen above.

During this time, the Yādavas of Dēvagiri were invading the Kalachuri territories and from there also encroaching upon the southern borders of the Chandélla kingdom. The Purushottamapurī plates of the reign of the Yādava king Rāmachandra, dated Śaka 1232 (1310 A.C.) claim for him a victory over the king of the Dāthala country, who was presumed to have been Hammiravarman. As we have already seen above, the Paramātras too had then penetrated up to the Śīgar District. Thus during the reign of this king the Chandélla kingdom appears to have been circumscribed, facilitating attacks of enemies from all sides.

The latest known year of Hammiravarman supplied by the Ajayagadh Satī stone inscription is V.S. 1368 or 1311 A.C. By this time he has been on the throne for about twenty years. It is not recorded when he ceased to rule; nor have we any definite evidence about his successor. On the other hand, from a village of the name of Salaiyā, about 5 kms. from Bāhmni, we have another Satī stone inscription dated V.S. 1366 (1309 A.C.), mentioning Sultān Alī-ud-din as the reigning king. It would thus appear that the career of the house came to an end and the kingdom of the Chandellās finally passed into the hands of the Muslims in about 1309 A.C. It is possible that some of the members belonging to this house may have continued to wield their sway in some remote corners of the state, for example, Viravarman II, who is known to us from an inscription of 1315 A.C., as already seen above, of course presuming that Cunningham's reading of its date is correct. It would, however, appear that Hammiravarman himself, or his successor, was subjugated by Alī-ud-din and his kingdom was annexed.

1 Ep. Ind., Vol. XX, p. 134. The engraving of the record is also equally careless, and what Hiratal reads Sthit and explained it as due to the Muslim influence then prevailing in the surrounding region, appears to us as -tyātā from the impression.
2 No. 132.
4 No. 153.
6 From the dates of the Satī stones at Bāhmni and Salaiyā, it seems reasonable to hold that Alī-ud-din's armies, which were at that time marching to the Deccan, may have captured the region around Damōh in 1309 A.C., but Ajayagadh continued to remain in the possession of the Chandellās for about two or some more years and at least till 1311 A.C., which is the date supplied by the Satī-stone inscription found at that place. We have no decisive evidence to show that the Chandellās were permanently driven out of Kā拉萨jār. Also see D.H.N.I. Vol. II, p. 735, which says the same.
7 See supra, p. Here we may add the name of another Paramārād known from an inscription of V.S. 1466 (1409 A.C.) and who, if belonging to the Chandellā family, should be taken as the second ruler of the name. See below, No. 196.
INTRODUCTION

THE KACHCHHIPAGHĀTAS

The royal house of the Kachchhipaghātas, or Kachchhipāghātas, of which three distinct families have so far been known, arose out of the ruins of the imperial Pratihāra dynasty after its decline in the middle of the tenth century A.C. These families held sway over regions around Gwālior, Dubkūṇḍ and Narwar, respectively.

The origin of these houses is shrouded in mystery. They are generally taken to be the predecessors of the Rājpūt clan known as Kachchhavāh or Kuśavāh, 1 and though the words are philologically connected, we have no epigraphical evidence in support of this view.

I GWĀLIOR HOUSE

Our main source of material for reconstructing the history of this house consists of an inscription set up in the temple, popularly known by the name of Sās-bahā, in the fort of Gwālior. Another inscription, which is fragmentary and which was found at the same place, is now exhibited in the State Museum at Lucknow. 2

The first historical person mentioned in the Sās-bahā inscription was Lakshmana, who is described in it as “an ornament of the Kachchhipagātha race, who had, by force, extirpated mighty princes”. 3 This conventional praise may probably be taken to show that this ruler sided with those who caused the downfall of the imperial Pratihāra dynasty, though we have nothing to corroborate this suggestion. From his description in the inscription as a king (kṣhāṇi-pati) he appears to have carved out a principality for himself, nothing about which is so far known as stated above. That his capital was not at least at Gwālior, the credit of capturing which from the enemies is given to his son Vajradāman and not to himself, as we shall presently see. Or, even though the royal epithet of a king applied to him shows that he may have enjoyed some regal power, it is possible to hold that he may have been referred to merely as an ancestor and was called a king by courtesy.

VAJRADĀMAN

C. 950 TO C. 980 A.C.

The Sās-bahā temple inscription informs us that “Vajradāman, son of Lakshmana, by his irresistible strong arms captured the fort of Gwālior from the ruler of Gadhinagar”, which is generally identified with Kanauj. 4 He has been identified with the homonymous Kachchhipaghāta ruler who was living in V.S. 1034 = 977 A.C., as we know from an inscription at Suhāniyā (Mōrenā District). 5 From the Rākhētra stone inscription of

2 Our Nos. 155 and 156, respectively. The Lucknow Museum contains another fragmentary stone inscription, for which, see p. 126, n. 1 below.
3 No. 155, v. 5
4 Ibid., v. 6. For this name of Kanauj, see H.K., p.4.
5 I.A.S.B., Vol. XXXI (1862), p. 411. It mentions Vajradāman as Mahārājādhirāja, but we have often seen above that this imperial title was not inconsistent with the feudatory rank in that period. See the Rājkī stone inscription of Mathurādāva of V.S. 1016 or 950 A.C. in the Epi. Ind., Vol. III, pp. 265 ff. Also cf. No. 154, 1. 58, mentioning Vikramaditya of the Dubkūṇḍ branch as Mahārājādhirāja, and No. 157, in which all the three kings belonging to the Narwar branch are given this title. It is, however, possible that in the days of the weakness of their overlords, the Chandelines, these kings may have proclaimed independence, or at least feigned to do so.
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Vijayapâladéva, dated in V.S. 999-1000, we know it for certain that this fort was held by the Pratihâra ruler till at least 942-43 A.C.; and from this it is evident that the Pratihâras must have lost it some time between that year and 977 A.C., which is the year of Vajradâman’s inscription. We have seen above in the account of the Chandellâs that the fort of Gwâlîor was held by Dhanga as early as in V.S. 1011 or 953-54 A.C., and when Vajradâman is said to have captured it on or before 977 A.C., the possible conclusion is that the conquest of Gwâlîor by the Kachchhapâghâtas and the Chandellâs refer to one and the same event when they sided with each other in defeating the Pratihâra ruler who has been identified with Vijayapâla.²

Vajradâman was a liberal ruler. He often distributed quite pure gold after weighing himself against it.³

MAÎNGALARÂJA

c. 980 to c. 1005 A.C.⁴

Vajradâman appears to have closed his reign in c. 1000 A.C., when he was succeeded by his son, Mangalarâja, who is conventionally described as scattering his enemies as the Sun does the darkness. He was devoted to Śiva, unlike some other members of the house who are known to have been Vaishnavites.⁵

KÎRTIRÂJA

c. 1005 to c. 1030 A.C.

Mangalarâja’s successor was his son, Kirtirâja. His description in the inscription referred to above, that “in his march, the sheet of dust rising from the armies took away the colour of the Sun and at the same time that of his enemies” (v. 9) does not appear to have been a vain boast, for he is also said to have “repulsed the army of the Mâlava king, whose countless host met with defeat and received such a terrible shock that the multitudes of spears fallen from their hands in every direction through fear were subsequently collected by the villagers (of course of Gwâlîor) and were used for surrounding their houses” (v. 10). The Mâlava ruler may be identified with the Paramâra Bhôjâdēva. We have seen above in the history of the Paramâras that this valorous feat appears to have been accomplished by Kirtirâja with the help of the Chandellâ Vidyâdharâ and also how Bhôja was afraid of him. But with all his valour he had to suffer from a blow outside. It was probably Kirtirâja or his father Mangalarâja who had ultimately to surrender to Mahmûd of Gaznâ, when the latter invaded Gwâlîor in 1021 A.C. in the course of his expedition against the Chandellâ Vidyâdharâ.⁶

---

3 H.C. Ray suggested that the Kachchhapâghâtas were at first feudatories to the imperial Gîtrâja Pratihâras and subsequent to their conquest of Gwâlîor they had soon to yield to the rising power of the Chandellâs, but this view is not acceptable to S.K. Mitra, for which see E.R.K., pp. 38 ff.
4 The period of the reign of each of these princes is conjectural, calculated by assigning the usual average, as in such cases, of 25 years to each reign and giving only 10 years to Padmapâla who is stated to have died young.
5 He is probably to be identified with his namesake mentioned in the ‘Ukhâ Mandar’ stone inscription at Bâyana (Bhairatpur Dist.), Râjasthân. See A.S.I.R., Vol. VI, pp. 50 ff.; Ind. Ant., Vol. XIV, pp. 9-10.
6 T.A., p. 14; S.E., p. 18. The ruler of Gwâlîor is styled nâhâm, sâdâr or râjâ, respectively, by Nizâmud-î-Gurjâtî and Fîrûzshâh, showing that he (Mängalarâja) was not an independent ruler but only a feudatory, of course, under the Chandellâ Vidyâdharâ.
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Kirtirāja was devoted to Śiva. He built a temple in honour of the deity at Simhapāniya, modern Suhāniya in the Mōreṇā District.

MŪLADĒVA

C. 1030 to c. 1055 A.C.

Kirtirāja was succeeded by his son Mūladēva, who was known also as Bhuvanapāla and Trailōkyaamalla. Nothing about this ruler is so far known except that his queen was Dēvārvatā, from whom was born a son named Dēvapāla, who succeeded him. His Secretary was Manorathu, a Kāyastha of Mathurā.

DĒVAPĀLA

C. 1055 to c. 1080 A.C.

The Śās-bahū temple inscription describes this ruler only figuratively, stating that he surpassed Karna by his generosity, the son of Prithu (Arjuna) by his skill in using the bow, and Dharmarāja (Yudhishthira) by truthfulness (v.15). But as nothing specific about him is mentioned in it, he does not appear to have been an ambitious ruler. No political event of his reign is recorded.

PADMAPĀLA

C. 1080 to c. 1090 A.C.

This ruler was the son and successor of Dēvapāla. The Śās-bahū temple inscription devotes nine stanzas (vv. 16-24) to describe his heroism, valour, piety and some other personal qualities, but without mentioning any historical event of his reign. However, his description though vague and conventional, may tend to show that taking advantage of the weakness of his overlord, the contemporary Chandēlla king, he may have proclaimed independence, as can be known from the epithet chakravarti-tillaka, applied to him in verse 16 of the Śās-bahū temple inscription, which we have often referred to above. This imperial position appears to have been continued also by his brother and successor, Mahipāla who is described as bhattipati-chakravarti in verse 72 of the same record.

This ruler began to construct a temple of Hari; and we are further told that before the shrine was completed, he died and was succeeded by Mahipāla, son of Śūrapāla, or Śūryapāla.

MAHIPĀLA

C. 1090 to c. 1115 A.C.

Mahipāla was probably the cousin of Padmapāla, who had no son. The inscription devotes as many as thirty-eight verses to describe his personal qualities and coronation (vv. 30-68), but they are all historically worthless. This ruler completed the temple, the construction of which had been begun by Padmapāla. He also attached a Brahmmapuri to it, established a charitable hall where food and drink were distributed, and made suitable arrangement for the maintenance of all these establishments.

The known dates of this ruler are 1092 A.C. when the Śās-bahū inscription was engraved and 1104 A.C., when another inscription was set up.1

---

1 This name appears to have been chosen to honour the memory of his brother Padmapāla who had begun to erect the shrine.
2 Nos. 155 and 156.
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RATNAPĀLA

c. 1115 to (?)

Mahipāla's son, born of Ramadēvi, was Ratnapāla, who succeeded him some time before V.S. 1165 = 1108 A.C., which is his only known date. Nothing about him is known, though this appears to have added a new name in the Kachchhaphaghāta genealogy.¹ Nor do we know any name of any of his successors. This region, as is well known, was conquered by the Muslims in 1196 A.C., after a short reign of the Pratihāra family there.

II. DUBKUND HOUSE

The material for reconstructing the history of the Kachchhaphaghāta family, which established itself at Dubkund in the Shivpuri District of Madhya Pradesh, is restricted to a solitary stone inscription found at that place.² The record gives the genealogy of this dynasty for four generations. The last prince mentioned in it is Vikramasithha, who was on the throne in V.S. 1145 or 1088 A.C. The capital of this house was Dubkund itself,³ after which it has been called here. It is situated on the top of a tableland on the left bank of Kunu, a tributary of the Chambal.

The first prince of the family was Arjuna, a son of Yuvarāja. He was an expert bowman, skilled in archery. He became renowned by slaying Rājayapāla in a great battle fought by him as an ally or feudatory of (the Chandella) Vidyādhara. In our account of the Chandellas we have seen how the Chandella Vidyādhara entered into hostility with Rājayapāla, the last Pratihāra ruler of Kanauj, who resorted to flight and surrendered his territory to Mahmūd Gazinesī in the latter's invasion of the Pratihāra dominions; and Arjuna appears to have acted bravely in the struggle in which Rājayapāla was killed. This event took place in 1019 A.C.

Counting back from the date of the inscription and assigning the usual average of twenty years to each of the four rulers belonging to this branch with some latitude, of course, Arjuna's rule may be placed in the early years of the eleventh century. We may provisionally take his period from circa 1010 to circa 1030 A.C.

ABHIMANYU

c. 1030 to c. 1050 A.C.

Arjuna was succeeded by his son, Abhimanyu, who, in verse 10 of the inscription, is conventionally praised as possessing unblemished qualities and also as vanquishing his enemies in battles. "The skill that he showed in the marvellous management of horses and chariots and in the use of powerful weapons was highly eulogised by the intelligent Bhōja." This statement probably goes to show that Abhimanyu was an ally of the Paramāra Bhōjadēva in the latter's expedition in the north against the Kachchhaphaghāta ruler of Gwālior, as already seen above.

This ruler was succeeded by his son Vijayapāla.

¹ A.S.I.R., 1836-37, pp. 93 f., noticing an inscription in the Lucknow Museum, which is said to have been "badly damaged" in that year but now completely obliterated, showing only a few aksharas in the top corner on the right side, Lucknow Museum Catalogue, No. E-19. The record mentions the names of Stryapāla and Mahipāla and states that it was composed at the request of Ratnapāla.
² No. 154.
³ The place is mentioned in the inscription (v. 19) as Dibha, which can easily be connected with Dubkund, and not Chadibha as read by the editor, for which see my note in the relevant stanza of the text.
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VIJAYAPĀLA

C. 1050 TO C. 1070 A.C.

This ruler too has the conventional praise of being brave and glorious. No political event of his reign is so far known. However, his description in verse 15 of the Dubkuṇḍ inscription that "in battles he terrified all his enemies one after another", does not appear to be a vain boast. The Ukhva Mandar inscription at Bayānā (Bharatpur Dist. Rājasthān) shows that the region around its findspot was in the possession of the Gvālīor branch of this house, in the reign of Manorājā and another inscription from the same place and dated V.S. 1100 (1043 A.C.) mentions Adhiraṇṭa Vijaya, who has been identified by Kielhorn with our Vijayapāladēva. If Kielhorn's identification is accepted, as H.C. Ray has pointed out, it may be held that the Dubkuṇḍ branch conquered the Bayānā region from the Gvālīor branch some time before 1043 A.C.

VIKRAMASIMHĪA

C. 1070 TO C. 1090 A.C.

This ruler was the son and successor of Vijayapāla. The inscription describes him as an ornament of the Kachchhapaghātī race, and from this description it seems almost certain that this family was connected with the ruling house of Gvālīor. But we have no epigraphic evidence in support of this view. This king is called a Mahārājādhirāja in the inscription.

During the reign of Vijayapāla some Jain traders built a temple at Dubkuṇḍ, to which he made certain assignments and provisions for the purpose of worship and also for keeping it in good order.

III. NARWAR HOUSE

The existence of a third house of the Kachchhapaghātīs which established itself at Narwar is revealed from the Narwar copper-plate, issued in V.S. Year 1177 or 1120 A.C., by Vikramasimhā, the successor of Saradaiśīnha (Saratāsirha), who, in his turn, was the successor of Gaganaiśīnha. It is not known whether the second and the third of these rulers were, respectively, the sons of their predecessors.

No historical event of the reign of any of these rulers is known from the plate which endows each of them with the imperial title of Mahārājādhirāja. We have nothing but conventional praise even in the case of the donor Vikramasimhā.

The family name appearing in the record is spelt as Kachchhapaghātī, which is more akin to the name Kachhavāhā, than Kachchhaghātī, as spelt elsewhere.

Assigning the average reign of twenty-five years to each of these rulers, the house appears to have been founded in the beginning of the latter half of the eleventh century A.C. Nothing about its end is known, though it seems to have disappeared from history soon after the grant referred to above was issued.

Narwar is only about 90 kms. distant from Dubkuṇḍ, which again is about 72 kms. south-southwest of Gvālīor. Hence the three houses of the Kachchhapaghātīs mentioned

1. Ind. Anti., Vol. XIV, pp. 9 ff.
2. For the identification see ibid. pp. 8 ff.
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here appear to be mutually related to one another, but no evidence in this respect has so far been noticed.

THE DYNASTY OF VIJAYAPĀLA

The history of this dynasty has been reconstructed from two stone inscriptions. One of them was originally set up in a temple at Ingaṇāpadra, modern Inignīdā, also spelt as Ignōdī, Inignōd or Ringnōd, a village now included in the Ratlam District of Madhya Pradesh;1 and the other was found at Thākardā in the Dūgharpur District of Rajasthān.2 The first of these records is now untraceable and the second has not been published as yet; and the stone on which it is inscribed is now not available for re-examination.

The first of these inscriptions, which registers a grant made by the Mahārājādhirāja and Paramēśvara, the illustrious Vijayapāladeva, in the Vikrama year 1190 = 1132-33 A.C., gives the following genealogy of his house:

Prithvipāla

His successor, Tihunapāla

His successor, Vijayapāla

To Prithvipāla, whose name figures at the head of the genealogical list, is also given the epithet of Bhurtripāta. The names of all these kings appear also in the Thākardā inscription, in the same order, only with the difference that in it the second name appears in its Sanskritised form as Tribhuvanapāla. Besides this, the Thākardā inscription carries the genealogy two generations further and names Sūrapāla and the Mahākumāra Anayapāla, respectively, as the son and grandson of Vijayapāla. According to this inscription, the last mentioned person granted some land in favour of the temple of god Siddhēśvara, in V.S. 1212 or 1155 A.C.

Assigning the average of twenty years to each of these persons, we may presume that Prithvipāla, the earliest known member of the house, rose to power, approximately, in the last decade of the eleventh century A.C.

Different views have been propounded with respect to the name of the family of these rulers, which is not mentioned in either of these inscriptions. D.R. Bhandarkar identified Prithvipāla with Mahiṇḍāla of the Khachhāpahūṭhā house of Gwalior and called this house by that name.3 But except that the two names are synonymous, we have nothing to support this view. G.H. Ojha, on the other hand, held that these rulers were possibly the descendants of the Pratihāra family of Kanauj, which ruled in Central India and Rajasthān, after the end of the Pratihāra kingdom of Kanauj.4 This suggestion appears to be based on the fact that the names of some of the rulers of the Pratihāra family end in pāla, as given here. But in the absence of any corroboration, this view too is untenable. Besides, we may note here that the suffix pāla is found to end the names of the members of some other royal families also, for example, Vighrahapāla (Chālamāna), Vijayapāla (Chandēlā), Gēpāla (Pāla) and Dēvapāla (Paramāra).

Thus, neither of the views mentioned above appears to be justified, and nothing on this point can be definitely said unless further material on the subject is available. It may however be suggested here that the title of Bhurtripāta attached to the name

1 No. 138.
2 A.R.P.M., 1915-16, p. 3.
3 In the List of Inscriptions, No. 229.
4 As n. 2, above.
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of Prithvipala in the inscriptions may have been adopted from the name of the Guhila ruler Bhatta Pratapapalata II whose inscription dated V. 999 was found in Pratapagarh (Rajasthan) and about 45 kms. north west of Kota, where the first of the records mentioned here was discovered. This view receives corroboration from the Virapur copper-plate dated V.S. 1242 (1185 A.C.) mentioning Mahirajadhiraja Amritapala, a son of Mahirajadhiraja Vijayapala alias Bhatta Pratapapalata, and thus a brother and successor of Surapala, as a subordinate chief ruling at Vagada, under the suzerainty of the Chaulukya Bhima II. In the plate, Amritapala is stated to have belonged to the Guhila family.2

A great uncertainty also prevails about the commencement of the political career of this house. D.C. Ganguly suggested that Vijayapala, who appears to have been a local governor under the Paramara Naravarman, declared independence in the days when the kingdom of Malava was overpowered by the Chaulukya Siddharaja Jayasimha.3 In our account of the Paramaras of Malwa we have seen that in the last days of Naravarman a great political disturbance was raging throughout the country, and in view of this, Ganguly's suggestion appears to be justified.

An inscription of Jayasimha Siddharaja, which was found at Talwad in the Bhandwada District (Rajasthan), shows that this ruler, after he occupied Malwa, marched further west, probably to humble the pride of the Paramara kings of Vagada who were their kinmen; and it is possible to hold that taking advantage of the situation, the contemporary Ignoda ruler, presuming Vijayapala himself, changed to the side of Jayasimha and also accompanied him in the invasion of the Vagada country. He probably advanced to the enemy's capital, Athun, which is about 120 kms. straight to the west of Ignoda and about 50 kms. southwest of Talwad, where Jayasimha's inscription referred to above has been found. Vijayapala's successor, Surapala may have extended his conquest in the north up to Thakardar, which is about 80 kms. straight north of Athun and where was found the aforesaid inscription of the Mahakumara Anayapala. This is only how the data known so far can be explained by connecting them together.

How this house ended its political career is also not definitely known. A conjecture, however, may be hazarded in this respect. Anayapala, who issued the Thakardar grant in 1155 A.C., as an heir-apparent, may have, in the natural course, succeeded his father Surapala, but was soon displaced by the Guhila Sambantasimha, as we know from the latter's inscription found at Sofaj and dated V.S. 1236 (1179 A.C.), in the Dungarpur District and about 60 kms. south of Udaipur and about 20 kms. north west of Thakardar, the find spot of Anayasimha's inscription.

Above, we have referred to the Virapur copper-plate, which states that Mahirajadhiraja Amritapala was ruling in the Vagada country in V.S. 1242 = 1185 A.C. His kingdom may have been smaller in extent than before. It is, however, not known if he regained a part of his hereditary possessions and was ruling as a vassal of the Chaulukya king Bhima, who was then exercising supreme authority over Vagada, as we know from an inscription from Diwada, in the Dungarpur District.6

THE YAVAPALAS OF NARWAR

Very little is known of the history of the Yavapalas of Narwar (ancient Nalapura)

2. A.R.R.M., 1929-30, pp. 2 f. If these rulers belonged to the Guhila clan, they were certainly different from that of Sambantasimha.
5. Ibid., No. 392.
6. Ibid., No. 433.
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who played an important role in the history of India in the latter half of the thirteenth century A.C. In his *List of Inscriptions of Northern India*, D.R. Bhandarkar enlisted only seven records of the reign of this house,\(^1\) whereas as many as about two dozen of them are now known to exist, which are in some way or other helpful for reconstructing its history. They were all found at Narwar itself (Shivpuri District) and in the surrounding region and are noticed in the *Annual Reports* of the Archaeological Department of the former Gwalior State. Some of them were edited in the *Indian Antiquary* and the *Epigraphia Indica*.

The seat of this house was at Nalapura, modern Narwar, a strong hill fort\(^2\) in the Shivpuri District of the State of Madhya Pradesh. It is situated on a steep hill in the Vindhyec range in the bend of the Sindr river, about eighty kms. south west of Gwalior, and, on account of its situation, was a place of great importance in the medieval times. The kingdom over which this house ruled was known as *vishaya* - 75,000 (*pādānalaksha*).\(^3\)

The founder of this house was Chāhada. Tod tells us that Prithvirāja of the Chāhāmāna dynasty had a brother of the name of Chāhādadeva,\(^4\) but both these rulers are removed in time by about forty-five years and therefore we hesitate to accept the veracity of Tod's account. The name Chāhada is also found in two other inscriptions; one of them was discovered at Udaipur, (Vidisha district) and is dated V.S. 1300, and the other at Bhaktar (Guna district), which is dated V.S. 1304.\(^5\) And though the time of both these records is almost the same, we have nothing to show that Chāhada mentioned in them is the same as found in the epigraph from Narwar.

Nothing is known about Ya(Pa)ramādīrāja mentioned as an ancestor of Chāhada in the Bhimpur (Shivpuri district) inscription of V.S. 1319 which gives him only the conventional praise viz., that in bravery he excelled Skanda who killed Tāraka.\(^6\)

A fragmentary inscription from Rataul in the Baghpet tehsil of the Meerut District speaks of one Chāhada's donation; it contains in the beginning the usual Chāhāmāna genealogy, including the name of Prithvirāja, who was no other than Prithvirāja III of the Chāhāmāna house of Sākambhari (1179-1192 A.C.).\(^7\) This led Dayaram Sahani, the editor of the inscription, to assert that the Chāhādadeva of this grant was identical with his namesake who ruled at Narwar and also that he was a lineal descendant of the Chāhāmānas of Delhi and Ajmer. Sahani, of course, had propounded this view in the absence of the information from inscriptions which were discovered after he wrote. The first of these was found at Bhimpur, some five kms. south of Narwar, and is dated V.S. 1319 or 1262 A.C. It tells us that "there was a race of kings named Yajvapālas; that in that race was born Śri-Ya(Pa)ramādīrāja; and also that he was succeeded by Chāhada.\(^8\) The other inscription referred to here was found at Narwar; it is dated V.S. 1339 = 1282 A.C. and from it we learn that "there was a hero of the name of Jayapāla and after him, his family was popularly known as Jajapāla.\(^9\) Connecting both these accounts, it is held that the current popular form of the name of the family, which originated from

---

1 N.os. 562, 576, 597, 603, 625, 636 and 642.
3 No. 160, v. 3; and No. 175, v. 19.
5 *A.R.A.D.G.S.,* V.S. 1974, No. 114, and *ibid.,* V.S. 1975, No. 113, both unpublished. Our references are to the work of H.N. Drivedi, entitled *List of Inscriptions in the Gwalior State* (Hindi), Nos. 107 and 111, respectively.
6 No. 159, v. 7.
7 *Ep. Ind.,* Vol. XII, p. 221.
8 No. 159, vv. 6-7. D.C. Ganguly takes Chāhada as the son of Ya(Pa)ramādīrāja (S.E., p. 57), which is, of course, not true.
9 No. 175, vv. 3-5.
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a legendary hero of the name of Jayapāla, was Jajapēlla, which was later on Sanskritised into Yajvapāla, as it appears in the Bhimpur inscription. Thus we see that the rulers of Narwar were Jajapellas or Yajvapālas and not Chāhamānas.¹

CHĀHAḌADĒVA

C. 1242 to 1254 A.C.

We have so far no inscription of this ruler and the period of his reign can be ascertained only from his coins. A. Cunningham has recorded the discovery of his coins from V.S. years 129x to 1311.² Unfortunately the unit figure on his earliest issue is not known, but, as R.D. Banerji has shown, if we take it to be the latest possible year, i.e., 1299, the English equivalents on the dates of his coins would be from 1242 A.C. to 1254 A.C.³

The Bhimpur inscription describes Chāhaḍadēva as “a conflagration for burning the forest of his adversaries”; and though conventional, this praise is well deserved. For, from an inscription at Narwar, we know that he captured from enemies Nalagiri, i.e., Narwar, and other big towns.⁴ This clearly shows that his predecessor Ya(Pa)ramāḍirāja did not rule at Narwar. The enemy mentioned here is evidently Malik Nusrat-ud-din Tayasā, a governor of Itutmish. More on this point will be said presently. However, here we may recall that it was almost at the same time when the Chandella Trailokya Varman wrested Kālanjar from the enemies, as we have seen above in the history of his house.

To comprehend the history of the house founded by Chāhaḍa, it is necessary to take up a general resume of the important political events in northern India and particularly in the region now comprising Madya Pradesh and Rājasthān, during the latter half of the thirteenth century A.C. We know how Qutb-ud-din, the slave Sultan of Delhi (1206-1210 A.C.), won a crushing victory over the Chāhamānas, the Chandellas and some other powers, raiding a portion of Gujarāt and Mewād and also came into hostile contact with a number of princes to the south of his dominions. Soon after, and particularly during the reign of Itutmish (1211-1236 A.C.) the Muslims had consolidated their power in the valleys of the Indus, the Ganges and the Jumānā, and from there they carried out successful raids in parts of Mālwā - in Bālsār and Ujjain. Almost all the Hindu powers of the North, viz., the Kachchhapaghātas of Gwāllīor, the Chāhamānas of Rājasthān, the Haihayas of Tripuri and the Chandellas of the region around Ajaγadh and Kālanjar all these had felt the brunt of the Muslim onslaught. Prithvirāja III was killed in the battle of Tarain in 1192 A.C., which practically put an end to the rule of the Chāhamānas of Sākambhari, one of the leading powers of the time. It may fairly be presumed that following this incident his followers tried to escape in large numbers, and we know how one of his descendants, Goγindachandra by name, established himself at Ranthambhōr, a strong fort near Sawai Madhopur in Rājasthān, presumably, of course, as a feudatory of the Muslims. Soon this line of rulers may have cast off the foreign yoke during the weak rule of the successors of Itutmish. And the example of this ruler may have been followed also by Chāhaḍa, who established himself at Narwar which he had then captured,⁵ some time about the fourth decade of the thirteenth century A.C. And in all probability he, too, may have endeavoured to cast off the Muslim yoke. How far he succeeded in this task remains unknown.

For a Muslim historian, Maulānā Minhāj-ud-dīn by name, records that in 1234 A.C. Itutmish

---

² Coins of Med. Ind., p. 90.
³ J.A.S.B., N.S., Vol. XVI (1920), p. 80; Pl. XII, 8.
⁴ No. 175, v. 6.
⁵ Ibid.
defeated at Ranthambhor a powerful ruler of the name of Chāhāḍādeva. It is not known whether this statement refers to the ruler of Narwar or to the Chāhāmāna.  

After occupying Narwar, Chāhāḍādeva attempted to conquer some of the neighbouring powers. That his army inflicted a crushing defeat on the Paramāras of Mālwa is known from a fragmentary record of the house, which tells us that Asalla’s father Nrivarman exacted a tribute from “the proud king of Dhāra”. As we shall see below, Nrivarman predeceased his father Chāhāḍādeva, and therefore it may be held that this event must have taken place during the reign of Chāhāḍādeva himself, at the hands of Nrivarman as a prince. The Paramāra history of this time is rather obscure, and therefore it is difficult to identify the ruler who was forced to pay tribute to the Yajvapāla house, presumably also acknowledging his allegiance to it. However, a study of the contemporary history may reveal something to enlighten us on this point. We have seen that following the reign of Dēvapāla, the Paramāras were constantly being harassed by their enemies on all sides - the Yādavas in the south, the Chaulikyas on the west, the Chandellas in the east and northeast, and the Chāhāmānas on the north and northwest; and to add to their catastrophe, the Muslims in the north also were invading their dominions. This is why the details of the Paramāra history of the time are rather complex; but we may hazard a suggestion here that the king who paid tribute to the Yajvapāla house may have been either Dēvapāla’s successor Jaitugidēva or the latter’s brother Jayavarman, more probably the former, as Chāhāḍādeva could have more easily extended his arms in that direction when he had not become the feudatory of the Muslims, i.e., before c. 1250 A.C.

It is possible to hold that Chāhāḍādeva carved out his principality in the reign of Raziyā. Nasiruddin came to the throne in 1246 A.C., and even with his anxiety to ward off the pressing external danger to his reign in the form of the menace of the Mongol invasion, he could not long ignore the disaffected Hindus; and he sent his able general Balban to suppress them. Minhāj-ud-din tells us that “the sublime standard (of Balban) moved towards Gwalior, Chandīri, Nurwūl Mālwa”. Thus Chāhāḍādeva was one of the first princes to bear the brunt of the Muslim attack before which he had to submit, and in all probability, he recognised their suzerainty also. This subjugation, however, appears to have been nominal, as is evident from his coins issued even thereafter. But Balban’s invasion was of a plundering nature, his main object being only to extend his victorious arms so far as Mālwa in the south; but not to make any territorial acquisitions. This event happened some time about 1250 A.C.

Chāhāḍādeva did not live long to bear this disgrace; he died some time about V.1311(1254 A.C.), which is the last date found on his coins known so far. This is also the first regnal year of his grandson Asalladēva, as we know from his coins. Thus, we may safely conclude that Chāhāḍādeva’s son Nrivarman must have predeceased him. Probably he died in a battle, as may be presumed from the unanimous testimony of the contemporary epigraphic records.

From one of the Narwar inscriptions, we learn that Chāhāḍa’s Superintendent of treasury (Kāśīkīvyākshā) was a Kāyastha of the name of Dāmōdara, whose family hailed from Gwāllor. No other officer under this king is known from any of the records, which describe him as a brave person.

1 T.N., Vol. I, pp. 690 ff. That the Chāhāḍādeva of Ranthambhôr was a different ruler from his namesake who ruled at Narwar is shown in J.A.S.E., NS, Vol. XVI, p. 82, and also in the Ind Ant., Vol. XLV, p. 244; for different view, see I.H.Q., Vol. XXXII, p. 400.
2 No. 160, v. 5.
3 T.N., loc. cit.
4 No. 161, v. 6.
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ĀSALLADEVA
1254 to 1279 A.C.

As seen above, Chāhādadeva was succeeded by his grandson Āsalladeva. We have two inscriptions for the history of this ruler. One of them was found at Bhimpur (No. 159); it is dated V.S. 1319 = 1262-63 A.C.; and the other (No. 160), which is incomplete, undated, and seems to have belonged to his son Gopāladeva’s reign. Besides, the Rāi (Shivpuri District) sañī stone inscription, dated V.S. 1327, is mentioned in the Indian Antiquary, Vol. XLVII, p. 241; but the whereabouts of the stone bearing it are unknown today.

No event of the reign of Āsalladeva is known from any of the sources. Balban, the Sultan of Delhi, was at this time busy suppressing the revolt of Bengal in the far east and repelling the Mongol invasions in the north west, as seen above. It may be presumed, however, that Āsalladeva continued to rule as a feudatory of the Muslims who considered him as an effective check and a buffer state against the Paramātras in the south. One of our inscriptions states that Āsalladeva was strong in cavalry and infantry.1

The name of the queen of this ruler was Lāvayadēvi,2 her parentage being unknown. The Bādōdi record mentions his Chief Minister Ďevadhara, whose wife Nīlā excavated a well at that place.3

GOPĀLADĒVA
1279 to 1289 A.C.

Āsalladeva was succeeded by his son Gopāladeva, who is known to us from four inscriptions found at Bādōdi, Narwar, Suryāvā and Sēsai, all in the Shivpuri District and dated respectively in V.S. 1336(1279 A.C.), 1339(1282 A.C.), 1341(1284 A.C.).4 Besides these, we have included here thirteen inscriptions discovered at Bāṅglā, a village near Narwar,5 since they are helpful in reconstructing the contemporary history.

Gopāladeva ascended the throne in about 1279 A.C., which is also the time of the Bādōdi inscription mentioning the construction of a stepped well, by his Chief Minister named Chhailāya. He was a brave general. The Narwar inscription dated V.S. 13396 tells us that he defeated the Jejābhukti ruler Vravarman in a battle. The inscriptions of the Chandāla king Vravarman range from 1254 to 1286 A.C., and he too claims to have won a victory over the Yajavāla king in his Dāhi (Bijāwar, Chhatarpur District) copper-plate inscription of V.S. 1337 = 1280 A.C.7 And since there is no reference to it in the Bādōdi inscription of V.S. 1336, which too was issued in the reign of the same king, the engagement appears to have taken place some time in V.S. 1337-38, corresponding to 1281-82 A.C. We have some further evidence to know the definite date of the battle. A number of memorial pillars have been discovered at Bāṅglā, a small village situated about eight kms. to the east of the fort of Narwar, some sixteen of which were counted and seven more recorded by the late M.B. Garde,8 and subsequently, by D.C. Sirca, who edited them in the Epigraphia Indica. Vol. XXXI. The results in details are given in our edition of the same, in this work, to which reference is invited here.

1 See No. 179, v. 6, and my n. on it.
2 No. 161, v. 6.
3 Ibid., vv. 19 and 23.
4 Nos. 161, 175, 176 and 177.
5 Nos. 162-174.
6 No. 161, vv. 19-20 and 23.
8 For details, see my writing in the edition of the inscriptions Nos. 162-174.
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From our epigraphic records, we know of some of the officers under Gōpāla who participated in the struggle. One of them was Jaṭābrahmaddēva who is mentioned in the inscriptions from Banglā, another was minister Gaṅgaddēva, mentioned in one of the Narwar inscriptions, dated V.S. 1338 = 1282 A.C. A Saṅī stone at Pacharā in the Shivpuri District, dated V.S. 1345 = 1289 A.C. also refers to the battle and mentions Gōpāladdēva's feudatories Hāṁsārāja and the latter's son, Valhādēva, who appears to have been the same as Palhādēva described as constructing a stepped well and planting a garden for the good of his deceased younger brother (and not the son as mentioned in the inscription) Hāṁsārāja, at Narwar in V.S. 1355 or 1299 A.C.1 One Kumāra Ballāladdēva, a son of Hāṁsārāja, is mentioned in the Bijoliā (Udaipur) inscription of V.S. 1349;2 the names of the father and the son are the same as given in the Pacharāl inscription, and the dates are not far removed. But we cannot safely identify these two persons with those of the Narwar record mentioned above in the absence of any corroborative evidence.

The last known year of Gōpāladdēva's reign is 1289 A.C., if we identify him with his namesake mentioned in the Pacharāl inscription. And as the first known record of his son Gaṅapatīdēva was issued in 1294 A.C., we may hold that the latter prince ascended the throne some time about 1290 A.C.

The Saṅī inscription and some of those found at Banglā reveal the name of Mahākumāra Jaṭāvarman or Jaṭābrahmaddēva. From the title of Mahākumāra, this person appears to have been a son of Gōpāladdēva, in whose time the struggle at Banglā took place, and who was probably regarded as the heir to the throne. D.C. Sircar has rightly brought this point to light and also held that this heir-apparent seems to have predeceased his father since Gōpāladdēva's throne passed after his death to the other son Gaṅapatī.3

GANAPATIDĒVA

C. 1290 to c 1300 A.C.

We have two inscriptions of the time of this ruler. One of them was found at Survāyā and the other at Narwar. They are dated, respectively, in V.S. 1350 and 1355, corresponding to 1294 and 1298 A.C.4

Of Gaṅapatīdēva's military achievement, nothing is known except that he renewed the struggle with the Chandellās, which his father Gōpāladdēva had begun, as already seen above. The Narwar stone inscription gives him the credit of capturing Kirtidurga, which may be identified with Chandéri in the Gunā District or with Dēogaj (Jhansi Dist.). The Budhērā pillar inscription of V.S. 1351 (1295 A.C.) states that Kirtidurga was then governed by the Bundēlā chiefs who were the feudatories of the Chandellās. Probably the Bundēlās were defeated. The capture of such an important fort therefore speaks highly of Gaṅapatīdēva's valour. It is not known whether the contemporary Saṅī stone inscriptions, discovered at Bhēsarwālā and Bālārāpur in the same region and which mention his name, can also be associated with the struggle.5 It may be presumed, however, that the Yajvapāla ruler may have been helped in this struggle, by his feudatory Rāṇā Chāṭchīgaddēva, who, in his Survāyā inscription of V.S. 1350 = 1294 A.C. is mentioned as Gōpāla's godson (dharmaputra) and the son of Padma of the Muchchhaka family.6

1 No. 179. For the Pacharāl inscription, see H.N. Drivedi's list, No. 157.
4 Nos. 175-79. For an earlier inscription of the time of this ruler, dated V. 1348, see I.N.I. No. 628. The stone is now not traceable, and no impression of it too is available. It is not edited here.
5 This is M.B. Gadre's view propounded in A.R.A. D.G.S., for v. 1922 (un-published). For the Saṅī stones found at both these places, see Drivedi's list Nos. 172 and 152, respectively.
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It is not known how long Ganapati retained his hold over Chandèri and even over his principality with its capital at Narwar. This was the time when Alà-ud-din’s armies were marching towards the Deccan; and we know that in his expeditions to the south in 1294 A.C., the Sultan followed the Chandèri-Bhilà route. Thus this was probably the time when Ganapati’s principality was annexed to the Muslim empire; his fate being unknown.

ADMINISTRATION

The inscriptions edited here mainly come from the different parts of Madhya Pradesh, viz., Málwá, Vindhyâ and the Gwâllor-Shivpuri region, and some from its adjoining areas comprising the Bânswâda and Sirîbhi tracts of south-west Râjasthân and the Districts of Jhânsi, Bândhâ and Hamirpur in the central and northern parts of Uttar Pradesh. In each of these regions, which presented not only varied geographical features but also diversified regional culture and traditions, the form of administration developed in its own way, and that too was bound to change from time to time with the extension of the boundaries of the different kingdoms existing there; and this being the case, we do not find uniformity in all the spheres of administration in the entire region. Therefore, it is proposed to give here only a general picture of the structure of the administration as it emerges mainly from our epigraphs which, even though with the meagre data furnished by them, depict the actual state of affairs. Orthodox sources, which often times present ideal features, cannot be regarded fully trustworthy, and are referred to only incidentally.

Out of all the royal houses with which we are concerned here, only two, viz., that of the Chândellâs and that of the Paramâras of Málwá, rose to imperial eminence from an humble beginning, whereas the others ruled only in feudatory capacity. The kingdoms of both these dynasties were fairly extensive; and whereas the first of these was known by the term bhukti, as we know from the expression Jejâbhukti, Jejâbhuktika or Jejâkabhukti, which we generally find in their inscriptions, the second was designated as dèsa and occasionally also as mandala. Among the other kingdoms, that of the Abû Paramâra house was known as mandala, and that governed by the rulers belonging to the Vâgaḍa branch, generally as mandala, though sometimes also as dèsa and vishaya, as we find in their inscriptions. The territory governed by the Yayâpâla rulers was designated as vishaya, and as for the designation of the kingdoms of the rest of our ruling dynasties, viz., those of the Khâchhpâpaçhatu and Paramâra houses of Bhânmâl and Jâlôr, our inscriptions are altogether silent.

As anywhere else in the Indian kingdoms of our period, the ruler was the supreme administrative head, and his executive, legislative and judiciary powers were unlimited. The Sukranîti sûra, which is almost a contemporary work, states that the king was "at the root of the tree of administration", thus denoting him to be the fountain source of power.

1 Elliot, Vol. III, p. 149.
2 As known after Jejâ or Jayastâki, one of the earliest kings belonging to this house.
3 For dèsa, see P.C.M., p. 1 and Prabhâvâchâra, pp. 134, 153 and 154, where it is called Mâlava dèsa, but also Avânti dèsa in p. 139. For mandala, see P.C.M., p. 25, and Prabhâvâchâra, p. 153. In No. 32, 1, 1, it is mentioned as a sanâdâya.
4 Cf. Achara-mandala in No. 63, 1, 3.
5 See respectively, No. 11, 1, 8; No. 90, vv. 2 and 25.
6 Cf. pûnavâluksha-vishaya in No. 159, v. 14 and No. 175, v. 19.
7 It is only the Gwâllor inscription of Malâpâla (No. 135) which uses the word mandala in a general way in its v. 102.
8 Rêya-vishaya mûlim hi ngi patih etc., v. 12. On the date of this work divergent opinions prevail, but I agree with Dr. A.S. Altekar in assigning it to between 900-1200 A.C. See his State and Government in Anc. India, 3rd edn., 1958, p.20. In this respect, see also S.E., p. 254, n.9.
He was the ultimate authority for the appointment, promotion, transfer and dismissal of ministers and other officers under him and also to choose the members of his assembly and court-poets. He exercised full control over his feudal subordinates, as we know from the instance of Vikramasinhha, a Paramārā ruler of the Ādil branch, who was deposed by his overlord, the Chaulikya Kumārapalī, for his treachery. Whenever necessitated by occasion, the king would also lead an army himself, as we find from a number of grants issued from military camps. He was also to look to the internal safety of his subjects, preserve peace and order to promote their welfare and ensure defence against foreign aggressions. All these duties go to justify the statements of our inscriptions calling him a monarch with the imperial titles Paramābhātāraka (the supreme lord), Mahārājādhirāja (the king of kings) and Paramēśvara (the lord paramount).

The supreme authority in all the affairs of government was vested in him because of his divine status for, he is often described in our records as an incarnation of God in human form and His agent on the earth. For example, verse four of the Dēogadh inscription, dated V. 1154, describes the Chandella king Kirtivarman as having Yudhishthira, Sadāśiva and Rāmachandra in his body, and verse nine of an Ajayagadh inscription of V. 1317 identifies his successor Viravarman with Vishnu and Śiva (Śiva), and thus deserving regard from the subjects. Taking examples from the Imperial Paramāra kingdom, we see that the Udaipur prāśasti describes Vākpati resembling Śatamukha (Indra), the Dongargāon inscription of Jagaddēva, dated in Śaka 1034 states that Bhūja resembled Rāma in excellence; and the Nagpur Museum stone inscription records that the Paramāra Lakshmādeva was Purushottama himself and also that his campaign in the different quarters struck their guardians with terror. Almost the same sort of description is to be found in the case of kings with smaller territories and occasionally also in the case of feudatories. The Sāsabhā temple inscription of V.S. 1150 uses different similes to describe the Kachchhaphagatha king Mahīpāla, showing that he resembled gods, demi-gods and legendary heroes; and the Yajnapāla kings are often stated in their record to have been jagadvandya, deserving high respect. The Girvid stone inscription of V.S. 1344 states that Dhārvavarsha excelled Chandikā in bravery, and in the same record his son Sōmaiśinha is said to have equelled Rāma and Sōmaiśinha's grandson Pratāpasinhha is compared to Pradyumna. The Arthūṇā inscription of Chāmundaṛāja of the Vāgada family bestows the same sort of praise on the king-himself and his ancestors. It is true that all the descriptions of this type come from the court-poets and are therefore not to be taken at their face value; but, shorn of the exaggeration, they at least go to show the high honour that a king commanded from his subjects. It is for this reason that the courts of kings were marked with great, pomp and show and are described in the epigraphs and other sources as crowded with ministers, other officers, court-poets and sycophants.

In order to perform all these functions successfully, the king, besides possessing the cardinal virtues like justice, prudence, temperance and fortitude, of which we have,

---

1 As to be seen below in the individual instances.
2 For example, Mahīa nominated his brother Śinduṛāja as his successor, for which see N.S.C., XI, v. 98. Also see No. 28, vv. 7–8. Dhārvavarsha called his younger brother Prahiladana a kumāra in No. 67, 1,6, and in 70, 1,3.
3 Jinaṇaṇaṇā's Kumārapalāprabandha, quoted in H.P.D. p. 303, n. 3.
4 This concerns only the imperial rulers. The feudatories were called Mahānandālīśvara, Mandālīśvara, Mandaliṅka or Māndaliṅka and Śāṃmacchha, etc., according to their status.
5 No. 111 and No. 125, respectively. Also cf. Sukrāntiśvara, II, v. 212.
6 No. 28, v. 4 and No. 33, vv. 44 ff., respectively.
8 For example, see No. 173, v. 4.
9 No. 82, vv. 15–17.
10 No. 85.
innumerable references in our inscriptions, had to be an efficient controller, a skilful horseman, a good bowman and an intrepid warrior, in brief, all the indispensable qualification of a leader during those troubled times. To give a few instances, we find that the Mau stone inscription of the time of Madanavarman describes his ancestor Jayavarman as an abode of liberality, truthfulness, political wisdom and valour;¹ the story of Bhoja’s rādhavēda⁵ is well-known;² Dhāravarsa is known to have pierced three buffaloes standing in a line, with one arrow;³ and the Kachchhappaghāta ruler Virasimha is said to have been compassionate, helpful, virtuous and truthful, and, above all, an undaunted warrior.⁴

The king was coronated with the usual ceremonies as prevalent from the very early times, and this ceremony was performed with great elan and splendour.⁵ On this occasion he would assure the subjects of his protection, release prisoners, and sometimes also issue grants.⁶ The divinity of the king was then emphasised, the intention being on the one hand, to stress on him the importance of the crown and the responsibilities that he had to shoulder, and, on the other hand, to make the people render reverence and obedience to him. He was called prabhu, svāmin and dēvā and was addressed by similar other terms.

As in the earlier times, monarchy continued to be hereditary in all the kingdoms represented by our inscriptions.⁷ As regards succession, the deceased king was generally followed on the throne by his eldest son, and in case when he left no male issue behind him, the crown passed on to his younger brother or any other member of the royal family and a near relative. The successor would always show him the due regard by recording the phrase tattād-dharmāyā in his grant.⁸ Thus, we find that the Paramāra kings Vākpati and Bhōjadēva, either of whom is not known to have left a son behind him, were followed on the throne respectively by their brothers Sindhurāja and Udayādiyā,⁹ and the fact that Udayādiyā’s son Jagaddēva who was appointed heir-apparent by his father, presented the Royal fortune to his elder brother Narāvarman,¹⁰ goes to show that it was a well-established custom that the throne usually went to the eldest son of the deceased king. The same custom of primogeniture was current among all the other royal families dealt with here, though we find a few exceptional cases which may have been due to some unknown circumstances. We have a few instances to show that the king nominated his successor.

The Chandella records furnish two interesting instances of voluntary abdication of the throne, viz., that of Dhanā who had lived for more than one hundred years and that of Jayavarman who, as he himself declared, felt weary of carrying on the burden of government.¹¹ The first of these kings was succeeded by his son Gāṅa or grandson Vidyādhara, but the succession of the latter by his uncle Prithivivarman, which appears to be rather unusual; it may have been due to there being no other capable person

1 No. 125, v. 11.
2 See No. 60, v. 34 and n. under the same.
3 No. 82, v. 15. Also cf. the expression mātṛh-dhehāyikatā in No. 145, v. 11.
4 No. 157.
5 As we know from No. 153.
6 For example, see No. 125, v. 68, and No. 47.
7 For example, see the expression labādānayaḥ in No. 84, v. 26, anukrama-vālata in No. 88, v. 71 and kula-dhāraṇa dādhi in No. 125, v. 12.
8 The meaning of this expression has been correctly shown by D.C. Sircar in the Journ. of the Andhra Res. Soc., Vol. X, p. 229 and also by K. Chattopadhyaya in J.H.Q., Vol. XVIII (1942) p. 64. This reminds us of the expression tatt-prājñapāla of the Gupta inscriptions.
9 See above in the political history section.
10 No. 28, v. 8. The appointment of a heir-apparent (or successor) is known from Ep.Ind., Vol.VIII, p.211, v.38; and also from N.S.C., XI, v.98.
11 No. 114, v.55 and No. 148, v.25, respectively. In the latter of these records the name of Prithivivarman is broken in its first part, but it can be taken to refer to the same king.
to succeed the deceased monarch.\(^1\) However, viewing all the cases of succession to the royal throne in the families dealt with here, this is not a single instance in which it was disputed.

The younger sons and some of the other relatives of the king are known to have been appointed to responsible posts in the government. We have seen that the Paramāra prince Lakshmīdeva worked as governor in the eastern part of the dominions of his father Udayaditya, that Prahladara, who was appointed pradīka, helped his elder brother Dhārāvarsha in administration, and also that the Chandella Yasōvarman placed his younger son Kṛishnapa to guard the south western frontier of his kingdom adjoining to the Malava territories. The word rājaputra and rāti, which are often used in our records,\(^2\) probably point to the same practice. None of our inscriptions says anything about the procedure of the education of these persons.

The queen was known as Rājī or Mahishi,\(^3\) and the chief queen as patañjali, patañjaleśvarī, mahishi or mahārājī.\(^4\) We have no example of a queen taking part in administration, except in the case of Dhārāvarsha’s dowager queen Śrīngāradēvi working as a regent during the minority of her son Sōmasimha.\(^5\) She could make a grant only with the permission of her husband, excepting in case of that when she made from her jāgir, as we know from the expression sva-bhūtvam-bhāṣyam, often used in our inscriptions.

No small portion of the kingdom was held by the feudal proprietors known as Rājākura,\(^6\) Rāti,\(^7\) Sāmantra\(^8\) and Thakkura,\(^9\) who performed some military service to their overlords, by annually paying some amount of money or by sending their troops to fight their battles, or both. Broadly speaking, all these subordinates were the masters of the land granted to them and looked to the administration, and security of the territory in their charge.

The supreme authority of the king, as described in our records, shows that the type of government was monarchical, but his actions were not arbitrary. One of the checks on his willful actions was the public opinion which he had to respect.\(^10\) He was also responsible for promoting virtue, as is indicated by the expressions dharma-rājya often used for his government in our inscriptions; and for establishing dharma, his personal conduct itself was to be an example. Most of our records refer to him as a virtuous person, eager to acquire religious merit, and of good behaviour and self-restraint. A paramāra inscription describes Naravarman as a kinsman of a respectable woman (para-nāri-sahīḍara), and a similar expression, viz., para-kul-āngan-ti-bandhu, is used in the case of Dévavarman in a Chandella grant.\(^11\) Thus the greatest check on his actions was the awe of religion. Besides being endowed with bravery and the knowledge of the science of warfare, which expected him to be a good bowman and skilful horseman, as we have already seen, he was to be an abode of good qualities and was expected to have knowledge of the Sūstras, which he was implicitly to follow in administration, as we know from expressions in our epigraphs, viz., dharma-dhāra, dharma-parānya, dharma-bhīra, dharma-parā, and so on.\(^12\)

---

1. For a similar case, cf. the accession of the Yādava king Bhīllama (V) succeeding his nephew Kāliya Balāla by superseding the latter’s sons, as stated by Hemādri in his introduction to the Vairāghyadha, quoted in E.H.D., p.242, v.37.
2. For example, in No.69, 1.4.
3. For example, in No. 119, 22.23 and 27-28. Also see P.C.M., p. 23.
4. Respectively, No. 70, 1.3; No. 73, v. 3; No. 145, v. 14; and No. 119, 1. 23.
5. As in No. 77.
6. E.g., in No. 41, 1. 13; No. 71, 1. 10 and No. 142, 1. 13.
7. It is an abbreviation of rājaputra and found in No. 121, 1. 3; No. 128, 1. 3 and No. 137, 1. 3, by way of an example.
8. See, for example, No. 91, 1. 9.
9. E.g., in No. 50, 1. 38 and No. 120, 1. 2.
10. For example, see No. 76, v. 6 (jātādhi-kumāro ṇeṇe).
12. Respectively, No. 114, v. 31; No. 117, 1. 3; No. 98, v. 20; and No. III, v. 2.
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The supreme authority of the king was also controlled by what is known as the mantri-parishad, or amātiya-sabha (council of ministers), which played a very important part in administration. The Śukraniti sāra, which we have already referred to, lays down that the ministers are “trunks of the tree of the kingdom” (v. 12); and that this injunction was completely in practice is known from references in our records. The Mīśākhāra on Yājñavalkya states that the advice of the ministers should be sought by the king but also that the ultimate responsibility rests with him.\(^5\) To cite a clear case, we have seen how Rudrāditya, the minister of Vākapati-Muhi, requested him not to cross the Gōḍāvari in his campaign in the south.

In addition to all these checks, the king also had to consider the opinions of those who formed the retinue of his court, e.g., the nobles in attendance (śāmantas), the chamberlain, the pandita, poets and bards, and also the pradhāra (door-keeper) who regulated the people’s entrance to his presence.

The ministers were known variously as amātiya, mantrin, sāchiva, pradhāra and sarvādhikārin, all these expressions being used in our records; but on very rare occasions the difference between one another of them has been brought out. The Deogarh inscription describes Vatsarāja as the amātiya-mantrindra of the Chandella king Kirtivarman,\(^2\) and this probably shows that he was the king’s chief minister and an adviser as well. One of the Kachchhapaghāṭa record uses both the terms, viz., amātiya and mantrin,\(^3\) which also goes to indicate that sometimes the two designations were different and sometimes combined in one person. The fragmentary Mau stone inscription of the time of Madanavarman uses both the words mantrin and sāchiva in the same verse,\(^4\) and for the same person, showing that the terms were occasionally almost equivalent. Thus we find that different practices prevailed in the different reigning families and this difference naturally existed even in one and the same reigning house.

The chief minister was helped by some others in the affairs of administration, as we shall see below. In smaller kingdoms, however, e.g., in that of the junior branches of the Paramāras, the Kachchhapaghāṭas and the Yajavālās, we have not even a single instance when there were more ministers than one, who was sometimes called sarvādhikārin (plenipotentiary). He controlled the Śrī-karana (Chief Secretariat).

As to the acquirements of a minister, we have epigraphic evidences to tell us that besides coming from a noble family, he should have studied the Śrāstras, to be spotless in character, upright, virtuous, of clear intellect, resolute in will and action, and besides, he should be skilled in archery and a leader of horses and elephants, as he had also to consolidate the kingdom of his master and stabilise it by suppressing enemies and troublesome elements.\(^6\) Almost the same sort of description we find in our ancient scriptures.\(^7\)

The injunction of the Smrītis that heredity should be considered in the selection of ministers was actually observed in our age at least in some of the kingdoms. This

---

1. Cf. Rājaśa ḍeva dūḥah na mantriṇah in Mīśākhāra on Yāj. Sm, Ch.II, v.I.
2. No. 111, v. 5.
3. No. 158, l. 4.
4. No. 125, v. 30. In the T.M. we often find the use of the adjectives buddhi-sāchiva and nāma-sāchiva, e.g., on pp. 28 and 189, and p. 18 respectively. Being a contemporary work it must be taken into account though we have no epigraphic evidence to corroborate it.
5. This of course excludes doubtful cases as in No. 179, v. 14, where we find the use of the term mantri-varṣṭha (the topmost of the ministers), and where we have the mention of only one minister.
6. For some these references, see No. 125, v. 17; No. 150, v. 22; and No. 179, v. 21.
7. Cf. Yāj. Avālīka, I, xiii, v. 31, and
   Sa mantriṇah prakurita prājān maṁlaṁ sāhirāṁ sāchiva
   taṁ sarvanḥ chintayayā = cājaṁ viṣṇuṁ aha taṁ param
   and Manuśa Śrātra-vadāḥ śrātra labhasa-lakṣhāṇaṁ kṣad-dhāvatā.
   1
   sāchivaṁ saptā cb = taṁhaṁ va kṛtvā su-varṇadhānaṁ quoted in Mīśākhāra on Yājñavalkya. Also Cf. the expression anvaya-prāpta-sāchiva in the Udayagiri inscription of Chandragupta II of the Gupta dynasty.
is testified to by the records of the Chándellas, as we know from the expressions maidh occurring in v. 41 of the Mau stone inscription, and 1. C-1 of the Darbát inscription uses the word kul-amātva in the same connection. The first of these records also states in its v. 17: tad-varmiṁah kirtyate dhunan thereby stressing the eminence of the family to which the ministers of the royal family belonged. As already pointed out by A.S. Altekar, five generations of one family, viz., Prabhāsa, his son Śivānāga, his son Mahāpāla, his son Ananta and his son Gṛhadhara worked as ministers or prime ministers under seven generations of the dynasty represented by Dhaṅga to Prithīvīvarman. Similarly, the Baṭēśvara stone inscription says that Lāhaḍa was minister under Madanavarman, and also that the former’s son Sallakṣhāna and grandson Purushottama worked in the same capacity under Paramārīna, the grandson of Madanavarman. We have two more examples to add here: one of them is from the Ajayāgarh stone inscription of the time of Viravarman which says that as many as seven members of the family of Lakṣmīdhara successively served the kings of this dynasty from Kṛttivarman to Viravarman in ministerial or some other capacity and another from the same place, stating that Nāna, the chief minister of Bhājavarman, was one of the seven members of the family which successively served the royal house.

Of the several instances that go to show that an interview by the king himself was necessary for appointment to the post of ministers and other officers, only a few may be cited here. The Mau stone inscription, which we have often referred to above, clearly states that Prabhāsa was first tested by Dhaṅga and his son Ganda, as we know from the use of the word parikṣhita in its v. 21. It also says that the king Sallakṣhāna interviewed some persons before appointing them on suitable posts. This procedure is corroborated by another inscription which comes from Ajayāgarh. From it we know that it was only after a test that Paramārīna appointed Gangaṭhara, a descendent of Jájūka, to the post of his chief minister and also that Trailokyaavarman, the next king, entrusted Vashē of the same family to guard the fort at that place.

So far as records of the Paramārīs and the other dynasties dealt with here are concerned, we lack this sort of detailed information, though we definitely know that the ministers and other responsible officers were appointed only by the king.

None of our inscriptions mentions the full strength of ministers and high state functionaries at one time under any of the kingdoms represented by them. The records of the junior branches of the Paramārīs, the Kachchhaphagāthas and the Yajavālīs mention only the chief minister, calling him mantrin, amātva, sachīva and sometimes savādhikārī or adhikātri-mukhya, showing that in each of these kingdoms there was only one minister who was invested with supreme powers of carrying on the entire administration, in addition to the accountant who is occasionally mentioned. But the Chándellas and the Paramārīs of the main branch, who reigned over extensive areas, must naturally have more than one minister working simultaneously, though their definite number is nowhere recorded. All the ministerial posts too do not appear to have come into being at one time and also varied from time to time. With these general remarks, we now proceed to learn about the functions of the ministers other than the chief minister whose duties we have already seen.

Mahā-sindhivigrahika: This officer was in charge of the Department of Peace and War, like a Foreign Minister of the present time, and thus an important member of the ministry in those days. He was the political adviser to the king on matters concerning warfare, and received instructions from him, and either himself drafted royal charters or

---

1 *State and Govt. in Anc. Ind.*, 1958 (3rd edn.), p. 179.
2 No. 145.
3 No. 153.
4 No. 150, vv. 10 and 17 respectively.
5 See No. 57, 11, 49-52, No. 60, 11, 72, No. 80, 11, 3-4, and No. 155, v. 32, for example.
supervised their drafting by some one else. The first Sandhivigrahaika recorded in the
inscriptions of the Paramaras was Bilhaṇa who flourished during the reign of Vindhyavar-
aman and Arjunavarman and appears to have been succeeded by Mallaḍhara under
Jayavarman II. So far as the kingdom of the Chandellas is concerned, this officer is
mentioned only twice, first in the Baṭeshvara stone inscription of V.S.1252 and thus slightly
erlier than in the Paramara records just referred to, and thereafter in the Dhurēṭi copper-
plate inscription of 1212 A.C. The Kalvaṇ plate of Yaśovarman, a feudatory of the Paramara
Bhojaḍāva, was drafted by Jōgēśvara who is mentioned as a Sandhivigrahaika, and a
parallel instance is afforded by the Arthūṭa inscription of the time of Vījayaṣaṇa who
belonged to the Vāgṣa branch of the Paramaras. It is a sectarian record, dated in
V.S. 1165. The first of these two documents comes from Nāsik which was then included
in the southernmost part of the Paramara kingdom; and thus it may show a different
sort of affair, but it appears rather curious that even feudatory princes could employ a
Sandhivigrahaika under them. Here it is worth noting that in both these records the
designation appears without the word mahaṭa, as we find in some cases, elsewhere.

The MahāSandhivigrahaika, who had to keep regular records of the king’s warfare
and sometimes also to draft the charters, was expected to be learned. Bilhaṇa, mentioned
above, was not only a Paṇḍita but also a poet; and the Chandella minister referred to above
is stated to have been “foremost among the learned” (vidyavasthi paramah) and a
poet of the first rank (kavi-chakravarti).

This officer is not to be found in the earlier records of the Paramaras, whose
charters were composed or drafted by some other persons, for example, the Ujjain grant
of Vākpatirāja was drafted by one Gunandhara about whom nothing is stated in the record
except that he was a Kaviṣṭha. Similarly, the Kachchhahapagāṭa inscriptions of V.S. 1145,
1150 and 1161 were composed respectively by Udayarāja, Mānikiṇṭha and Yaśōdēva, the
first of whom is stated to have possessed a clear brain (śudhakhaḍi) and the rest two
were of high erudition and eminent poets. The records of Vajrapālas dated V.S. 1350
and 1355 were composed by two brothers, viz., Jayasimha and Śivanābha, both of whom
were highly learned and sons of a Treasury Officer. Lohapati by name.

Dharma-lekhaṇ: This officer is mentioned only in some of the later records of the
Chandellas, showing that a separate department existed under them. He was an important
officer of the Central Government. He appears to have kept a record of religious
endowments made from time to time. It is interesting to note here that this department is
mentioned under the Chaullikyas and the Kalachuris also.

1 As stated in our authorities, for which,compare:
   Sandhivigrahaika tu bhavē sa yam tuṣya lekhaṇa
   svayaḥ rāja uṣmākṣaḥ ta lekhaṇa rāja dhana
   (Mādhyārṇa on Vījāvavalkya).
2 See No. 685, v. 19, which is his own composition, and Nos. 47-48 and 51, which were composed under his guidance.
3 No. 57, 1. 50.
4 No. 139, vv. 30-31 and No. 143, 1. 8. The first of these records was composed by Dēvadharī who was the son
   of Mahaḥ-sachiva-sandhivigrahaikārī Gādādharā and the use of the word sachiva clearly indicates that he
   enjoyed the status of a minister. The second record drops the word mahaṭa before it, as we have seen in some other
cases.
5 No. 60, v. 29.
6 This reminds us of Haridēva, the composer of the Allahabad purāṇa of Śīmatra Gupta and his sandhivigrahaika,
   showing thereby that eminently learned persons were appointed on this post.
7 Nos. 154 to 156, respectively.
8 Nos. 158 and 179, respectively.
9 Nos. 119, 128, 130-132 and 134 were all drafted by this officer. The first of these is of the time of Madanavar-
   man and all the rest belong to the time of Paramārdin (1166-1200 A.C.), and thus this office seems to have existed
   only for a short time.
10 For the Chaullikyas, see P.C.M., p. 266 (Tan = mahaṭi dharmavahikāḍi = allīkha); and for the Kalachuris, see C.I.I.,
   Vol. IV, p. 466. Thus it appears to have been a widespread practice.
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Pratirajjika: This officer is mentioned in the Kalvan grant of Yasovarman, a feudatory of the Paramāra prince Bhōjājēva.\(^1\) It has been explained as 'probably an envoy at the court of a hostile king';\(^2\) but it is doubtful whether a feudatory prince was entitled to employ an envoy when in all foreign affairs he was to deal with his imperial overlord. It is also unknown why this officer figures among those in whose presence the grant was announced, as we find in this record.

Military Department: The importance of the military department in our age cannot be over-estimated; and though the king and the chief minister himself led the army occasionally, we find that there was a regular military department functioning at least under the Chandellas and also under the Paramāras, its head being designated as sēṇāpati, dārāṇādyakā or dārāṇādhipā.\(^3\) The sēṇāpati Madanavarman, as recorded in the Ichchhāvar plate inscription of Paramārda, received a grant from the king in a camp (l. 19), presumably for some distinguished military service, and the dārāṇādyakā Śricandra, as we are told in an inscription from Bhilsā (Vidisha), got the eulogy of the Sun prepared from the mahākavichakravartin Chhittapa (l. 12). Our records also use the designations mahāsādhāhanika, mahāsādhāhanika and sādhāhanika\(^4\) etc., who appear to have been officers of a lower cadre in the army. This department also possessed some other officers who were efficient in controlling elephants and horses (hastayaśvanetā) and expert in curing the diseases of the horses etc. Ordinary soldiers were known as bhujaśas, so often referred to in our inscriptions.

The people in the military service were rewarded for their valorous deeds, as we learn from the Dāhi plate stating that the general Mallaya received a gift for his victory over the king of Narwar, and also from the Charkhāri grant which was registered in favour of Rāuta Abhi for his bravery in the battle of Sondhi. The Gauḍā charter registers a grant to the heir of a person killed in a battle (mrītyuka-vṛitti).

The army consisted mainly of elephant forces, cavalry, and foot soldiers. The chariots of the old times had almost disappeared, though they were sometimes used by the kings and their generals.\(^5\) The elephant force was an important part of the army. The Khajurāho inscription of V. 1011, for example, describes Yasovarman entering the battle field as mounted on an elephant and surrounded by warriors holding bows and arrows in their hands (v. 28). The Nagpur Museum stone inscription gives a poetic description of the elephant forces of Lakshnavarman in vv. 45 and 50-51.\(^6\) That there was an officer to control this force is known from the Tilakarnāmaṇjari which mentions a kariṣṭādhanādhipyakha on p. 149. We have also some examples of kings fighting with sword in hand. Bow and arrows were also used in a battle; and some references to kunta we have, e.g., in the case of the Kachchhaphagāhta Mahāpāla.\(^7\) King Dhārāvansha is well known for the use of an arrow, as we have already seen above.

Military guards with competent forces were placed at places of strategic importance. The Ajayagadā stone inscription of the time of Bhōjavarmar\(^8\) (undated) informs us that Mahēśvara, his descendant Gaṅgādara, his descendant Āhū and the latter's great-grandson

---

1. No. 16, l. 26.
4. Respectively, No. 5, l. 9; No. 111, l. 4; and No. 60, l. 87. The first and third references are from the Paramāra inscriptions and the second is from that of the Chandella ruler Madanavarman. The word evidently comes from sādhana meaning an army.
5. Whereas according to Kauṭilya and Kāmandaka, victory depends mainly on the elephant force, the Nitiśāyagambita states that untrained elephants cause troubles of various types. In his Yaktikātpeta the Paramāra ruler Bhōjajēva lays down that chariots are to be used on level ground, elephants on uneven tracts, and horses in desolate forests.
6. Nos. 96 and 33 respectively.
7. No. 155, v. 10; also see vv. 5 and 23 of the same, referring to bow and sword, respectively, as in many other inscriptions.
8. No. 155.
INTRODUCTION

Vāsēka, who all belonged to the family of Jājūka, the chief minister of Gaoḍa, worked as officers in charge of the fortress of Kālaṇjar, and Vāsēka's younger brother Amada was in charge of that of Ajaygadh. We also learn from the same record that Gaṅgādhrā and his brother Jaunādhrā died in course of protecting the fort from the attacks of an enemy who is not mentioned by name. The word used in v. 20 of this inscription is 

Kātāpāla: This designation occurs in the Dhureṭi plate dated in the Kalachuri year 963 (1210-11 A.C.), showing that the person held it was an officer of a minor cadre.

We have an interesting passage in the Tilakamāṇjarī, stating how forts were cared for in wartime by taking defensive measures. It tells us that ample corn was stored inside the fort and also that all care was taken to remove mud from the dried and decayed wells, including stepwells. Entrance of a stranger was prevented at the main street which was protected by troops of soldiers in charge of trustworthy military officers; stone balls to be hurled at the enemy were kept within approach, and the whole circuit was guarded by horsemen, and also that the various kinds of war-machines (yantras) were set near the rampart at the top. The description is no doubt poetic, but it enables us to form a general idea of the warfare of and the defensive measures adopted in those days.

The work of the Police Department appears to have been much related to that of military, and though we have no direct reference to it in our inscriptions, it appears to have been controlled by the Chief minister. In our records we find references to suppressing the seditious people, for example, in the Mau stone inscription, which states that Sallakshana, the Chief minister of Paramardin, set them right. Under this minister there were a number of officers known as dandaṭikā (one entrusted with the punishment of criminals), tulāra (prefect of the city police), balādhyaksha (one in charge of military or city force), and sva-gopāla (explained as protector of property). We have also a number of references to removing the fears of the subjects (apīṣaprajaṭān bhuyam), to establishing peace by clearing (the country) of thorns (kanṭakauśādha) and also to controlling wild tribes like those of bhillas, sābaras and pulindas, necessitating the existence of a large and efficient police force as required by the areas of the kingdoms of those days.

The Śrīnāramaṇjarīkathā (p. 62) mentions a dandaṭikā who must have been a police officer. The Mungthali inscription of Dhāravarsha uses the word bhūta-parṣa in the sense of one who inflicted punishment, and, as already pointed out, it is used in the same sense in the Lekhaṇadhaṇa also.5

The police-system of a village was left to the villagers themselves, as we shall see below.

Judicial Department: The highest tribunal of justice was the ruler himself, who disposed of judicial cases with the help of experts under him. These experts, who were learned Brāhmaṇas, worked only in an advisory capacity and the final decision rested with the king himself. From contemporary and later records, however, we know that the king's Courts did not entertain cases directly.4 We know nothing about the Chief Justice and his subordinate officers, except two epigraphical instances, one of Dharmādharā (the department of dharma), which was in charge of Yaśōdhara under the Chandella ruler Dhanag, and the other under Dharmādharāpura Panḍita Prabhākara mentioned in a Paramāra inscription.5 The first of these terms has been explained as 'court of law, and
the officer in charge of it as relating to civil and criminal courts as well as to religious and charitable endowments.\(^1\) This shows how both these departments were connected. It is not definitely known, though it appears probable, that the designation of dharmatékhin, which we have already mentioned above, was also connected with this department.

**Revenue Department:** The few references that we have in our inscriptions do not enable us to have a systematic account of the functions of this department, though they enable us to know that the main sources of the state revenue were as shown below:

1. Taxes on land;
2. Customs tax, trade tax, excise duties, road cess, ferry duties in the riverine areas, mines, salt-pits, etc.
3. Cesses for temples;
4. Fines imposed for offences;
5. Annual tribute from the feudatories (cf. karaśi-kriya-bhúpaśáh in No. 125, v. 24);
6. Customary presents to the king and his officers;
7. Income from forests, pasture-lands, salt-pits, etc., which must have been a great source of income to the State.

Some of the terms are often found in our inscriptions. In a general way, they can only be mentioned here, without our comments, as they have already been explained. They are:- bhóga (land-tax, the king's share of produce), bhóga (royal dues, also mentioned as rájábhávyas), kara (tax in general), hiranya (tax payable in cash) and upárkara (additional tax). The terms nídhi or nídána and níkhépa are also mentioned in connection with our grants and they have been explained respectively as cess imposed upon agricultural lands and treasure trove.\(^2\)

Resuming the main theme in hand, we find that customs and excise duties, along with some other taxes, appear to have been collected at the market pavilion (mándapika) which is mentioned in some of our inscriptions. We also find an officer described as employed for keeping records and accounts of all that was spread in the market (prásáta-vahiká-karaṇé-niyuktáh).\(^3\) This officer also appears to have collected taxes on articles imported or manufactured in the town (báhyá-báhyáantar-áddáya), mentioned in a number of our inscriptions.\(^4\)

The Arthánti inscription of Chámundarája, dated V.S. 1136, mentions some of these taxes, along with some others, e.g., traders' tax, tax on gambling houses and traders' associations; and for details of these, reference is invited to our edition of the record.\(^5\) That ferry duties were also in vogue is known from the Sehore grant of Arjunavarman, dated in V.S. 1270.\(^6\) None of the other inscriptions edited here has a reference to it.

The king was the master of all marshy land, wood land and jungles, pasture-lands, mines and salt-pits, madhúka and mango groves, treasure trove and the like. All these

---

1 See *I.E.G.*, p. 92. The *T.M.* (p.12) mentions the designation dharmatékhya, probably in the same sense.
2 A reference to all the details about them is invited to some well-known books like the *Hindu Revenue System* by Ghoshal and D.C. Sircar's *Ind. Ep. Glossary*.
3 No. 86, v. 19.
4 For example, in No. 118, 1.17; No. 129, 1.34, etc.
5 No. 85, vv. 60 ff.
6 No. 49. The inscription is not transcribed line by line and hence the concerned line cannot be mentioned.
repeatedly find mention in our inscriptions, but how dues from all these were collected is nowhere stated. This was the duty of some officers posted there.

Some of the contemporary literary sources afford interesting information on some of these points. For example, the Nemināṭhacarita, a work in Prakrit composed by Dāmōda in V.S. 1287 in the reign of the Paramāra king Dēvapāla, mentions one Jaina-chattāmarī Nāgendra as avanapiyā, under the same king and living at Nilachchhēdapura, i.e., Nalchhi in Dhār District. This term has been explained as a 'customs and excise officer'. The Kāṭvan grant, which we have so often referred to above, casually mentions a śaṅkika explained as customs officer or officer in charge of collecting customs duties. The Lēkha-paddhati mentions dānika meaning collector of land-tax or customs duties.

Treasury Officer: The Chief Treasury Officer in the kingdom of the Paramāras was known as mahāmudrādāññika and in that of the Chandellas as kōśādhiṅkīrī. Bhījavarmān's kōśādhiṅkīrī (poetically expressed as kōśādhiṅkāraṇḍhipati) was Subhāja, the Chief Minister himself, who was a member of the king's assembly and also held the charge of bhānādāraṇapati, i.e., one who looked after the royal provision or store-house (bhānādāri of the present times), showing thereby how some of the officers were in charge of more than one portfolio. That this officer came from a high family is known from the Māndhātā inscription of Jayavarman, dated in V.S. 1331, which introduces his treasury officer Anayasingha with the title of Rāṭā (Rājapura), enjoyed by one of his ancestors. We do not know anything about the subordinates of this officer.

Being important, the post of treasury officer finds mention in some of the inscriptions of the other royal houses also. Thus we see that one Dhāmādeva was appointed to this post by the Mahārājādhirāja Aśānāsimha of the Añjī Paramār branch and the Gavilor inscription of the time of the Kachchhpahātā king Mahipāla, dated V.S. 1161, mentions one Manoraṭha as the treasury officer of his grandfather, Bhuvanapāla. The same inscription also informs us that this officer ascertained (calculated), directed and checked the income and expenditure and also kept an account of the same. The Yajavālā inscriptions use the terms kōśādhiṅkūsas and kōśādhiṅpas to designate this officer.

The śrēṣṭhins, whom we often refer to in our inscriptions, functioned as bankers. They occupied high position. For example, Pāthilla, who belonged to the Grahapati family, was honoured by the Chandēllā king Dhāṅga himself. We have also an example of the two brothers, Rishi and Ḍāḍha by name, who were entitled as śrēṣṭhins approved by the Kachchhpahātā king Vikramasimha himself.

---

1 For example, in No. 68, l. 21, we find that the cows of a sage were allowed to graze in a pasture-land by the Abu Paramāra king Dhāṅgavarsa himself, and the donations of salt-pits, along with some other objects, is mentioned in No. 49, No. 107, l. 12-13 (with iron); No. 115, l. 16; No. 151, l. 12; No. 155, v. 70 and in some others. A tax on uḷapākās (and not chāpākās in the sense of chāpa to be imported as taken by some for which see P.B.F., p. 234) is mentioned in No. 82, l. 38. It is a tax levied on bundles of uḷapā-grass brought from the royal grazing ground and to be used as fodder.

2 Reference from Virasvāmināndā-Grantkamālī, Pushpa 14, by Paramānanda Śāstrī (Delhi), 1963, p. 138.

3 No. 16, l. 27. The word pravatsi, which is used in No. 143, l. 14, also appears to convey the sense of customs duty, for which reference is invited to n. in the text. This tax also figures in the (Gāhāvāla) grants, for which see Ep. Ind., Vol.IV, p. 99; ibid., V, pp. 113, 115, 117. Also see H.K., p. 348.

4 See E.C.D., p. 219.

5 No. 52, l. 7, and No. 150, vv. 28-30, respectively. The first of these terms sometimes also designated the Chief Minister who was in charge of the royal seal.

6 No. 60, v. 57.

7 No. 80, l. 3-4.

8 No. 156, v. 12.

9 See No. 160, v. 16 and No. 161, v. 27.

10 No. 99, v. 1. Another Chandēllā record mentions one Śrēṣṭhi Dēdi of the same family, See No. 124, l. 1.
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Akshapatalika: Another important government officer was Akshapatalika, who is mentioned only in the Charkhārī grant of Dēvavarman, dated V.S. 1108. This term has been taken in the sense of ‘keeper of records’ by some, and as ‘keeper of accounts’ by others. As this term figures in only two of our records, it is not possible to ascertain the exact duties of this officer in our time. In both these records he is mentioned in connection with drafting the charter.

Śrīkaraṇāṭḍhipa: This officer is mentioned in some one of our records, e.g., the Kālāṇjar stone inscription of the time of Kīrtivarman. His office appears to have been that “of the Chief Secretary or one who wrote and issued all orders on behalf of his master and kept the State records”.

Mahāpratihāra: The high chamberlain was an influential person at the royal court. He was mainly in charge of informing the king about the visitors and he also regulated their entrance to the king’s presence, as we find from a reference in the Tilakamanājari.

He was also a personal attendant of the king, sometimes representing the king himself, as we find from the instance of Gāṇadēva, the chamberlain of the Paramāra king Jayavarman II, not only carrying on the royal order regarding making the donation but on rare occasions also doing all the duties of the king, e.g., bathing, etc., on his behalf. The high financial position of some of the chamberlains can be gauged from the instance of the Mahāpratihāra Sangrāmasimha who made some benefactions, according to the Kālāṇjar stone inscription of V.S. 1186, and also from that of the pratiḥāra Lākhanasimha and his brother Gopāsena doing the same, as we are informed by the Bhūla inscription. That he was a brave and learned person and that his position was indeed very high is known from the Mau stone inscription informing us that Gaddādhara, the pratiḥāri of the Chandella king Jayavarman was promoted to the rank of the Chief minister by the king’s younger brother Prithivivarman. It is not known if it was a rare example.

Rājaguru: In our epigraphic records we have occasional references to a person known as Rājaguru (royal preceptor). For example, the Kālāṇjar stone inscription, dated V.S. 1147, mentions Viśuḍēva as the guru of the Chandella king Kīrtivarman; and the emphatic tone of the former, viz., “hear him, O, this (my grant) is to be regularised by the Śrīkaraṇāṭḍhipas,” goes to show the high influence he wielded in the royal Court. The name of the Mahārājaguru is casually mentioned in an inscription from Khajurāhō, dated in V.S. 1011 and that of bhūṭārakā Rājaguru Vimalaśīva we know from the Bhurēj plate dated in K.S. 967 or 1212 A.C. From the Paramāra inscriptions we may cite the instance of the Rājaguru Madana, who composed the Pārtiṭāta-māṇjarī in the reign of Arjunavarman. He was entitled Bālāsarasvatī. Matvāka is mentioned as the royal preceptor of Dēvārīja of the Bhūmīl Paramāra branch (see No.91, ll. 19-20).

Puruḥita: This term occasionally occurs in our inscriptions and also in the Tilakamanājari, which states that the person who held this post was in charge of performing

1 See E.R.K., p. 158, and Imperial Unity, p. 243, respectively.
2 No. 106, i, 23; No. 198, I.3. This officer is also mentioned in T.M., p. 84.
3 No. 110, v. 6, and No. 128, 19. Hemādēva was Śrīkaraṇāṭḍhipa of the Yādava ruler Gāṇadēva and the meaning of this term as taken here is the same as explained in E.H.D., p. 202.
4 P. SI. The passage is of great interest as it shows the order in which people were received in the royal Court.
5 No. 57, ii. 28 ff. The record is dated V.S. 1317.
6 No. 115 and No. 81, ii. 13 ff., respectively.
7 No. 125, vv. 40-41.
8 No. 110, vv. 4 and 6.
9 No. 143, 1, 13.
10 See the section on literature that follows.
religious rites in the palace.\footnote{1} Perhaps he also helped the Rāja
guru who was presumably
in charge of literary assemblies arranged in the palace from time to time. Yaśōdhara,
the purūhita of Dāngā, was also his chief
justice.\footnote{2}

The other Central officials mentioned in our inscriptions are Panditas, poets, writers,
bards (vaśīḍhikās)\footnote{3} kāṇchukīn\footnote{4} and diṭṭa or diṭṭaka\footnote{5} who conveyed the ruler’s sanction of
a grant to local officials.\footnote{6}

Concluding this section, it has to be observed here that some of the officers and
officials enumerated above are mentioned in the earlier of our inscriptions while others
in later ones. They also differed from one to another kingdom. Some of them, particularly
the ministers as we have seen above, were employed on the principle of heredity, whereas
the others appear to have been promoted to high posts by merit. Some were, of course,
directly recruited.

\section*{Territorial Administration}

It has already been seen that two of the kingdoms, viz., the one of the Paramāras
in the south and the other of the Chandellas in the north, were fairly extensive and
also that the rulers belonging to both these dynasties claimed imperial titles in their palmy
days. Each of these houses had gradually developed an administrative system of its own,
mostly based on that of its erstwhile imperial ruling house, viz., that of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas
of the south and that of the Pratihāras of the north, respectively, and as a result of
this, some of its characteristics were common to both, whereas others were bound to be
peculiar to each other. Studying the administrative system of both these houses, we find
that excluding those parts which were under the feudalatory princes, for administrative
purposes, each of these kingdoms was divided into various units and sub-units in descending
order of size. And first of all we may notice the various terms denoting these divisions
which were formed for the organisation of administration.

The largest administrative divisions under the Paramāras were known as mandalas,
whereas those under the Chandellas as viśakyas, either of these terms being almost
equivalent to a district of the modern days. We also note that the term viśaya denoting
the largest territorial division is found only in three of the earlier grants of the Paramāra
kings,\footnote{7} but it soon fell into disuse, giving its place to the term manḍala, which continued
to the end of their reigning period, as will be known from the list given at the end
in an appendix. Going through the same list, we note that some of the manḍalas, e.g.,
those of Avanti, Chachchhurōti, Manḍū and Upendrapura, were known after the villages
or towns which appear to have been their headquarters, that of Hūna was known after
the people, and the one known as Nīlāgiri, after a mountain. It also appears that the
Mahādevīdāsaśaka-mandala contained not twelve villages in it, as is generally the case
elsewhere, but twelve smaller units like pathakas, as the use of the word mahaś in its
beginning suggests. This suggestion is corroborated by the fact that one of the pathakas
known as Bhiringārī-chauśabhāṣṭi,\footnote{8} which was a group of sixty-four villages, is, in its
turn, said to have been included in this manḍala.

\footnote{1}{For example, in No. 39, I, 13; No. 114, v, 56; and No. 158, II, 4–5. For T.M., see p. 59.}
\footnote{2}{See No. 114, v, 56. Also cf. Mādīkārī on Y.Ś. i, 312–13; 333, which assigns the status of a minister to a royal
priest.}
\footnote{3}{No. 155, v, 68.}
\footnote{4}{No. 150, v, 10.}
\footnote{5}{No. 39, I, 13; No. 57, I, 53; No. 68, I, 14; No. 158, II, 4–5, etc.}
\footnote{6}{See C.I.I., Vol. III, p. 100, s 3, where it is stated that this officer was to carry not the actual charter itself but
the king’s sanction and order to the local officials.}
\footnote{7}{See appendix.}
\footnote{8}{No. 53, II, 8-9.}
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A mandala was further divided into smaller units called pathakas or pratijägaranakas, which appear to have been the same as paraganas or tehsils of the present day. The first of these terms appears only in five of our records, viz., the Gaonry grant (II) of Väkapatiřa, the Mahudi, Ujjain and Dępalpur inscription of Bhūjakṛiva and in the Mändhätā inscription of Jayavarman II, dated in V.S. 1317. Taking the last instance as a singular exception and considering the restricted use of the term pathaka, we are constrained to conclude that this nomenclature, which is found only in the earlier grants, continued for a short time and its place was later taken by the word pratijägaranaka, which, appearing for the first time in the Dëwās grant of Naravarman, dated V.S. 1152, continued almost till the end of the Paramāra period.

That both these terms, viz., pathaka and pratijägaranaka, were synonymous of each other is also shown by the instance of the name Mahauḍa figuring as a pratijägaranaka in the Mändhätā grant of Dëvapāla, dated V.S. 1282 and as a pathaka in one issued from the same place by his son Jayavarman only thirty-five years later in V.S. 1317.

The pathakas or pratijägaranakas were further split up into smaller groups, each named after its chief village. It also appears possible, as shown by some of our records, that occasionally the extent of some of these groups may have been the same as of the pathakas or pratijägaranakas. Each of these groups shows the number of villages included in it. From a study of the groups of villages given in the appendix, we also know that whereas the smallest group included only twelve villages, as found in the case of Tinjasaparda and Vikhilapadra, the largest, viz., Muktāpalli, comprised as many as eighty-four villages.

The epigraphic records of the Paramāras occasionally mention still another territorial division known as bhūkti. It is connected with the word bhōga and was designed to indicate the territory which was meant for the enjoyment of a governor under whose charge it was placed, or of some other person entrusted with some other duty. The term bhōga, as already noted by V.V. Mirashi, comes from Mahārāṣṭra, and its use was naturally limited to Mālwa, which was its neighbouring province. It must be remarked here, however, that it was not a regular territorial and administrative unit; and we have no clear indication of its definite extent; some of the bhōgas may have been bigger while others smaller.

Here it may be of interest to note that of all the records of the Paramāras we have only one inscription, viz., the Gaonry grant of Väkapatiřa, issued in V.S. 1043, which mentions all the administrative divisions in the descending order. While naming the village Kāḍahāchchhakā, it says that it was included in the Madh uka-bhūkti which was connected with the Pārva-pathaka, included in the Ujjayini vishāya, which, in its turn, was included in the Avanti-mandala.

SUB-DIVISIONS OF THE CHANDÉLLA KINGDOM

Coming to study the territorial divisions of the kingdom of the Chandéllas, we do not find it divided into as many administrative units as those of the Paramāras. With

---

1 No. 7, I. 9; No. 9, II. 5-6; No. 12, II. 6-7; No. 13, I. 6 and No. 57, I. 23, respectively.
2 No. 30, I. 6.
3 No. 51, I. 17 and No. 57, I. 23 respectively.
4 We have a singular instance viz., that of Vōdasir, to show that occasionally not only one but also two villages were combined to indicate the name of a group. See my remarks on the location of this name in the respective inscription.
5 See the appn. at the end of this section.
6 C.I.I., Vol. IV, p. cxxxiv. Also see the words bhūkti and bhōga in I.E.G. As often noted, this term was used to denote the entire Chandélla kingdom, and at times it denoted a district in it.
7 No. 7, II. 9-10.
reference to it, we have only two divisions; one of them was known as vishaya, which was sometimes called pattalā, as we shall presently see, and the other as groups of villages. They are all enlisted in the appendix that follows. We have no means to ascertain the boundaries of these divisions, but we may take it for granted that some of them may have been large whereas the others small.

One of the vishayas of the Chandellā kingdom is mentioned as Navaratṣhī-tra-mandala-vishaya.1 In this connection it appears to me that the word mandala should be taken only in its general sense of territory, and the whole expression, as meaning a vishaya comprising the whole territory of Navaratṣhī. In one of the Chandellā grants it is also mentioned as a pattalā in the Prakrit form of this word (as Navaratṣha),2 and the fact that two of the other divisions, etc., Erachha and Nandāvāna, are mentioned both as vishayas and pattalīs3 goes to show that both these terms were almost identical. It may also be noted here that the use of the term pattalā is found only in two of the records, one of which is private.4

In our study of the village-groups in the Chandellā kingdom, we note that out of the seven groups mentioned in our inscriptions, three consisted of five villages each, three of twelve each and one of eighteen villages.

Besides vishaya, we have another territorial unit known as avastha which is mentioned only in the Nanyaurā grant of Dēvarman. We have no means to ascertain the definite significance of this term.

The administration of the mandalas under the Paramāras and of the vishayas under the Chandellas seems plainly to have been carried on by officers known as manḍalādāśus or manḍalēsuras and vishayapatis, corresponding to the modern Collectors or Deputy Commissioners. These officers were usually appointed on the basis of ability or distinguished military service5 or both. We have no instance to show that these posts were filled in on the principles of heredity, excluding, of course, a few instances of the persons belonging to the royal family, as we shall presently see. These officers had their own subordinates to help them in their work, though our records do not furnish details in this respect. The officers in charge of the districts worked under the direction of those in the Central government, as we know from their designation without the prefix mahat, e.g., in Śiddhanīka and Mahātādhanaṇīka, etc., though the possibility that both these officers may have been at the centre itself cannot altogether be precluded.

Some of these units appear to have been governed by military leaders whose duty in those days of frequent warfare and unsettled conditions of the period was to safeguard the frontiers and the highways passing through their territory and also to put down the internal local disturbances. Some others were placed under the mahāvattakas like Malayasimha, who appears to have been in charge of the Dhanavāhī-pattalā, as we are informed by the Dhurēṭī plates.6 The outposts of the kingdoms, which were of special significance, were in charge of the king's sons and near relatives. The Chandellā king Yaśovarman's younger son Krishnapa was posted at Duddhi, and as we have already seen while dealing with the political history of the Paramāras of Mālava, Udayāditya seems to have entrusted the government of parts of the eastern and the western divisions of his kingdom, respectively, to his sons Lakshmidēva and Naravarma. To these we may add the instances of

---

1 No. 108, 1. 14.
2 No. 119, 1. 12.
3 See the appr.
4 Nos. 119 and 143. The latter is a private record. Sometimes pattalā is mentioned as a division of pathaka. See Ep. Ind., Vol. V, p. 113.
5 As we know from the instance of Vigraha, the brother-in-law of Pṛṇapalla, the Paramāra king of Āḍhī. In No. 62, v. 12, he is described as sva-saurya-viry-arjuna-bhūpapātādhā.
6 No. 143, 1. 8.
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Prahładana, the younger brother and heir-apparent of Dhăravarsha, and also of the rājaputras or rādītas who often appear in our inscriptions.¹

FEUDAL PROPRIETORS

Parts of the State territories were held by feudatories, known variously as Bhoktas, Rānakas (Rājānakas), Thakkuris and Rājaputras (Rāvalis). They were like the jāgirdārs of the present day. They made suitable arrangements for administering their territories, subject to the control of the Central government. They also established peace and order in the villages under their jurisdiction, participated in the battles of their overlords² and paid a fixed sum, as we find also in the other contemporary kingdoms. A list of bhaktis is appended at the end. Here it may also be noted that the Paramāras of Vāgaḍa were feudatories of the main branch and those of Ābū were subject to the rule of the Chaulikyas of Gujarāt.

TOWN AND VILLAGE ADMINISTRATION

In towns and villages administration was carried on by the pañchakulas or a committee of five, the details of which we find in Somaśēva's Niśākhyāṁrita.³ Mahāpañchakulika, or Mahattātara, was perhaps the head of all of them, as he often figures among those to whom royal grants were communicated.⁴ These members appear to have been elected at regular intervals, as we know from the expression “êtad-varsha-vārīka” appearing in one of the inscriptions from the Bhimnāl area.⁵ In addition to those elected, there were some who were nominated by the king.⁶

The pañchakulas had their own staff. As already noted, the Dhureti plates mention a pañchakula-dharmādhī-karana, which was probably the Judicial department managed by a pañchakula.⁷ The system appears to have been almost the same under the Paramāras also. The pañjakila and the grāmākītha are also mentioned in some of our records. The first of these officials was in charge of collecting taxes on land. The śaullika, who collected customs duties, also figures in some of the records; and village customs officer, village accountant and a city kōtvāl are mentioned in some of the inscriptions from the records of the Junior Paramāras.⁸

The pañchakulas, who appear to hold their office in some prominent place in the town or village,⁹ probably also looked after the sanitary arrangement and safety of the place and exercised general control over it. No powers of taxation, however, was delegated to these bodies. We do not know if a suitable pañchāyat law existed for their guidance, as we find in modern times.

---

¹ See No. 39, l. 13, No. 56, l. 42 and No. 60, v. 57. The second of these words is the Prakrit form of the first.
² As we know, for example, from the instance of Kanka of the Vāgaḍa house, who died fighting a battle of his overlord Śyaka against the Rāhilakcīta Kṛtiṅga.⁴
³ No. 80, l. 5. Niśākhyāṁrita, XVIII, 49. For the details, see C.I.I., Vol. IV, p. coliv, n. 15.
⁴ For example, in No. 107, l. 8.
⁵ No. 92, l. 5.
⁶ See No. 73, v. 4, where Nāgara, who is here called a saukina, himself says that he was appointed by the king.
⁸ In No. 85, l. 18 which mentions -prastara-vahikā-karaṇa. An accountant figures in the Dhureti plates also. See No. 143, l. 9. Tātara (probably a city Kōtvāl) is mentioned in No. 64, l. 12, and No. 65, l. 10, both of which do not help us in ascertaining its exact meaning. For the different interpretations of this word, see I.E.G. and also E.C.D., p. 205 and n.; C.E.G., p. 235.
⁹ See No. 84, v. 54 we learn that a vārīca was allowed to stay in a temple, along with some other persons.
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An alphabetical list of towns and villages mentioned in our records is given at the end of this section. A few remarks, however, may be made here. The names of towns and big villages generally ended in *pura, nagara, pattana, padra, padraka, pāṭaka, and of some others in khāṭaka, pallī, pullikā and such other suffixes according to their size, as we find in Vaṭanagarā, Vaṭapurī, Sarasvatipattana, Dādārapadra, Kadambapadraka, Mōkhalapāṭaka, Paṁsulakheṭaka, Pāṣhāpapalli and Phulahali, etc., references to which can be seen in the list given below. Some of these names also end in *hrada or *daha, e.g., Nāgahrada or Nāgadaha and Kāyadraha. To some of these names, as to those of Dāhā, Ujjayini, Māṇḍū, Kharjūravāhaka and Vilāsapura, we find the prefix śrī or śrimat attached to them.¹

To make some more remarks, we find that some of these towns and villages were named after kings and some other members of the royal families, for example, Udayapura and Dēvapalapura after the Paramāra kings of these names and Madanapura and Hamirapura after the Chandélā rulers. All these places are known today exactly in the same form, or with slight changes. A number of them, which were of strategic importance, were fortified, as known from the word *durga mentioned at the end of their names, e.g., Kōśhavardhana, Maṇḍapa- Maṇḍhātri-, Navasara-, Kirti- and Jaya- or Jayapura-, all ending in durgā. Some are well known after the holy places, e.g., Arbuda-, Kōjī- and Piśāchadēva- all of which end in tirtha. And besides them all, there were agrahāra, that is, donated to Brāhmaṇas as rent-free villages and generally ending in -brahmāpuρī, -bhataqgrāma and the like. References to all these will be found in the list given at the end.²

¹ See, e.g., No. 9, l.7; No. 7, l.9; No. 57, l.24; No. 114, l.32; and No. 129, l.13, respectively.
² It is interesting to note that Wadā, who completed his work in 1328 A.C., says that at that time Mālāwī contained 1, 893,000 towns and villages. See Elliot, Vol. III, p. 31. Of the other regions we have no information.
APPENDIX 1

TERRITORIAL DIVISIONS AND SUB-DIVISIONS MENTIONED IN INSCRIPTIONS
A. PARAMĀRA INSCRIPTIONS

(a) Maṇḍalas (arranged alphabetically)

Note: The first figure in the brackets gives the number of the inscription and the second that of the line.

1. Avanti (7,9) : Here it denotes not a district but the kingdom, since Ujjayini is mentioned as a district (Maṇḍa) in it.

2. Chachchurī (23,6) : Comprising the territory round about the modern Chāchurī, also spelt as Chachbī, on the confluence of the Nēwaj and Parwān in the Jhālāwāḍ District of Rajasthān.

3. Hiṇḍa (6,7) : Around the northern part of the present Mandsaur District in Madhya Pradesh.

4. Kheṭaka (1-2,9) : Roughly equivalent to Kairā in Gujarāṭ; mentioned only as a territory of a mahāmaṇḍalādhīpu (maha-mandala) and not a regular division as district.

5. Mahādvaḍāśaka (40,5 and 44,7) : comprising parts of the modern districts of Vidishā and Bhopāl.

6. Maud (56,44) : Around Mōḍi, a village in the Mandsaur District and now submerged in the Chambal dam.

7. Möhaḍavāśaka (8,6) : Part of Sāharkaṭā District near Ahmedābād in Gujarāṭ; here it appears to denote a territorial division rather than a regular maṇḍala, as others.¹

8. Nilagiri (45,9) : Comprising parts of the Hoshangābād District, close to the reserved forest known by the same name.

9. Pūṇapathaka (18,6) : The territory near the island of Māndhāṭa on the Narmadā.

10. Samgamaḥkheṭaka² (15,7) : The region around Sāṅkheṭa in the former Baroda State territory. It is different from Kheṭaka mentioned above (No. 4).

11. Sthali (118) : Roughly corresponding to the Vagāḍa region or Bāṅsawāḍ-Đīngarpur tract.

12. Uparīhaḍa (54,3) : The region around Rāhagad in Sāgar District of Madhya Pradesh.

13. Upendrapura (34,5) : Probably corresponding to the eastern part of the modern Ujjain District (?). It appears to have been named after Upendra, the earliest known king of the royal Paramāra house.

14. Vindhyā (46,8) : Probably the eastern part of the modern Dēwās District in Madhya Pradesh (?). Named after the mountain.

15. Vyāpura (33,39) : Its definite location is not known, but it appears to have included some of the eastern portion of the Paramāra empire.³

¹ Here the reading is Mōhaḍavāṣakā-arbhaśṭama-maṇḍala, which, according to D.C. Sircar, means the subdivision of 70 villages in the district, whereas according to Subbr, who edited the inscription first, the district comprised 750 villages. This region is now included in Gujarāṭ, but it is interesting to note that Hien–Tsiang locates Mālwa in the valley of the river Mō–ha, i.e. the Mīlī in Gujarāṭ, and he further says that Khēṭa (Mod. Kairā) and Anandapura (mod. Vindnapur, which is mentioned in our inscriptions Nos. 1–2), formed parts of Mālwa. See D.C. Sircar’s Geog. of Anc. and Mod. India, 1971, p. 207.

² We may note that this was called a vishaya in 661–42 A.C. See C.I.I., Vol. IV, No. 19, 11, 9–10. It is different from Khēṭaka mentioned above.

³ To this list we may add some others which are of doubtful nature, viz. Ardhāshṭana (Ep. Ind., Vol. XXXIII, p. 197). Maru (Ind. Ant., Vol. LXV, p. 136) and Śīharā (I.H.Q., 1964, p. 163, 1. 2).
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(b) Vishayas

Āudrahādi (16,9)
Mohaḍavatsaka (1,12; 2,13)
Ujjayini (7,9).

(c) Pratijāgarapakas

Amāḍāpadra (45, 9-10)
Madhumati (198, 12)
Mandāraka (34,5)
Narmadāpūra (46,9)
Śākapura (47)
Vardhamānapūra (60,88)

Bhagavatpūra (30,6)
Mahuḍa (51,17)
Nāgadāha (60,89)
Paṭāra (49)
Saptāśī (60,88)

(d) Pathakas

Bhūmigriha-paśchima - (9, 5-6)
Mahuḍa - (57,23)
Pūrṇa - (198, 8 and 10)
Ujjayini-paśchima - (13,6)

Dakṣiṇa - (198, 12)
Nāgahara-paśchima - (12, 6-7)
Pūrvā (7, 9)

(e) Bhūkis

Āvaraka (6, 7)
Iraṇapadra (30, 6)
Madhumati (198, 11)
Rājaśayana (40, 5)

Gardhhabhāpānya (4, 9)
Maddhuka (7, 9)
Pāṇḍū (198, 11)
Vyāghradhāra (11, 8)

(f) Groups of villages

Bhringōrī-64 (53, 8)
Makutā-42 (18, 6-7)
Nyāyapadra-17 (10, 5)
Śāthari-16 (48, 1)4
Vatālīhājakā-36 (38, 8)
Vōḍasīrā -48 (46, 9)5

Madhumati - 700 (198, 11)
Muktāpalli-84 (16, 8)3
Pāṇḍū -350 (198, 11)
Tinissopadra-12 (5, 9)
Vikhilapadra-12 (44, 7)

Each of these groups mentions the name of the principal village of the unit in which it was situated, and following it, the number of the other villages included in it for administrative purposes. That this unit was almost identical with a pathaka is known from the mention of Bhrināgṛī (Bhringōrī of the list) as a pathaka and a part of the Mahāvītāsaṅkha-mandala in an inscription from Udaipur (Vidishā Dist.) dated 1173 A.C., which also shows that this mandala consisted of 12 such units (pathakas or groups of villages).

---

1. This is also mentioned as a mandala. See n. 1, above.
2. The principal town of this is not mentioned.
3. The reading of the next conveys the sense that Āudrahādi was a vishaya, with Muktāpalli as its chief town.
4. Here the reading is Śāthariśī, the precise meaning of which is not known to me. The reading of Wilkinson from which I get the text, is also doubtful. Ganguli interprets the expression as probably a group of sixteen villages called Sāvāri (H.P.D., p. 29), but to me it appears doubtful to take sāvāri to mean sixteen here, though I am unable to offer a proper explanation of the expression.
5. This appears to have been a composite name forming an administrative unit, for which see location of the name in the respective inscription.
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B. CHANDELLA INSCRIPTIONS

(a) Vishayas (arranged alphabetically)

1. Dāhi (144,8) : Around Bijāwar, a tehsīl in the modern Chhatarpur District of Madhya Pradesh.

2. Dudhāi (126,8) : modern Dudhāi in the Lalitpur subdivision of the Jhānsi District. Also mentioned as Dūdhūli in No. 119, 1. 6.

3. Erachha (130,8) : The region around Erich on the Bētwā and cir. 100 kms. north west of Mahōbā.


5. Kirāyiḍa (132,5) : Around Kirāḍi, about 12 kms. from Mahōbā.¹


7. Nandāvāna (129,8) : A part of Bāndā Dist.

8. Navarāṣṭrā (108,14) : Mentioned also as a mandala. Its precise location is not known, but as it is stated to have been situated on the Yamunā, it may be somewhere in the Bāndā, Hamirpur or Allahābād District.²

9. Paniūli (141,7) : Around Pannā, the chief town of a district in Madhya Pradesh.

10. Pāsūpi (138,6) : The valley of the Pāsūpi river flowing in the eastern part of the Bāndā District and joining the Yamunā.

11. Pitaśaila (112, v. 4) : Around Baldēobāgh tehsīl of the former Orchhā State, now in Madhya Pradesh.

12. Suṭāli (118,6) : Near about Vidishā.

13. Vāḍāvārī (126,8: 142,7) : Part of Sāgar District, as it is also mentioned in 140, 1, as Vāḍāvārā.

14. Vārahgl (200,6) : A part of Tikāmgadh District.

15. Vēdēsaiṭha (151,9) : Unidentified.

16. Vikaurā (126,7) : A part of Sāgar District.

17. Vikraunī (141, (ii), 7) : Probably identical with Vikaurā which is mentioned above.

(b) Pattalās

1. Dhanavāhi (143,10) 2. Erachchha (119,22)

¹ It is rather curious to see that a separate district then existed so near to Mahōbā which was the capital town.
² Also mentioned as Navaratha-pattalā.
INTRODUCTION

Kolava (119, 20, 28)
Nandavarna (119, 23)
Tintiri (119, 20, 24 and 27)

Mahishinēha (119, 21)
Navarātha (119, 21)
Vāndūrī (119, 21)

(c) Groups of villages

Hasta
Iśava-5 (126, 8)
Kṣatapada-12 (126, 7)
Pilihipi-5 (126, 8)
Tanta-12 (126, 7)
Isahara-5 (126, 8)
Khaṭauḍa-12 (126, 7)
Pilihipi-5 (126, 8)
Vārang-84 (200, 6)

APPENDIX II

TOWNS AND VILLAGES MENTIONED IN INSCRIPTIONS

Note: This list excludes those places which have already been included in any of the subdivisions mentioned above in Appx. I and also the original places of the donces which were outside the jurisdiction of the respective kingdoms. It, however, includes those which are mentioned in our inscriptions as forts, Īrithus, kṣṭetras and the like, apparently with the consideration that a settlement existed at the place. For further details about them, reference is invited to the respective inscriptions mentioning them. The first of the numbers that follows each of the names is that of the inscription and the second, that of the line.

Inscriptions of the Imperial Paramāra Dynasty

Amārēśvara-ṣaṭeṭra (57, 29) Ānandapura (1, 19)
Ānōha-bhaṭṭagrāma (6, 32-33) Avivā (6, 20)
Bhāllasvāmīdevapura (58, 33) Bhāllasvāmipura (60, 63)
Bhima (18, 7) Bhōjanagara (180, 51)
Chandrapuri (39, 9) Chikhillikā (4, 12)
Chirihilla (22, 4) Chitaliyā (188, 6)
Dādarapura (44, 7) Dapura (6, 36)
Dēvalapāṭaka (38, 1) Ṛvapālāpura (60, 80)

1. Here the reading is kṣatapāṭa-ṭhīkas-madhya, which, as already suggested by D.C. Sircar, should better be read as -asthīkāatra-madhya. By some, who read the chu before this expression as va, the name is taken as Vakṣhatapada, for which see E.R.K., p. 217, No. 20; but vakṣhata gives no meaning.

2. The reading here is Rāthā-satka-Tangi-thīkāfaka, and the word satka requires to be taken in the sense of 'connected with', as we also find in No. 107, 11, 7-8.
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Dhārā (in several inscriptions)\(^1\) Dhavali (21, 2)
Dōngaragrama (28, 6) Durgāry (9, 6)
Dvārmēla (58, 7)\(^2\) Gharaṭauda (56, 46)
Ghōshakūpik (22, 5) Guṇapura (45, 26)
Guṇaičā (46, 9)\(^3\) Guvāśā (56, 35)
Harshapura (8, 11) Harshapura (43, 1)\(^4\)
Harshapura (50, 13) Hathāvāda (16, 18)
Hathināvāra (49)\(^5\) Hathivāthā (186, 6)
Kādahīchinadhaka (7, 9) Kadambrāpdraka (34, 6)
Karpāśikā (23, 9) Kharjūrikā (6, 35)
Kiranka (13, 6) Kāśavardhanadurgā (23, 7 and 15.
Kumbhādāuda (60, 88) Kumbhārtāka (1, 12-13)
Laghu-Vaṅgānapadraka (38, 3) Lashaṇapura (60, 102)
Mahirātū (56, 52) Mahishav(b)uddhičā (16, 12)
Mahishmati (51, 19) Mahudāhā (198, 28)
Mālapuraka (30, 7) Maṅḍapa-durgā (57, 24, 60, 83, 85 and 90
Mānḍhātri-dhātikarā (60, 13) Mānḍhātri-durgā (60, 86)
Māyāmōdaka (39, 8) Mhaisadā (55, 4)
Mōkhalapātaka (33, 40) Nāla-tadāra (10, 6)\(^6\)
Nāṭiyā (60, 89) Palasavāda (45, 10)\(^7\)
Paṇvīṭha (55, 2)\(^8\) Paṭasvāda (45, 23)
Pāḍīvidī (47) Pippārikā-tadāra (4, 9)\(^9\)
Pāṭhadēva-ūrthā (4, 13) Rādaghajākā (21, 5)
Rājākiyagrāma (6, 37) Rālāgrāma (41, 14)

---

\(^1\) This name figures in several inscriptions of the Paramāra.
\(^2\) It is conjecturally taken as a village. See n. in the text of the inscription.
\(^3\) Probably the local form of Guṇapura.
\(^4\) This is separate than the other bearing the same name. Here it is mentioned as Harsha-puruvī ṃ purītt.
\(^5\) The number of the line is not known as the plates are missing and the text was not given line by line.
\(^6\) The mention of a tadāra shows that some habitation may have existed in the neighbourhood.
\(^7\) Differently read in the same inscription as Paṭasvāda and Savāda in different lines. As the plates are missing,
we have no means to ascertain the reading.
\(^8\) The reading is Paṇvīṭha-prātipattu and we have no means to ascertain whether it is the name of a village
or during the administration of Paṇvīṭha or Paṇḍīṭa Vītha, taking Paṇ as an alternation of Paṇḍīṭa (Paṇḍīṭa).
\(^9\) The meaning of tadāra is not known to me. The reading of the last letter is definitely ra.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Page Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Śābarisōlē</td>
<td>(48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sammati</td>
<td>(15, 10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savāḍā</td>
<td>(45, 28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sīhakā</td>
<td>(2, 13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śravanabhādra</td>
<td>(6, 28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suvāsani</td>
<td>(40, 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thikkarikā</td>
<td>(38, 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undapura</td>
<td>(50, 8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaḍauda</td>
<td>(57, 23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valauda</td>
<td>(60, 88)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vakaaligala</td>
<td>(16, 21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vardhainānapura</td>
<td>(39, 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaṭapadra</td>
<td>(11, 8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vilhaja</td>
<td>(15, 13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vrīvāsaka</td>
<td>(22, 5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Page Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Śakapura</td>
<td>(60, 81)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savāḍā</td>
<td>(45, 28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śayanapāṭa</td>
<td>(8, 8 and 9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sōpura</td>
<td>(6, 34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suvarṇaprāśādikā</td>
<td>(40, 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thīkariṅkā</td>
<td>(38, 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Udayapura</td>
<td>(18, 1, 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uttarayanō</td>
<td>(45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vatāvyapattāna</td>
<td>(59, 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaghādi</td>
<td>(60, 89)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanjikā</td>
<td>(6, 8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vatākāṭaka</td>
<td>(39, 8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vilapradaka</td>
<td>(23, 8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vīrānaka</td>
<td>(12, 7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Inscriptions of the Junior Paramāra Branches**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Page Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ājāhari</td>
<td>(64, 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bābhasavāda</td>
<td>(72, 1-2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhundipadra</td>
<td>(63, 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Būḍāpaṭa</td>
<td>(186, 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chhanatī</td>
<td>(82, 36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chitrakūṭa</td>
<td>(94, 20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhāṇatā</td>
<td>(77, 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grivāti</td>
<td>(82, 7 and 22)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Page Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Badari</td>
<td>(62, 9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhogypura</td>
<td>(84, 33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brahmāṇa</td>
<td>(189, 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chandravati</td>
<td>(71, 1-2; 73, 1; 81, 2; and 82, 15 and 38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chitāiltya</td>
<td>(188, 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deulapāṭaka</td>
<td>(84, 33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dundubhi</td>
<td>(73, 2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. It cannot be ascertained whether it is the name of a village or a territorial division. The reading is Śābariśōlē, which, as already stated above, D.C. Ganguli takes to mean “connected with Śābari-16, See H.P.D., p. 201.
2. The reading appears to be doubtful, and as the plates are missing, it cannot be verified.
3. See n. 7 above.
4. This and the preceding are the same with different spellings in the same record.
5. See n. 2 above.
6. This is different from the following village as the locations of both are different.
7. The reading here is Vamāḍrapāṭa yō Badārim jātaka, and it suggests the meaning that Vamāḍrapāṭa was the territorial unit with Badari as its capital town.
8. The reading is not certain; it may also be Undubhi.
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Hathadal (68, 21)
Kālhanavāda (82, 37)
Kirātakūpa (94, 20)
Maḍānulī (82, 38)
Maḍāladraka (84, 33)
Nāṭapāṭaka (84, 33)
Pāṃsulakheṭaka (84, 27 and 31)
Pāti (187, 9)
Philiṇi (71, 5)\(^1\)
Rohēḍā (82, 33)
Rudrtyantī (187, 9)
Savaḍavīddha (74, 3)\(^3\)
Śivakūpa (94, 20);
Talapāṭaka-pattana (90, 3)
Uṛthūnakā (90, 23)\(^4\)
Vāsana (67, 13)
Vāṭa (62, 9)\(^6\)
Vaṭapura (62, 15)

Hathikapāvā (186, 4-5)
Khālaṅghatte (84, 22)
Kūṁbhāramuli (68, 12)
Māgavāḍī (68, 21)
Māṇḍavāḍī (81, 6)
Navasara-durga (94, 23)
Panāchhi (84, 33)
Phalini (71, 3)
Phulahali (67, 8)
Rohēḍaka (81, 5)\(^2\)
Śāhīlavāḍī (68, 11)
Sindharajapura (94, 18)
Śrīmāla (91, 3 and 95, 5)
Tāṅkūṭṭa-durga (94, 23)
Vamsārathī (62, 9)\(^5\)
Vasīṣṭhaśārama (71, 2)
Vāṭanagara (62, 13)

Inscriptions of the Chandella Dynasty

Ajaya-sāgara
Āṇandapura (133, 4)
Bamharaḍā (118, 6)
Bhūtappallikā (108, 14)

Alaurā (143, 14)
Astāvala (119, 22)
Bāṇapura (133, 1)
Chachoch (134, 6)

---

1 It is the same as the preceding one.
2 The same as the preceding one.
3 That is Śavaḍa pūrṇa.
4 Cf. Uṛthuparāaka in No. 85, v. 73.
5 See n. 7 above.
6 Mentioned in plural as Vartṭhu showing it to be a region with the suffix pura or nagara when intended to show its capital.

7 Evidently from Ajayapura, which is on all occasions mentioned as Jayapura. See Jayapura-durga, below.
INTRODUCTION

Chulli (100, 10)\(^1\)  Dādari (119, 21)
Daviha (119, 23)\(^2\)  Dēddu (125, 27)
Dēnavāda (119, 21)  Dhanaura (130, 8)
Dhovahāṭa-pattana (143, 10)  Dugauḍā (112, 3; 150, 4)
Gahillī (130, 15)  Gōkula (126, 8)\(^3\)
Gōulā (119, 21), or Gōdala?  Hathidahā (126, 8)
Isarahara (126, 8)  Isauni (200, 6)
Ītalā (138, 6)  Itāva (126, 8)
Jalhuṭ (126, 11)  Jayapura-durgā (121, 2; 128,\(^4\) 2; 137, 2; and
Kāḍoḥa (141, 7)  149, 17 and 20; 192, 1; 193, 1; 194, 2; 195, 1)
Kakaradaha (126, 8)  Kakadahā (141, 10-11)
Kāraha (107, 7)  Kālāṇjara (110, 5, & 127,\(^5\) 1; 194, 2)
Kharjōvāṭhaka (114, 32-33)  Kēndī (125, 28)
Kōṭiṣā (128, 5)  Khātaudā (126, 11)
Kōṭitīrtha (108, 15)  Kōṭī (121, 4)\(^6\)
Madanapura-Pattana (126, 11)  Madanapura (126, 12)
Mahulī (119, 28)  Madanāśapurā (133, 4)
Maṇḍilapura (122, 1)\(^7\)  Maṇḍīlura (142, 7)
Nāndipura (145, 14)  Nandīnī (129, 8-9)
Pilikhiṇī (126, 8)  Parēyi (119, 14)
Pipalāhika (112, 7)  Pipalāhika (150, 5)
Paṇamauḍā (1077)  Sagauḍō (132, 6)
Saṅkalīṭa (121, 12)  Sēsayi (126, 7-8)\(^8\)
Sihadōṇī (142, 7)  Sōnasara (126, 12)
Sōndhi (144, 14)  Sūhavāṣa (107, 7)

---

1 The consonant of the first letter of this name may also be read as  นอกจากนี้.
2 May also be read as Dēvēha.
3 We have no means to ascertain whether it is a name or is used for grazing ground of a village.
4 Also mentioned as Jaya durga in No. 149.117.
5 It figures in several other records also.
6 Evidently the same as Kōṭiṣā, mentioned above.
7 Kielland read this name as Mahilapura.
8 It is also mentioned as a vīhaṇa, for which see the list of vīhaṇas in appx. 1.
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Tumurtumā (144,8) Uładana (126,8)
Vajavāda (141,9) Valahaudā (119,9 and 22)
Vasuhā (119,20) Vasuhātiṅkā (133,2)
Vilāsapura (129,12 & 132,8) Ṭrāhmanī (152,5)

Inscriptions of the Kachchhapaghātās

Babāda (157)4 Dōbha (154,31)
Gōpa (155,4 and 14)5 Gōpālikēra (156,2)
Jāyasapū (154,32) Mahātekhra (154,56)
Pashānapalli (155,32) Rajakadrāha (154,56)
Simhapāniya (155,6)

Inscription of the Ignōdā Royal House

Āgāsiyaka (158,7)

Inscriptions of the Yajvapālas

Gōpa (160, 9; 161, 17; 175, 25; and 179, 7)6
Nalagiri (175, 6) Kirtidurga (179, 6)
Nalapura (159, 10; 161, 3; 164, 1; 165, 2; 166, 2; 167, 6; 169, 3; 170, 2; 172, 1 and 4; 174, 2; and 179,2)
Pālasavātha (159, 22) Ratnagiri (175, 4)7
Sarasvatī-pattana (176, 5) Sēsai (177, 6)8
Vatapadra (161, 22)

1 The consonant of the first letter of this name may also be read as Cha. If so, the name may be taken as Chasuhā, or Sāuhlā, taking Cha separately.
2 This name figures with the prefix sullakṣhana in No. 134, 1, 8.
3 As read by Hall. As the original plate is not now forthcoming, the reading cannot be checked. The number of lines in cannot be given as transcript of Hall is not line by line.
4 For the reading and interpretation, see n. on the text.
5 In all cases it is mentioned as a mountain.
6 As above.
7 Whether it was inside the jurisdiction of the royal house or not is doubtful. See my remarks in the edition of the inscription.
8 This name also figures in a Chaudella inscription, for which see above p. 159 and the n. 8.
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Considering the state of religion in the period represented by our inscriptions, we first of all note that Buddhism, which had flourished during the previous centuries, had almost disappeared throughout the extensive region of Madhya Pradesh. None of our inscriptions registers an endowment to a Buddhist shrine or monastery. We have no doubt some stray examples both from Bundelkhand and Mālwā: one of them is the Charkhārī grant of the Chandella king Paramardin, issued in V. 1256, which informs us that five halas of land belonging to a Buddhist shrine were excluded while registering the grants to several Brāhmaṇas,1 but this goes to indicate only the spirit of toleration on the part of the ruler and not an active support. The grant is silent in telling us as to when and by whom the donation of the five halas was made.

Reference may also be made here to some Buddhist images unearthed at Mahābā. On the evidence of the characters incised on their pedestals, they have been assigned by K.N. Dikshit to the 11-12th centuries A.C.2 This, however, may be taken as an exceptional case confined to some areas, even if we rely on palaeographical evidence which is not always a sure indication of time.

From the region of Mālwā too we have only the single example of the sage Dānāśriṅgāṇa who is styled as Bodhisatva and Mahāvīrā and is represented as Malavali Pandita, and who, as it seems may have enjoyed the patronage of his contemporary Paramāra king in about the first half of the twelfth century when he flourished.3 But this information comes to us from the literary sources; and pointing out these stray examples, we may conclude that probably for want of the royal support this sect had almost totally disappeared from the entire region represented by our inscriptions.

Hinduism, on the other hand, is found to gain vigour in our period in almost all the regions under review, but its form was then considerably changed. The Vedic sacrifices which were very prominent in the Gupta period, had almost disappeared in our age, giving their place to the Grihya rites of the Purāṇas,4 and with the disappearance also of the philosophical aspect of religion, the one which captured popular mind was gaining ground. It was mainly represented by religious observances like bhakti (devotion), vrata (fast), dāna (charity) and śrīha-yētra (pilgrimage). To take first of these aspects, our period has been noted by a general rise of the bhakti cult throughout the country, and this general rise was marked by the activity of building temples where people could congregate. Here we have also to note that most of the kings of the time were followers of Śaivism and a number of them were zealous Śaivas themselves; as a result of this, Śaivism excessively flourished.

Taking the case of the imperial Paramāra rulers, we find that Siyaka II worshipped Śivanātha on the Māhi on his return after gaining a victory over Yōgarājā.5 Siyaka's son Vākpati donated a village for meeting the expenses of worship of Bhajñēśvarīdevī and

1. No. 132, 1, 14. The grants usually exclude a portion already donated, as we know from expressions like pūrvadatta-bhukti-varjām, etc.
3. S.E., p. 423.
4. Padārāgupta's description of Vākpati that he performed numerous Vedic sacrifices on the occasion of which he adorned the earth with golden sacrificial posts (N.S.C., XI, v. 73) is only a poetic panegyric since this form of sacrifice had then almost died out. So also is the poet's statement that Vākpati I resembled Indra and his horses drank the waters of the Ganges and also of the seas (Ibid., v. 10). Statements like Trayākṣāvarṇaḥ pravardhataṁ (No. 98, v. 49) also should be interpreted accordingly, and it may also be noted here that the titles and surnames of some of the donors appearing in our inscriptions are such as to show them only conversant with the Vedic sacrificial lore and not actually performing any sacrifice. In fact, not even a single inscription recording a donation for the Vedic sacrifice has yet come to light.
5. No. 1, 1, 15; No. 2, 1, 16.
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for repairing her temple;¹ and Vākpati's brother Śindhurāja, of whom we have no inscription, is known to have been devoted to Śiva for his praise of the deity as related by his court-poet Padmagupta.² Śindhurāja's son Bhōja and the latter's successors, perhaps excluding a few examples like those of Naravarman and Trailokyavarman whose religious inclination is not definitely known, were all Śaivites, as we know from their devotion to this deity and worshipping him while making grants.³ Bhōja is described as a zealotous Śaiva (Bharga-bhakta) in the Udaipur prāsaṣṭi,⁴ and he also composed a work entitled Tarva-prakāśa, expounding the principles of Śaivism, as we shall see while dealing with the literature of the time. We also know that Udayāditya is stated to have obtained his son Jagaddēva through the favour of Hara,⁵ and we have examples to show that royal examples were followed by the public. The building activities of some of these rulers will be enumerated below in the proper context.

Similarly, the Paramāra rulers belonging to the junior branches of Vāgaḍa, Ābu, Bhinmal and Jālōr were all followers of Śaivism, as we know not only from their paying homage to Śiva in the beginning of their records but also from the donations of some of them to Śaivite temples.⁶ And due to royal patronage this sect of Hinduism appears to have widely prevailed in the whole region.

Studying the religious inclination of the Chandella kings, we notice that with the exception of some of the early members of the house, for example Harsha and his son Yasōvarman, and also Jayavarman, who were followers of Vaishnavism,⁷ all were Śaivites, as we know not only from the expression Om namah Śivāya at the beginning of their grants and the initial verses thereof in which this deity is eulogised but also in the course of making the donations. Most of them also took pride in calling themselves parama māhēśvaras.⁸

The paucity of the material at our disposal does not allow us to make any definite statement about the religious tendency of the Kachchhapaghāta houses ruling in the Gwalior region. Only one of the three inscriptions of the house, which reigned at Gwalior itself, shows that Mahipala, along with his predecessor, was a Vaishnava, as he built a temple in honour of this deity in V. 1150. Of the other two inscriptions of the house, one records the construction of a Jaina temple, and the other, which speaks of the erection of a temple for Śiva in V. 1161, are silent about the religious predilections of the king. Virasīthta of the Narwar Kachchhapaghāta house, of course, was devoted to Viṣṇu.⁹

The Yajavpāda kings, who subsequently ruled over the same region, were almost all Śaivites.¹⁰

---

¹ No. 5, ll. 14-15.
² N.S.C. XVIII, vv. 14-23.
³ Cf., e.g., No. 9, ll. 8-9. Here it may be mentioned that Arjunavarman I was devoted to Kṛṣṇa.
⁴ No. 19, v. 21.
⁵ No. 28, v. 7.
⁶ See, for example, Nos. 76, 83 and 91. Possibly there may have been a few exceptions about whose religious inclinations we know nothing. It may also be pointed out here that this statement is not true in the case of every ruler of the Ābu branch and also that the only inscription of the Jālōr branch does not lead us to any conclusion regarding the religious faith of the rulers belonging to it.
⁷ See No. 98, vv. 20, 42-43. For Jayavarman, note the adjective prajñā-Nārāyana-pāda-tāvah in No. 148, l. 10.
⁸ For examples in No. 107, l. 2, and No. 142, l. 5.
⁹ See Nos. 155-157, respectively, for these houses.
¹⁰ This conclusion is based on stray references as we have no royal charter issued by any of the rulers of this house. With the single exception of No. 160 which begins with a verse in praise of Mūrti, and one or two more, all others invoke the blessings of Śiva and Viṣṇu in the beginning.
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Thus we see that Śalvisim was the most prominent cult in the whole region represented by our inscriptions, most of the rulers themselves being zealous champions of this creed. It is therefore natural that the religious faiths of these rulers must have been followed by most of their ministers, generals, feudatories and private individuals, and this led to a great building activity which was also accentuated by the cult of bhakti, gaining ground almost throughout India during this time. To take examples from Mālwā with reference to this activity, we find the Udaipur pradasīt stating that Bhōjadeva "made the world (jagat) worthy of its name by covering it all round with temples dedicated to Kāśīra, Rāmāvāra, Sāmanṭhā, Śuṇḍira (?), Kāla, Amala and Rudra", which are all Śiva's names. Some of these temples, though still unidentified, may have been in Mālwā itself.

The activity of building temples in honour of Śiva and the other deities is noted to continue throughout the extensive dominions of the Paramātras and their feudatories. Bhōja's brother Udayāditya erected the great temple 'of admirable beauty' in honour of the deity locally known as Nilakanṭhēśvarā;3 and almost to the same time belongs the exquisitely carved Sīdhēśvarā temple at Nēmāwar4 (Dēwās District) and the magnificent group of temples resembling those at Khajurāhō, at Un (Nimād District), some of which are dedicated to Śiva and the others to Viṣṇu or Jainā deities.5 Later on, in the reign of Dēvapālā, a construction a shrine in honour of Śambhu, at Harsū (East Nēmād Dist.) with some other deities in its precincts,5 and some beautiful temples at Mōḷi (Māndāur Dist.) were built during the reign of Dēvapālā's son and successor Jayavarman II.6

One of the Paramātras, rulers at Vāgāda, Dhanikā by name, constructed a shrine for Śiva, at Ujjain, near the temple of Mahākāli.7 It was known after the name of the king and it is still so known. Another king belonging to the same house, Maṇḍalika, who was a feudatory of Jayasimha I of the imperial house of Dhārā, erected a temple of smura-nīpa (Śiva) at Parāhētā (also known as Pānāhētā) and made liberal endowments for its maintenance.8 Maṇḍalika's son Chāmūndarāja is also known to have built a temple in honour of the same deity, at his capital Arikānā, in V. 1136, making sumptuous donations in favour of it.9 Anantapāḷa, a minister under this ruler, not only erected a temple for Hari but also carried on repairs to it in V. 1137.10

We have no record of the construction of a temple of Śiva by any of the Āhū rulers and we have a solitary instance of Mallārādēvī, the queen of Viṣṇa of the Jālōr house, endowing a Śiva temple with a golden cupola.11

That the temple building activity in Bundelkhand also was not less vigorous in the contemporary times is indicated by our records. The inscription of Dhaṅga, which was renewed by his successor Jayavarman in V. 1173, informs us that the former of these rulers built a temple at Khajurāhō and adorned it with golden cupolas. It was as lofty as Mērū and in it was installed a Śiva -linga (Phallus-emblem) of emerald, along with

1 No. 24, v. 20.
4 A.S.I.R., 1923-24; A.S.I.R., W.C., 1923-19, p. 54. At the place there is also a half-finished temple of Viṣṇu.
5 No. 50, vv. 10-11.
6 No. 56. Also see A.S.I.R., W.C., for 1919-20, pp. 94 ff.
8 Ibid., vv. 39 ff.
9 No. 84, vv. 66 ff.
10 No. 85, vv. 22 ff.
11 No. 96, v. 5.
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an image of Śiva, and the king also settled Brāhmaṇas in it, honouring them by donations of money, corn, cows and land.\(^1\) Another Chandella king, Paramardin, erected a splendid temple in honour of the same deity (\textit{adri-tanayā-ramaṇa} and \textit{Mridārī-parivriṃḍa}),\(^2\) and his chief minister Sallakshana built two temples side by side, one dedicated to Vishnu and the other to Śiva.\(^3\) Still another temple in honour of Śiva is known to have been built by Subhata, an officer under Bhōjavarman.\(^4\) It may also be noted here that during the reign of this king, a temple dedicated to Vishnu was also built by one of his ministers, Nama.\(^5\) These, of course, are a few prominent examples.

No temple of Śiva is known to have been built by any of the Kachchhaphagāta or Yajvapāla rulers, though an instance of building a Vishnu temple has been cited above, and another of a Śiva temple built by a minister under Mahipāla. It was built by Madhusūdana, a son of the treasury officer of Bhuvanapāla.\(^6\)

Thus we may note that of all the deities worshipped in our period, Śiva was the most popular. In our inscriptions he is mentioned by his common names such as Hara, Rudra, Sambhu, Mahēvara, Indumula and so on, and sometimes, by high-sounding poetic names as \textit{Adri-tanayā-ramaṇa}, as noted above. We have also instances when the deity was known after the person who installed the image or built the temple, for example, Udāyēvara, Dhanēvara and Manḍanēvara, as already seen above. Besides these, we have examples to show that this deity was also named after a place or a river, for example, Manēvara, after the confluence of the river Manā with a small stream, Ghaṇḍēvara, after Ghaṇḍapalli, and Achalēvara after Achalgadh at Abī.\(^7\) We have also Saivite names like Śatrulēvara and Gōhadeśvara,\(^8\) the significance of which cannot be correctly explained though they appear to be so called after some places near by.

Considering the religious practices connected with Saivism, we have evidences on record to show that all its four well-known sects, viz., Śaiva, Pāśupata, Kālāmukha and Kāpālikā\(^9\) existed in some form or other in most of the parts of the extensive region. The first of these sects which is also known as that of Lakulīsa, is said to have been found by Lakulīśvara, or Lakulīśvara, considered as an incarnation of Śiva Himself; and it is interesting to note that during the reign of the Paramāra king Dēvapāla a savant named Kēśava installed an image of Lakulīsa, along with those of some other deities, in a temple built by him at Hafsūd (Nemād Dist.), in V. 1278.\(^10\)

That this sect, which originated at Kārvar (Kāyavārōhana) near Baroda, may have spread its influence in the neighbourhood and was thus current in some parts of Māśrī has been shown by me elsewhere;\(^11\) and D.R. Bhundarkar and R.D. Banerji found images of Lakulīṣa in the villages of Mōjī and Sandhārā\(^12\) in the Mandsaur District. We have an inscription at Jalrāpātian (about 40 kms. east of it) in which a sage of the name of Iśānamuni is compared to Lakulīṣa.\(^13\) A fragmentary inscription from the first of these

---

2. No. 130, v. 11.
3. No. 130, vv. 25 and 25 respectively.
4. No. 150, vv. 28-29. This inscription is fragmentary but from the fact of its eulogising Śiva in the beginning, the shrine appears to have been dedicated to this deity.
5. No. 149, v. 34.
6. No. 156, v. 22.
7. No. 23, v. 3, and No. 112, respectively.
8. The Chitri and Ringnād inscriptions respectively.
10. No. 30, v. 11.
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places mentions a Pāṣupata sage of the name of Mallikārjuna who donated a village from his own bhūkti to a deity whose name is lost.¹

Of the Śaiva monasteries existing in our period in Mālwa, we may cite the example of one which is said to have been current at Ujjain itself, under the supervision of the ascetic Kādaṭāraśā, who is mentioned with eight of his spiritual ancestors in an inscription from Ābū, dated V.S. 1265 or 1208 A.C. The first of these ancestors was Nīhāna who came from Chandakātra.² The object of this inscription is to record the building operations at the Tirtha of Kanakhala in Achalgadh; and calculating the approximate time of two centuries for the eight successive ancestors mentioned in it, we may hold that the monastery may have made its beginning in the early years of the eleventh century A.C., in the time of Bhōjadeva, when Ujjain was a flourishing religious centre.

To give examples from the region of Ābū, we learn from a copper-plate grant of Dharavarsa, who belonged to the junior Paramāra house, a Śaivāchārya Visala Udagadama was allowed to graze his cows on the royal grazing ground without paying any tax.³ And that this sect was prevalent so far in the northernmost part of the kingdom of the Ābū Paramāra house is indicated by a number of images of this incarnation with an inscription recording a grant made to the temple dedicated to this deity in the reign of Dharavarsa’s son Somaśīnīha, from Nāpā (Pāli District) dated V.S. 1290.⁴

The prevalence of this sect in the Bhimnāl area in our age is attested by two of our inscriptions (Nos. 91 and 93), one of which mentions the donation of a field by Dēvarāja of the junior Paramāra house in V.S. 1059 (or 1069 ?) and the other, which is dated V.S. 1123 (1067 A.C.), states that in the reign of Dēvarāja’s grandson, Krishnārja, some drāmmas, which were offered by certain people to a Śaivite temple were actually handed over to a Pāṣupata Śaivāchārya, who was obviously in charge of the temple in which the deity was enshrined.

The Achāryas of theMattamāyāra clan who belonged to the Śaiva sect, are known to have spread from their original place Upendrapura, throughout the kingdom of the Kalachuris in the east and to the Rānōḍ-Kadvāhā region in the north. Upendrapura, which also appears in one of our inscriptions,⁵ has not satisfactorily been identified, though its location has been suggested in western Mālwa, by V.V. Mirashi.⁶ This suggestion, if correct, may indicate that some more Śaiva monasteries may have existed in the region during the period under review.

Viewing the spread of Śaivism in the Vindhyā region, we find the instance of the sage Vasudeva, who was the religious preceptor of the Chandella king Kirtivarman and who also built a manḍapa of the shrine of Nilakantha at Kalaṅjar. He is said to have requested the Śaiva and the Pāṣupata Achāryas to continue his donations to it.⁷ Another example is afforded by the Dharēti plate informing us that the lord (bhūtrākaka) and the illustrious Vinaiśiavā mortgaged a village (presumably for the maintenance of a monastery in his charge) to a Rānaka, also requesting the Śaiva and Pāṣupata ascetics to approve of his action.⁸

---

1 No. 56, 11. 33-35.
2 Ind. Ant., Vol. XI, pp. 220 ff. D.C. Ganguly’s remark that Chandakātra was at Ujjain is not convincing, for he has given no evidence and it may have been outside also. For his remark, see H.P.D., p. 248.
3 No. 68, 1. 12.
4 P.R.A.S., W.C., 1907-08, p. 49. See our No. 78, in which the name Laksūhitā is lost and has been restored from the reading of D.R. Bhandarkar.
5 No. 34, 1. 5.
7 No. 110, v. 6.
8 No. 143, 11. 15 ff.
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A glimpse into the daily life of these ascetics may be had from the same record which tells us that Vimalaśīva bathed and worshipped the god three times daily, and he also worshipped the fire; his son Śaṇaśīva led an austere life by observing Yoga i.e. Yama, nyāma and dhyāna, etc., and what appears rather curious, that the latter’s younger brother, who composed the inscription, was as dexterous in the use of weapons as in Śastras. Vimalaśīva, who is here mentioned as a Rāja-guru, appears to have been the same as the preceptor of the Kalachuri king Jayasimha⁴ and thus exerting considerable influence over the royal family.

The Kāpālikas worshipped Śiva in his terrific form. They appear to have exercised considerable influence around Ujjain in our period; and that their influence reached in the south so far as the Baroda territory is known from the Tilakāsā grant of V. 1103. This inscription describes the sage Dinakara as a mahātmāvadāhara and thus resembling Śiva himself. It is thus obvious that the Kāpālikas also had to observe certain vows. Because of some common practices, they were sometimes also confused with the Kālāmukhas.⁵ The Prabodhachandrodśayā, a drama written by Krishnarama to celebrate the victory of Chandella Kiritvarman, introduces a Kāpālika who holds a debate with a Jain monk and a Buddhist bhikṣu. Elsewhere, this drama also describes the Kāpālika faith as the doctrine of Paramāvarta and the worship of Mahābhairava by the followers of this cult.⁶ We have, however, no epigraphic evidence to show the spread of this sect in the Bundelkhand region. It also seems to have gradually dwindled throughout the regions comprising Mālwā and Bundelkhand, probably because of its repulsive practices.⁷

From the foregoing account it is clear that Śaivism was highly prosperous in the region containing two Jayātīlingas - one at Ujjain and the other at Māndhātā, along with a Siddha-śaṅka at Kāliṇjar.⁸

ŠAKTI WORSHIP

Šakti, Pārvatī or Dēvi, the consort of Śiva, is often referred to and eulogized in our records in various forms and by her different names. Occasionally, she is invoked to show her blessings, as in the Udaipur pratāṣṭi;⁷ and homage is sometimes paid to her while beginning an inscription, as Namās-Chaṇḍikāya.⁸ We have a few epigraphical instances to show the installation of this deity, e.g., of an image of Pārvatī at Māḍgū in V. 1138 or 1081 A.C.,⁹ of another, Ambikā, from Harṣād in V. 1275 = 1218 A.C. both from the Mālwā region; of that of Mahiśāsuramardini from Dhānta in the Sirōhi

---

1 C.L.I., Vol. IV, No. 63, 1. 22
2 No. 15
4 Act III, v. 13
5 For Kāpālikas and their practices, also see J.A.S.R. Letters, Vol. XIV, No. 1, (1948), p. 10, n. The Kāpālika introduced in the Prabodhachandrodśayā describes himself in the following words: “My necklace and ornaments are of human bones. I live in the ashes of the dead and eat my food in human skulls. etc. etc.” The way of description shows that this sect practiced horrid and repulsive forms of Śaivism, and it is possible that these practices may not have been allowed to continue in the Chandella kingdom where the Pāṇḍavas, exerted influence even on the royal house, as already seen. The number of the followers of this sect seems to have dwindled in Mālwā also, from the time of Śaṅkarāchārya, who defeated its representatives along with those of the other sects, as we learn from the Śaṅkaraśadvijaya of Ammatūgarī.
6 No. 110, v. 8
7 No. 24, v. 3.
8 No. 112.
9 No. 20.
10 No. 50, v.11.
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area in V. 1277 or 1221 A.C.; and of still another, under the name of Kālī, in Vīravarman's reign, at Kālaṇḍar, in the Vindhya region. Vākpati Mūrti issued a grant for the daily worship of Bhājāśvarī-Dēvī and also for carrying on repairs to her temple at Ujjain. Chārchiṅkā, another form of the same deity, was honoured by Naravarman, the Paramāra king, Limbāryā by Dēvapāla, and Mahārūṇḍa perhaps by the Vajrapāla kings.

Citing a few epigraphical examples of images of the same deity, from the Vindhya region, we note that they all belong to a later period, i.e., to the 13-14th centuries A.C. A fragmentary inscription of the time of the Chandellā king Vīravarman, who flourished in the third quarter of the thirteenth century A.C., informs us that he installed images of Nīlakanṭha and Kālī in splendid temples, and three records of the time of his successor, Harīvarman, mention the consecration of the images of Kālī, along with some Śaivīte feminine deities, at Ancilā in Subhaṭa, the Superintendent of the treasury and Chief Minister of Vīravarman, between the years 1287 and 1309 A.C. Among these, images of the pacific form are those of Pārvatī, Kāmākhyā, Harasiddhi, Śiva, Jivantapatrīkā and Gauri, and those of the terrific forms are Chāmubā and Kālīka.

From our literary sources we know that Ujjain was traditionally one of the Sakti pithas; and the Ashādasaṅgīthā, which is said to have been composed by Śankaracārya, mentions the seat of Mahākālī at Ujjain. Abū was another centre of this type.

In his Svarṇatāṅgana-stātāraudh, Bhāja mentions a number of forms of this deity; they are not taken into account here. Similarly, this description excludes the sculptural representations of this type found throughout the region of Madhya Pradesh.

The composite sculptures of Śiva and Pārvatī (Uṃta-Mahāśvāra), for example, those of dīṅgana, pātha and Ardhanārīśvarāva, were also worshipped in our age, as shown by the finds of images of this type and belonging to our time, either separate or in parts of temples throughout the region. But we have no epigraphical reference in this respect.

GANAPATI

Ganapatī, one of Śiva's sons who is believed to remove all our obstacles and give success; does not appear to have claimed much reverence at the beginning of our period. His blessings are invoked only in two Paramāra inscriptions, viz., the undated Udaipur pratisa and the Harsūl inscription of the time of Dēvapāla, dated in V. 1275 or 1218 A.C. The latter of these records also speaks of the consecration of an image of this

1 No. 77.
2 No. 148, 1, 27.
3 No. 5, 1, 11-15.
4 No. 86, 1, 1. A stone image of this deity was found by N.P. Chakravarti, at Panthārī near Māndhātā. See A.S.I., A.R., 1935-36, p. 80. The details are not recorded.
5 No. 50, 1, 6.
6 No. 180, 1, 2. Apparently it is a form of the mother-goddess, as the other two also.
7 Nos. 148, 1, 27.
8 Nos. 193-195. To these images we may add those of Durgā, who has both the forms, Surabhi, and also
9 Yogins to whom a temple was dedicated at Khajurāh. See A.S.I.R., Vol. II, p. 416, No. I.
11 ibid., pp. 20-22.
12 11, Chap. 77.
13 Some of these sculptures may be taken as belonging to our period. Images of Śakti were found at Dālākāhā and Kölni in the Mandsaur District and at Mākāli in the Ujjain District. They are all from the Paramāra kingdom and are ascribed to 11-12th centuries by R.D. Bannerji. See P.R.A.S.W.C., pp. 82, 86 and 101 respectively. From the kingdom of the Chandellās, Cunningham noted some remains indicating the existence of a Chandrāsastria Yogī temple of about 900 A.C. See A.S.I.R., Vol. II, p. 417; and the images of Ashvalakāi carved in a row at Ancilā, one of them being that of Chāmubā (ibid., Vol. XXI, p. 47). These are only a few examples.
14 No. 24 and 50 respectively.
deity, along with some others. Besides these, we have only three instances, each one from the region of Mālwa, Vindhyā and Gwālia, paying homage to this god in the beginning of the inscriptions.1 We have still another reference in this respect; it is furnished by the Kālañjār inscription of the reign of Viravarman, dated in V.S.1325 or 1281 A.C.2 It records the installation of this deity under the name of Vāṇi-Vinayaka, by Vāsudeva, a son of Gaṇapati and the younger brother of Jagadvīra, a minister under Viravarman. But all these references, which are stray and far between, do not indicate the popularity of the worship of this deity throughout the region and probably also go to show that this cult began to gain ground in this area some time in the 13th century to which the Harsīḍ and the Kālañjār inscriptions referred to above belong.

OTHER ŚAIVA DEITIES

The worship of Skanda, another Śaivite deity and the other son of Śiva himself, does not appear to have claimed many votaries in our age. We have neither many images of this deity and not even a single epigraphical evidence in this respect. The images of Nandin, the vehicle of Śiva, and of the accompanying Bhairava, are found in a large number throughout the region, as they are an indispensable adjunct to a Śaiva shrine. But so far we have not even a single epigraph by way of reference to them.

VAISHNAVISM

The other important sect of orthodox Hinduism was Vaishnavism, known after Vishnu, another member of the Trinity, whose worship was popular, perhaps not to that extent as of Śiva, in most of the royal families represented by our records.

It is true that most of the rulers of our time were devoted to Śiva, but they did not confine their allegiance to this god alone and extended reverence to other deities also, who were worshipped side by side with him in our age. The official representation of the Paramāras, for example, was Garuḍa, and that of the Chandellās, Lakshmi or Gaṅga-Lakshmi, as to be seen on their copper-plate charters; and their predilection to some other deities is shown from their worship of the Sun, the fire and Vishnu and other deities while making donations and also from invoking the blessings of these and the other deities at the beginning of the inscriptions.

During the period under review we find some of the kings building and repairing temples dedicated to Vishnu; and their examples were followed by ministers, other officers and the general public who were fervent devotees of this deity. Taking the case of the Paramāra rulers, an inscription from Bhilsā tells us that the Mahākālaṭa Trailokyavarman constructed at that place a shrine of Murāri in the form of Varāha and installed in it the images of Vishnu in different forms.3 In the reign of Dēvapāla, a later Paramāra king, a person named Kēśava, installed, among others, images of Varahā and of some other incarnations of the same deity in a temple of Śiva constructed by him at Harsīḍ.4 That this cult too had captured the public mind is known from an eulogy in honour of the same deity which was composed by Bilhaṇa, the Minister of Peace and War under Subhūtikarman.5 It does not refer to any temple building activity.

---

1 Nos. 35, 145 and 160 respectively. He is also invoked in an inscription from Khajurāho, No. 114, v. 5.
2 No. 147.
3 No. 42, vv. 4–6.
4 No. 50, v. 11.
5 No. 185, B.
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We have a solitary example from the Ábū area informing us about the Brāhmaṇa minister of Pratīṣṭhāna, who repaired the temple of Paṭṭa-Viṣṇu at Gīravad in V.S.1344 or 1286 A.C. and presented gold and silver ornaments to the deity.¹

We have seen above that some of the Chandēla rulers were fervent devotees of Viṣṇu, and the Khajurāhī inscription of V.S.1011 (953-54 A.C.) tells us that Yaśūvarman constructed the splendid, lofty and gold-pinnacled temple of Viṅgūthā.² The other temple for Nārāyana was built by Gaddādhara, the Chief Minister of Madanavarman,³ another by Sallakshana, the Chief Minister of Paramardin in V.S.1252 or 1195 A.C.⁴ and still another, in honour of Kāśīva, was built by Nāna, the Chief Minister of Bhūjavaran in V.S.1345 or 1288 A.C.⁵

All these Viṣṇu shrines built almost at regular intervals speak highly of the prevalence of Vaishnavism throughout the reigning period of the Chandēlas, also showing the popularity of the cult.

So far as the territory around Gwāliör is concerned, reference has already been made to the temple of Viṣṇu with the name Padmanātha which was begun by the Kaśchchhapaghātā ruler Padmapāla and completed by his younger brother Mahipāla in V.S.1150 or 1092 A.C.⁶ For the maintenance of this shrine, as we are also told, the king made luxurious arrangements for clothing and decorating the images of Aniruddha, Cākṣaṇa and Achyuta, which were all of precious metal, and he also established at Brahmapuri a charitable feeding house and granted a village, levying taxes throughout his territory. He also made due provision for the maintenance of this establishment and appointed a supervisor to look after the whole arrangement.

We have so far only one inscription of the Kaśchchhapaghātā house ruling at Narwar in the Shīyapur District, to throw light on this point. It is a grant issued by Viśnughīma in V.S.1177 or 1120 A.C. and from paying homage to Nārāyana in the beginning and the expression para-yā-vaishnavā applied to him in it, he was obviously a fervent devotee to Viṣṇuvism.⁷ We have no means to know anything about the religious inclination of the rulers belonging to the Kaśchchhapaghātā house reigning at Dūbkūṇḍ.

Our epigraphs mention Viṣṇu by most of his common synonyms such as Hari, Nārāyana, Viṅgūthā, Kāśīva, Dāmodara, Mādhava, Gōvinda, Dātyāri, Pīṭāmbarā, Vāsudēva, etc., but also as Aniruddha and Padmanātha, which are interesting. According to the Brahma-Purāṇa, the first of these two names is applied to one of the four aspects of the deity referring to him as sleeping on Sēsha in the ocean, the other three aspects being known as Vāsudēva, Saṅkarṣaṇa and Pradyumna. The name Padmanātha (and not Padmanābbha, by which the deity is generally known) is also interesting in indicating the deity after the name of the king Padmapāla and thus reminding us of a Śaivite name.

The Nagpur Museum stone inscription uses for Viṣṇu the name Viśvarūpa,⁸ whereas we have two instances - one from Mālwā and the other from Vindhyā,⁹ where this deity is addressed as Viśvamūrti. The appellation Viśvamūrti, though generally it denotes the
RELIGION

Sun,\(^1\) appears to have been used here to indicate that in our age too both these deities commanded the same type of equal respect as in the former age.\(^2\)

The Vidiśā inscription, referred to above, belonged to the Paramāra Mahākumāra Trailokyavarman and is dated V.S.1216 or 1159 A.C. In verse six it states that the king who built a temple of Vishnu in the form of Varāha, installed in it the images of the same deity which were distinguished from each other by the way in which they held the four well-known āyudhas in their four hands. It is thus significant to note that the worship of Vishnu was also current in that age at least in Mālwā. We have no other instances of this type from any of the other regions.

Vishnu is the only member of the Trinity who is known for assuming avatāras, and these avatāras also are mentioned in several of our inscriptions to invoke his blessings, as can be known from the following tabular statement:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name of avatāra</th>
<th>References</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1.  | Fish            | No. 33, v. 7  
               | No. 149, v. 4 | Śripati is invoked in verse 2. |
| 2.  | Tortoise        | No. 149, v. 5 | |
| 3.  | Boar            | No. 42, v. 4  
               | No. 60, v. 10 
               | No. 98, v. 1  
               | No. 149, v. 6 | Along with man-lion. |
| 4.  | Man-lion        | Nos. 1-2, v.1 
               | Nos. 4-7, v.1  
               | No. 60, v. 10 
               | No. 149, v. 7  
               | No. 120, 12 | Referring to installation of an image of the deity at Kālanjār in V.S.1192. |
| 5.  | Vāmana          | No. 98, v. 2, v.38 | Here Vishnu is described as superior than Śiva. |
|     |                 | No. 149, v. 8  |       |
| 6.  | Paraśurāma      | No. 47, v. 2  
               | No. 48, v. 3  
               | No. 51, v. 3  
               | No. 57, v. 2  
               | No. 60, v. 2  
               | No. 149, v. 9 |       |
| 7.  | Rāma            | No. 47, v. 3  
               | No. 48, v. 3  
               | No. 51, v. 3  |       |

---

1 Cf. Mālaśimādhava, 1, 3;  
2 Cf. Ādiyānām-abhin Vishvott, in the Citā, X, 21.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name of <em>avatāra</em></th>
<th>References</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Balarāma</td>
<td>No. 57, v. 3; No. 60, v. 3; No. 149, v. 10.</td>
<td>Only occasionally and rarely mentioned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Krishṇa</td>
<td>Nos. 4-7, v. 2; No. 33, v. 2; No. 149, vv. 1-3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It may be noted here that all these *avatāras* are mentioned in No. 149, invoking their blessings.

The above survey indicates the wide prevalence and popularity of the worship of Vishṇu throughout the region, as we can conclude from the finds of images also. The epigraphs, however, refer to the *avatāras* of Varāha, Nrisimha and Krishṇa more often and generally in connection with rescuing the kingdom by the kings from their enemies. The Udaipur *prasasti* compares Udayāditya to the Varāha incarnation in connection with relieving the Paramāra kingdom from its enemies, the Chaullikyas on the west and the Kalachuris in the east. The Dēogadh and Mahībā inscriptions, referred to above, compare the Chandella king Kirtivarman to Krishṇa who obtained Lakshmi by chrnning the ocean in the form of his enemies. For a similar reason the Chandella king Trailokyavarman, who restored the power and prestige of his house, is compared to the same deity in an inscription of Viravarman, his immediate successor.¹

The special importance of the worship of the Varāha and Nrisimha *avatāras* of Vishṇu in our time may probably be ascribed to the incessant struggle ranging among the royal houses; and the former of these deities appears to have been worshipped for ensuring victory to the dedicant and the latter to destroy his enemies. It is probably this thought which gave rise to the worship of the composite form of both these *avatāras*, as we notice in iconographic representations. Cunningham found images of this type at Chandrāvati (Jharapājan), Gwālīor and Khajurāhō,² which represent all the different territories of our extensive region, and the images found by him at the last mentioned place appear to have been referred to in an inscription found in its close proximity.³ On the other hand, the *avatāras* of Rāma, Paraśurāma and Krishṇa are mentioned in our inscriptions which belong to a later period, i.e., of the thirteenth century, of course with some stray earlier exceptions, as is evident from the table given above.

**LAKSHMĪ**

Lakshmi, the consort of Vishṇu and the goddess of fortune, not only finds mention in some of our inscriptions but is also depicted on the coins issued by the Paramāra and the Chandella rulers. She was regarded as Rājya-lakshmi, representing the kingdom. The figure of Gaja-Lakshmi is engraved at the top of the land-grants of the latter of these dynasties. Her images are found in most of the Vishṇu temples, e.g., at the Dēvi-Jagadamba temple at Khajurāhō, locally known as the Dēvi temple.⁴ Lakshmi was also propitiated in every house on the night of Dipāvall, as at present.

---

1 No. 45, v. 7. Also see No. 82, v. 18. The *avatāras* of Vishṇu are often mentioned while describing kings, e.g., in No. 84, v. 39, and their blessings are also invoked, e.g., in No. 98.
3 No. 98, v. 2. Vide *Kirtimahā-purāṇa*-obhuya-jūshum. This inscription and the image were found by Cunningham near the Lakshmanā temple. Also see op. cit., p. 426.
SUN-WORSHIP

The Sun, who was an important deity from very early times, appears to have attained considerable influence at the beginning of our period, at least in Mālā and its surroundings. The earliest epigraphical reference to the worship of this deity is furnished by the eulogy composed in his honour in the reign of the Paramāra king Bhijādeva, by the Mahākavi Chakkavati Pandita Chhibbapa and found at Vīdīśa.  

Another instance, which is slightly later, is afforded by the Jainā (Adilābād District) stone inscription recording the construction (or repairs) of a Sun temple by Padmavati, the consort of a military officer under Udayālīya. In this connection it is of interest to note that in his Rajamārtanda Bhijādeva mentions the worship of the Sun-deity on the seventh after fast on the sixth (vv. 1116-7) and also that we find that this deity is generally worshipped by the kings while donating land and villages, and also at the beginning of other pious deeds.

Inscriptions from the other areas of Madhya Pradesh are not very helpful in this respect, for they offer homage to this deity only in a passing way, for example, the use of the expression namah Sāturē while concluding an inscription from Khajurāho and the invocation of this deity in a verse in an inscription from Narwar, of V.S. 1355. These stray examples do not lead us to any definite conclusion and probably indicate some personal or individual inclination.

The Sirōhi-Bhimāl area, on the other hand, affords unmistakable evidences regarding the worship of this deity, which was current there in our age. An inscription from Varman, dated V.S. 1099, speaks of the repairs of a Sun-temple, calling the deity by the name of Brahmanāśvāminī, which appears to be a corrupt form of Brahmāndasvāminī, i.e., the lord of the universe. Another inscription, from Vasanta guards in the same area and dated in the same year, tells us that Lāhini, the widowed sister of Pūrnapāla, the Sirōhi Paramāra king, repaired the temple of this god and also made some other benefactions to it. The expression trālikai-dīnō Hariḥ used in one of the mangali-slokas of the same epigraph clearly shows that the Sun was regarded identical with Hari, which is a point worth noting, as we have already observed above in the course of dealing with Vaishnavism. The inscription also tells us that the worship of the Sun was prevalent throughout the town.

We tread on sure grounds while dealing with the worship of the Sun-deity in the region of Bhimāl, the capital of one of the junior branches of the Paramāra rulers. From one of the inscriptions found at this place and dated in Krishnāraja's reign in V.S. 1117 or 1060 A.C., we know of the restoration of the temple of Jagatpāmin, as the name is used here, and of furnishing it with a golden cupola and a banner by certain persons. The opening verse of this record uses such expressions as to indicate that the Sun-deity is superior even to Śiva, and it also tells us that the above mentioned pious deed was performed by certain persons including Jainas also, after inducing kings, princes, Brahmans, and the other citizens to resort to Saura-dharma, i.e., the worship of the Sun.

Another inscription from the same place and dated V.S. 1239 or 1183 A.C., i.e. 123 years subsequently, mentions the name Varakya, i.e., Balarka (the morning Sun) and records the

---

1 No. 57. Another inscription from the same place and ascribed to c. the 11th century (Ep. Ind., XXX, p. 215) shows Vīdīśa to be a centre of Sun-worship in our period.
2 No. 29, v. 19.
3 No. 98. For a temple dedicated to the sun, at Khajurāho, see A.S.I.R., Vol. II, p. 422.
4 No. 179, v. 2.
5 No. 61.
6 No. 62, v. 27.
7 No. 92, II, 9-11.
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donation of a dharma each, by a person and his wife to the deity.¹ Both these epigraphs clearly show, as also concluded by D.R. Bhandarkar, that about the middle of the eleventh century Sūrya-worship was a common religious ground for both Hindus and Jainas to meet and make benefactions.² This conclusion rests on the mention in our epigraphs, of persons who belonged to both these communities, as stated just above.

BRAHMĀ

Brahmā was no longer a popular deity, losing his importance some time probably before this age, and we can have no idea of the philosophical tenets of this deity. The only temple dedicated to him and belonging to our period has so far been discovered at Dudhāl near Lālitpur, in which Alexander Cunningham found six short inscriptions, all of which inform us that it was built by Krishnapa, the grandson of the Chandella king Yasovarman.³ No temple of Brahmā has so far been discovered in any other region represented by our inscriptions, except the one at Vasantagadh,⁴ in the Sirōhi District and though a number of the images of this deity are to be seen in parts of the temples and also separately, the only one which is inscribed was found at Bāghi, the well-known archaeological place in Dhar District.⁵ It is true that in some of our inscriptions he is invoked with the other two deities of the Trinity, viz., Vishnu and Śiva, e.g., in one which belongs to the reign of the Paramāra king Dēvapāla,⁶ but the influence of this god was felt only in name.

VĀGDEVI

Bhūjadēva, the greatest of all the Paramāra kings, was zealously devoted to this deity, called variously as Sarasvatī, Vāti, Bharati, Śrādā, and so on; and during the time of this king, she achieved very great importance, plainly owing to his attitude of patronising men of letters. He refers to the worship of this deity in his works and also installed an image of her in his palace known as Sarasvatī-karñātēbhārana, at Dharā. The image is inscribed.⁷ Even after the reign of this great king the deity appears to have continued to gain some honour, as we find her invoked in the inscriptions of his successors and also from those of the other ruling dynasties throughout the region.⁸ From her invocation in two of the inscriptions which are sectarian,⁹ we know that she commanded the same respect from the Jainas also as from the other sects of Hinduism.

Concluding the section of Hinduism, it may be observed here that we have not taken into account stray and solitary references to images from our epigraphs as they do not lead us to any definite conclusion. By way of examples, we may mention the images of Hanumāt and Kṣhētrapāla which are stated to have been installed at Harṣiū during the reign of the Paramāra king Dēvapāla in V.S. 1275, that of Nṛsimha in the reign of the Chandella king Madanavarman in V.S. 1192, that of Trimūrti in some other

¹ No. 95.
² P.R., W.C.A.S.I., 1907-08, p. 37.
⁴ P.R., A.S.I., W.C., 1905-06, p. 50.
⁵ No. 66.
⁶ No. 50, v. 3.
⁷ See No. 14. The P.C.M. says that once when the king summoned a convention in which the representatives of the different sects appeared and each spoke in favour of his own creed, the goddess Sarasvatī appeared and said to the king:

Ahiṣṭā - lakṣaṇaṃ dharma mānā devi che Bhāratī ||

dhyāneṣā nauktim = āpño sarva - darśanam manam || (p. 42, v. 105)

⁸ For. Mālāv, see Nos. 33, 50 and No. 185; for Vindhyā, Nos. 114 and 143; for Sirōhi region, Nos. 60 and 62-63; and for region around Nurwar, Nos. 160 and 180.
⁹ Nos. 154 and 159. In the former of these records she is called Śnīta-devatā or, and in the latter, Śrādā.
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inscriptions, and paying homage to Pañchajanya in the Améra inscription of the time of Naravarman and the Yajñapurusha in an inscription of the Yajvapāla king Gopāladēva.¹

**JAINISM**

Along with Brähmanism, Jainism also flourished in our period throughout the region, particularly more vigorously in these parts where it found literary and missionary activities of the Jain saints and also liberal royal patronage. This we may study by recording the activities of building temples and installing images in the respective parts of the area.

Taking the case of Mālwa, it is true that we have no epigraphic example of building or renovating a Jain temple, but the references to consecration of images enable us to form an idea, e.g., two of them coming from Bhōjpur in the Raisen District in the east, one from Shērgadh in the Kōja District in the north and one from Kalvan in the extreme south west.² Of the records from Bhōjpur, one states that an image of Śāntinātha was set up at that place by Sāgaramanand in the reign of (Rājadhi)rajā and Paramēśvara Bhōjādeva, and another that of Chīliṣaṇa of the Vēmakā family installed there a pair of Jainā deities (Jina-yugma) in V.S.1157 (1100-1101 A.C.) in the reign of Naravarman, the nephew of Bhōjādeva. The record from Shērgadh, which is dated V.S.1191 or 1134 A.C., speaks of setting up three images, those of Śānti, Kunitā, and Aranāthā, at that place by a devotee named Dēvapāla.

From the Kalvan grant, mentioned above, we learn that Amma Rāṇaka, a feudatory of Yaśōvarman, who was himself a feudatory of Bhōjādeva, renovated a Jainā temple at that place and endowed it with liberal donations. As stated above, this is the only example of carrying on repairs to an old temple in our epigraphs in the whole of the kingdom of the Paramāras of Mālwa.

All these examples belong to the 11-12th centuries A.C. and we have no epigraphs to enlighten us as to the condition of Jainism in any other time under the Paramāras, nor have we any evidence of a royal endowment for the maintenance of a Jainā shrine.

Of the Jainā temples built in the kingdoms of the junior-branches of the Paramāras, the earliest example is furnished by two of them, both built in V.S.1159 or 1101 A.C., at Arthūṇa, one by Sahaja who was a merchant honoured in the royal court, and the other, by an officer under the king Chāmundaṛāja.³ Some seven years later, in V.S.1166 (1109 A.C.), another temple in honour of Vrīshabhanātha was constructed in the same town, during the reign of Chāmundaṛāja's son and successor, Vījayaṛāja, by Bhūṣaṇa, a wealthy and devout Jainā.⁴ It is interesting to note that in such a short period we have records of the construction of as many as three Jainā temples at one and the same place and all in honour of the same deity. It is as well interesting to see that the prasastis set up in one of these temples was composed by the Sāndhuvinigrahika, who, by his name Vāmana, appears to have been a Brāhmaṇa.

From the Sirōhi region we have another record of building a trika (group of three temples?) at Jhāloḍi, by some members of the town assembly, in V.S.1255 (1197-98 A.C.)

---

¹ Respectively Nos. 30, 120 31, 33 and 178 (v.2). The images of Hanumā, though of minor importance, are generally found in temples of Rāma (and also separately), whose cult was coming into importance in our period, as already seen. An inscribed image of the monkey-god belonging to the end of the ninth century was found at Khajurāhō. For another inscribed image of this deity, see No. 90.

² Respectively Nos. 17, 32, 35 and 16. The dates of the first and the last of these inscriptions are lost.

³ Nos. 86 (v.6) and 87 (v. 14), respectively. The deities installed in both these temples are not mentioned in the inscriptions but appear to be Vrīshabhanātha, to whom homage is paid in the beginning.

⁴ No. 88, vv. 25-26.
and the donation of a plot of land made to it by Śrīṅgārādēvi, the queen of Dharāvarsha who was a devout Saiva.

Taking stock of Jainā idols installed in the kingdom of the Chandella rulers, we find the earliest one representing Śāntinātha, the sixteenth Tīrthankara, set up at Darbāt (or Darbat), near Hamirpur, in V.S.1132 or 1075 A.C., during the reign of Kirtivarman, by two brothers Pāhilla and Jijǐ, at the instance of the sage Vāsavachandra. Following this, we have records of three images, two of Neminātha and one of Sambhavanātha, consecrated respectively in V.S.1208, 1211 and 1215, all in the reign of Kirti varman's great-grandson Madanavarman. The first and the third of these three images were erected by the members of the Grahapati family which was known for its high reputation throughout the time of the Chandella rule. We have one more instance of an image of Śāntinātha established at Ahār near Tikamgaadh, in a shrine (chatīya) which was built to shelter it in V.S.1237 or 1180 A.C., in the reign of Paramardin, Madanavarman's grandson. The temple was built by two brothers Jāhada and Dayachandra (or Udayachandra) who also belonged to the Grahapati family.

These idols which are only five in number come from a restricted area and they roughly belong to the 11-12th centuries A.C.; and they therefore do not enable us to hold that Jainism thrived under the Chandella rulers, which may have been due to the lack of royal support.

Coming to the north-west and to a later time, the Dubkund stone inscription, which is of course a sectarian record, informs us that Rishi and his brother Dāhada, who were both endowed with the title of śrēṣṭhā by the Mahañā Kārīmānasinha of the Kachchhapaghatā house, constructed a shrine, in V.S.1145 or 1088 A.C., along with some other private individuals and influential persons, all actuated by the saint Vijayakirti, whose three predecessors are mentioned. We also learn that Mahāñā Kārīmānasinha himself also made liberal donations to the temple for its maintenance and repairs.

Coming to a still later period, we learn from an inscription from Bhimpur near Narwar, the capital of the Jajapāla king Aśalladeva, that Jaitrasinīha, who was a royal officer, was so immensely devoted to the Jaina faith that he took a vow to consecrate one Jaina image every day, renovated a Jaina temple at that place, in association with some leading persons of the town, in V.S.1319 or 1262 A.C., and also constructed a new one at Palāsāvāha.

Recording all these instances, we find that our period seems to have been remarkable for a wave of temple building activity which swept over the whole region.

---

1 No. 73, vv. 7-8. An earlier inscription recording the installation of an image of Vardhamāna and dated V.S.1024 (967 A.C.), during the reign of Krāharpālā, son of Aranyāra of the Sroth branch of the house, is mentioned in A.S.I.R., 1935-36, but the image cannot be found out today, nor is an impression of the inscription available.
2 No. 109.
3 Nos. 122-124. The name of the Tīrthankara Sambhavanātha does not occur in the inscription but is known from the itāchāhana. For the installation of an image of Śāntinātha in the reign of this king, in V.S.1203, see No. 190.
4 No. 133. This inscription describes the Grahpāti "family in eloquent expressions and records some building activities of the ancestors of the two brothers who built the temple at Ahār. This family also installed some other Jaina images. See No. 192.
5 No. 154, vv. 24 and No. 34, 11, 55 ff.
6 No. 159, vv. 34 and 36.
And we may also hope that some of the best specimina are still to come to light. The Paurāntic Hinduism, particularly as it is depicted in the later Purāṇas, lays stress on constructing temples and calls it a meritorious act; and this statement is also found echoed in some of our epigraphs which enumerate rewards for building temples of grass, wood, raw and baked bricks and of precious metals and stones.

It may also be remarked here that with all the numerous sects and sub-sects of Hinduism prevailing side by side, our time witnessed a spirit of harmony and genuine respect for the belief of others. In spite of some mild hostility of the creed that may have temporarily prevailed in some parts, as shown by archaeological evidences, our age maintained a spirit of tolerance towards all the rival sects, and the different creeds respected each other as in a time of mutual give-and-take. We find Brahmantical images set up in Jaina temples, and here it is interesting to give an example of building a Śiva and a Vishnu temple side by side by one and the same person in the same year. It is equally interesting to note that two of our inscriptions which record setting up Jaina images have their opening verses so composed as to be equally applicable to a Jaina deity and also to Śiva.

We have seen that a good many of those who caused temples to be built, particularly the members of the royal houses, also made provisions for carrying on timely repairs to breaks in them, for daily worship including waving light, cooking the naiśdhyā for the deity and for maintenance of the charitable feeding halls attached to them. Besides these, arrangements were also occasionally made for festivals in connection with installation of the deity (pratiṣṭhā), raising banner (dhwajārāpana) and car-procession (ratha-yātra) of the god, and also for public performances like music and dancing on ceremonial occasions. And with these remarks we now close our account of the cult of bhakti which occupied a very high place in the religious thoughts of our age.

SOME OTHER CULTS

Side by side with the cult of bhakti, some other forms of religion, which were already current even before, began to gain strength in our age. They are the cults of vrata (observing religious fasts), dāna (giving alms) and ārtha-yātra (visiting pious places), all forming the most popular aspects of the Śmaśāna-Paurāntic religion or the religion of the masses. Of the vratas, we find only a few, like the ekādaśi and the Śiva-rātri incidently referred to in our inscriptions but that this form of religion was vigorously current in our age is known from the writings of Bhājadeva, who enumerates in his Rājamātratāṇḍa 32 vratas to be observed by a householder, also stating that they were all current in

1 For examples, the Jaina statues at Gwalior, Narwar, Chandēri and also in the surrounding region. Some of these images appear to belong to this time. Narwar was the capital of the Vajrapālas and in a subterranean house at that place are preserved a number of Jaina images. Chandēri which is now in the Guna District of Madhya Pradesh, is only about 5-6 kms. west of the Betwa and not more than 35 kms. west of Lalitpur, the region around which was under the Chandella Madanavarman. The views expressed here, however, are not supported by our epigraphic evidences.

2 No. 139, v. 20 ff. and No. 156, v. 22.

3 No. 139, vv. 25-26.

4 The first of these inscriptions is our No. 47, from Bhōjpur. It records the installation of an image of Śatābhāṣa but opens with the expression Chandrānta-dvīra, also denoting Śiva. The second is from Arthunī (No. 87); it describes Vīrihābhāṇa as Śrīdēvarājanam Vīrihābhāṇa-nāthiṣav and jaṭā-manda- mandaṁaṁiṁ, which is applicable to Śiva also.

5 For example, see No. 19, 1. 6; No. 82, vv. 30 and 38; No. 83, v. 48, No. 84, v. 73; No. 155, vv. 72 ff. and No. 159, 11. 54 ff.
his time.\textsuperscript{1} \textit{vratas} and \textit{upavāsas} are mentioned also in the \textit{Tilakamāriśa} of Dhanapāla,\textsuperscript{2} a member of Bhūja's court; and Alberiṇi gives a list of fasts and festivals current in his time in some of the divisions of the country.\textsuperscript{3}

The interesting instance of Dēlihaṇa, a Brāhmaṇa Minister of Pratūpasiṇhā of the Sircā branch of the Paramāras, is perhaps worth mentioning here. As we learn from the Girvān stone inscription, dated V. 1344, this officer, who renovated a Viśnu temple at that place, observed the vow of taking his meals only one time every day till the work was completed.\textsuperscript{4}

That the cult of \textit{vratas} was gaining popularity also in some other parts of the country is known from the contemporary writers, and here we may mention the name of Hēmādrī, the Brāhmaṇa Minister under the Yaṭava kings Mahādeva (1260-1271 A.C.) and his nephew Rāmacandra (1271-1309 A.C.). Hēmādrī mentions a number of \textit{vratas} to be observed by a householder,\textsuperscript{5} and from the sources he names, we find that a large number of the \textit{vratas} mentioned by him are from the Purāṇas rather than from the Smitrīs. And presuming, of course, that the state of affairs in Malvā was not much different from that in its bordering region in the south, it is interesting to compare Hēmādrī's treatment of the \textit{vratas} and the number of them as given by him with the writing of Bhūjaḍeva, who flourished about three centuries earlier. This comparison very probably goes to show that the \textit{Smārta-dharma}, which was popular towards the beginning of this period and which mentions less number of the \textit{vratas} assumed the form of the \textit{Paurāṇic dharma} towards its end when Hēmādrī wrote.\textsuperscript{6} In accepting this view, however, we have to grant some allowance, since Hēmādrī seems to have treated the subject more from the literary and less from the practical point of view, for he did not mention the actual state of affairs as done by Bhūjaḍeva.

CHARITY

Another popular aspect of the Smārta-Paurāṇik religion, or of the religion of the masses as it may be called, was \textit{dāna}, or making gifts to temples, Brāhmaṇas and some other individuals; and that this cult too was highly prevalent in our age is known from the fact that it is extolled in our grants as one of the means of bringing welfare and also of leading one to heaven. Charitable persons are described in our epigraphs, as even excelling the wish-fulfilling cow, jewel and the tree and in some other similar ways.\textsuperscript{7} Reinforcement to the theory of making donations appears to have come from their elaborate treatment in the Purāṇas and the contemporary literature based on them, and from this we can also gather that this form of religion was in vogue not only in our region but also throughout the length and breadth of the country in our age. The objects to be given in charity constitute a plot of land or a village, cows, gold and gold coins, clothes, dwelling places, gardens, shops, halls and the like, all of which are referred to in our epigraphs, some of which mention the first two, \textit{i.e.}, land and cows, along with knowledge, which are extolled in them as great or liberal gifts (\textit{ati-dāna}).\textsuperscript{8} The various

\begin{enumerate}
\item Aufricht, \textit{op. cit.}, In our inscriptions we have some vague references like \textit{vṛatāvaiśa} in No. 86, v. 11, which does not necessarily denote fasting.
\item 2 Pp. 60 ff.
\item 3 II, pp. 175 ff.
\item 4 No. 92, v. 32.
\item 5 \textit{Chaturvarga-chintāmanī}, Vratakhandā, Calcutta edn., p. 166. Also see \textit{Matsya Purāṇa}, ch. 274.
\item 6 It is significant to note here that of the 113 \textit{Vratas} mentioned in the \textit{Vratēkha} all but three are based on the Purāṇas and of 128 mentioned in the \textit{Vratāsva}, all are based on the Purāṇas.
\item 7 Cf., Kāmadāśāṅk = akāmā bāt-chō chintā chintā = mañjā = api | vikalpam kalpa - vrikshaya srutī= yad = dānam = saṁsthutam || in No. 84, v. 65, and in karō usau - visvijānā No. 130, v. 9.
\item 8 For example, see No. 45, v. 10 and II. 17-18.
\end{enumerate}
motives of making grants in favour of temples are to provide for the worship of a deity, keeping shrines in proper order, providing food, clothing and the other necessities of life in favour of the Brahmans and others residing in the temples etc.

From this point of view, the details found in the copper-plate charters issued by the imperial Paramara rulers and their feudatories may be tabulated as below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name of king</th>
<th>Donated object</th>
<th>Occasion</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>Siyaka II</td>
<td>Villages</td>
<td>Amāvāsyā</td>
<td>Victory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>(fragmentary)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Vākpati II</td>
<td>Tadāra (?)</td>
<td>Pavitra-parva</td>
<td>Worship, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Vākpati II</td>
<td>Village</td>
<td>Lunar eclipse</td>
<td>Worship, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Udagayana-parva</td>
<td>Worship, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Yaśvarman,</td>
<td>Land</td>
<td></td>
<td>Maintenance of a Brāhmaṇa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>feudatory of Bhōja</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Bhōja</td>
<td>Village</td>
<td>Lunar eclipse</td>
<td>Victory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Full-moon day</td>
<td>Victory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Land</td>
<td>Fifth of the bright half of Magha</td>
<td>(victory)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Village</td>
<td>Udagayana-parva</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Land</td>
<td></td>
<td>Expiation for killing animals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Jasōrāja, a</td>
<td>Village</td>
<td>Lunar eclipse</td>
<td>Temple-worship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>feudatory of Bhōja</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Amma, feudatory of Bhōja</td>
<td>Land</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Temple worship, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Jayasimha I</td>
<td>Village</td>
<td>Solar eclipse</td>
<td>To feed Brāhmaṇas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Udayāditya</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Damanaka-parva</td>
<td>Temple-worship¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Naravarman</td>
<td>Land</td>
<td>Father's anniversary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Though a stone inscription, it is included here as showing the arrangement of its contents similar to what we find in a Paramara grant, as already observed by A.S. Altekar who edited it in the Ep. Ind., Vol. XXIII, pp. 133 ff.
## INTRODUCTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name of king</th>
<th>Donated object</th>
<th>Occasion</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Naravarman</td>
<td>Land</td>
<td>Full-moon day of Kartika</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Village</td>
<td>Solar eclipse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Jayavarman</td>
<td>Fragmentary</td>
<td>Nothing is definitely known</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Yaśōvarman</td>
<td>Village</td>
<td>Mother’s anniversary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Lakshmīvarman</td>
<td>Villages</td>
<td>Father’s anniversary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Hariśchandra</td>
<td>Villages</td>
<td>Lunar eclipse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Solar eclipse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Udayavarman</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Mahā-vaisākhyaṁ parvanī</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Arjunavarman</td>
<td>Village</td>
<td>Coronation ceremony</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Solar eclipse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Land</td>
<td>Lunar eclipse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Dēvāpāla</td>
<td>Village</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Jayavarman II</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>A general of</td>
<td>Villages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jayavarman II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Going through the above statement, we find that of the thirty-two grants, three were made to temples and the rest to Brahmans, four of which (Nos. 18, 51, 57 and 60) were intended each to establish a Brahmapuri. As for the occasion for making the grants, we note that four (Nos. 18, 45, 48 and 198) were made on the occasion of a solar eclipse, seven on that of a lunar eclipse, four (Nos 1-2 and 10-11) to celebrate victory over an enemy, one (No. 47) to celebrate the coronation day, one (No. 13) by way of expiation for killing animals (soldiers in the battle), three on the occasion of anniversary, two on the udayagayana and one on the damanaka-parva, and one on the full-moon day of Vaiśākhā which was regarded specially holy, as we know from the expression mahā-vaisākhyāṁ parvanī, pūṁḥīṁ being considered generally holy. Only two of the grants (Nos. 1-2) were made on amatāvatāṁ, though there was no solar eclipse, but the intention was to celebrate victory over the enemy. The remaining of the grants were made on ordinary days without mentioning any parva.

Of all the junior branches of the Paramāras, we have only two royal charters, one of which was issued by Dēvārāja, from Rūpi, in V.S. 1099 (or 1069?), and the other by Dhāravarsa of the Āhūl branch, from Hāthal, in V.S. 1237.² The first of these charters

---

1 This is one of the three dates mentioned in our record No. 34, ii. 14 ff. Another date, found in 1. 17 as the full-moon day of Pausha, is not taken into account here. The pūṁḥīṁ of Vaiśākhā and Kartika are specially recommended for making donations, see the Brahma P., quoted in Hamsāri's Dānakhyāṇa, p. 65; and Ātri Smṛti (VI, 7), respectively.

2 Respectively, Nos. 91 and 68. The date of the first of these records was differently read by D.R. Bhandarkar and V.N. Sastri (see the inscription), and the plate bearing it is not available for checking it. Also see No. 93, 12.
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records the donation of a field to Aûrakachârya, the superintendent (adhistâ) of a temple, on a lunar eclipse; and the second registers a gift of two halas of land to a sage, along with permission to graze his cattle free of tax on the royal grazing ground. The latter of these donations was made on the dêvâtthâni ekadasi (11th of the bright half of Kàrtika), which is mentioned as a specially holy day. That even an ordinary ekadasi was regarded holy is known from the Girva inscription of Pratâpadinha, great-grandson of Dhârtarashtra, which records the donation also of a cess to be collected on twelve such days, i.e., ekadasi.1 It is also worth noting that the ekadasi falling on the bright half of Ashâdha (dèvâ-sâyamî) is called a parva in one of our inscriptions.2

No copper-plate grant issued by any other house dealt with here is so far known, and with respect to grants made by the members of any of these houses nothing is specially noteworthy. With this remark we may now pass on to investigate the problem in hand with respect to the kingdom of the Chandellla rulers, who are known to have issued sixteen charters so far, as tabulated below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name of king</th>
<th>Donated object</th>
<th>Occasion</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Dhânga</td>
<td>Village</td>
<td>Lunar eclipse</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>Vidyâdharma</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Solar eclipse</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>Dēvâvârman</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Mother's anniversary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Lunar eclipse</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>Madanavârman</td>
<td>Land</td>
<td>Maghi pûrûjâni</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Land; also confirmation of some other grants previously made</td>
<td>Vishuva- sanâkrânti</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>Paramardin</td>
<td>Village</td>
<td>Confirmation of a grant made previously by his grand-father on a solar eclipse 7th of the bright half of Vaisakha (Gângâ-saptami?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Lunar eclipse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Land</td>
<td>Makara-sanâkrânti</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 No. 82.
2 No. 158, 1, 7.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name of king</th>
<th>Donated object</th>
<th>Occasion</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>Paramardin</td>
<td>Land</td>
<td>Eighth day of the dark half of Kartika</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Village</td>
<td>Seventh of the dark half of Chaitra</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Fourth of the dark half of Phalguna</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Land</td>
<td>Fourteenth of the bright half of Phalguna</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141(A&amp;B)</td>
<td>Trailokyavarman</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Pension to one whose father was killed in a battle; in fact they are two separate grants</td>
<td>do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>For bravery (reward)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>Viravarman</td>
<td>Land</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ravi-pushya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
<td>Hammiravarman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Making a general survey, we find that of the total number of eighteen grants, one (No. 107) was issued on the occasion of the anniversary of the mother of the donor, one (No. 141) as a pension to the family of a warrior killed in battle, one (No. 144) for distinguished military service, and the rest by way of charities to Brahmans or for maintenance of worship. Of these, the last mentioned three (Nos. 100, 108 and 129) were issued on a lunar eclipse, No. 200 and the original of No. 126 on a solar eclipse, two (Nos. 119 and 130) on a śaṅkrānti and one (No. 151) on Puspha nakṣatra on a Sunday (ravi-pushya being regarded a holy day). One of the grants (No. 118) was issued on the full-moon day of Māgha which appears to have been regarded as a holy day. It is as well noteworthy that as many as seven of these grants were made from military camps.

It has already been stated that no grant of any of the Kachchhapaghatā or Jayapāla rulers has so far come to light, except the singular example of the Narwar plate, issued by the Kachchhapaghatā king Viraśimha, on the amāvatā day of Kartika in V.S. 1177. The occasion is not mentioned in the inscription, but we have to remember that it was the Dipāvali day and the grant may have been made in propitiation of Lakshmi. It may also be stated here that the above statements take into account only the copper-plate charters, and there are others, viz., the stone-inscriptions, recording liberal donations made for the maintenance of worship, etc. The donations of the Jayapāla kings and the officers under them are restricted to excavation of tanks, wells and reservoirs and to plant gardens and similar other works.

Of the great gifts (maha-dānas), three of our inscriptions mention that of tulā-parascha, i.e., the gift of some precious metal like gold and other objects equal to that of one's own body. One of them is that which was renewed by the Chandella Jayavarman and which speaks of his sixth ancestor Dhangä as having performed it a number of times; another says that this gift was made by Viravarman, a later prince of the same house; and the third is the Gwalior stone inscription of Mahipāla, dated V.S. 1150, which states...

---

1 No. 157, 1. 1.
that the fifth of his ancestors, Vajradāmāna did the same. We have no other instance of it on record in our inscriptions, but that this gift was in vogue in some parts of the country in our time is known from the instance of the Kalachuri king Yasahkarna who performed it as we are informed by his Khairha plate dated K. year 823 or 1076 A.C.

Another kind of great gift (Mahādana), namely, that of Gōsahasra, was performed by the Paramāra Mahākumāra Hariśeandra, as we are informed by his Pipilānagar grant, dated V.S. 1235 (1178 A.C.). It is, however, a solitary example in all our epigraphs included here.

We have incidentally referred to endowments for feeding Brāhmaṇas as an act of charity, of which we have at least half a dozen cases on record. From a Chandella inscription we know that Dhangā, one of the earliest rulers of the house, settled some Brāhmaṇas in parts of a temple that he built at Khajurāhō in V.S. 1059, and the earliest Paramāra record referring to a parallel instance is that of Jayasimha I, dated V.S. 1112, which informs us that he donated a village for feeding Brāhmaṇas settled in the temple at Māndhātha. Of a later period we have again an inscription from the same place and dated V.S. 1331, telling us about the establishment of a Brahmapuri (Brāhmaṇa settlement) at Māndū and another at Māndhātha, by Anayásimha, a military officer under Jayavarma II. And in the north the Kachchhapagāhita king Mahipāla is known to have established Brāhmaṇas in parts of a temple and in the Brahmapuri attached to it. From still another inscription we know that a Brahmapuri existed at Riṅgō in the present Ratlam District in V.S. 1190 or 1133 A.C. This general survey indicates the prevalence of this practice throughout our age, of course naturally with some regional variations.

PILGRIMAGE

Still another aspect of religion which was extensively popular in the country in our age is tīrtha-yātṛa or pilgrimage to holy places; and our region was not an exception to it. Here we may first of all note that most of the temples themselves were centres of pilgrimage. With its hoary antiquity, for example, Ujjain along with Māndhātha, which appears to have come to prominence later in our age, was a renowned tīrtha in Māl̵ä, and Kālañ̵āra in Vindhya and Arbuda in Rājāsthān were almost equally renowned, all

1 No. 114, v. 52; No. 148, v. 60, and No. 155, v. 7, respectively. In the first of these records we have the use of sataśah, which is to be taken to show frequency and not in its literary sense; and in both, the use of the plural in puruṣahāha seems to suggest that either of the kings performed this ceremony on more occasions. Mahipāla also seems to have distributed his weight in gold, as we know from a fragmentary inscription which is not included here, See A.S.I., A.R., 1936-37, p. 93.
2 See C.I.I., Vol. IV, No. 56, v. 21. The Mōdī inscription (No. 56, l. 13) seems to state that Vairisimha, the father of Siyaka II of the Paramāra house of Māl̵ä, gave a tīrtha; but this is not certain as the record is fragmentary.
3 No. 45. The Mahādana are usually enumerated as 16 but sometimes 10. For details, see H.D., Vol. II, Pt. II, pp. 86 ff.
4 No. 114, v. 53.
5 No. 18, l. 14-16.
6 No. 60, v. 66.
7 No. 155, vv. 71 and 79.
8 No. 158, l. 5.
9 From Ujjain we have as many as five copper-plate grants of the Paramāra kings (Nos. 5, 12, and 38-40), the earliest of them bearing the date V.S. 1036, whereas from Māndhātha we have four (Nos. 18, 51, 57 and 60), of which the earliest is dated V.S. 1112 and after a large gap, we have one of V.S. 1282. This clearly shows that Māndhātha came to be regarded as a tīrtha later than Ujjain, at least so far as the Paramāra rule is concerned. Similarly we may note that the earliest Chandella inscriptions are from Khajurāhō and the later ones from Kālañ̵āra.
these localities attracting people in large number from far and near. Each of these places is also known to have possessed a number of ārthas in its vicinity.\footnote{1}

Our epigraphs furnish a number of instances to show that some of the ārthas like Kedāra, Rāmāvaram and Sōmanātha, were visited by people for paying homage to the deities enshrined there while Gaya was for performing funeral rites.\footnote{2} In support of the first of these statements, we have a contemporary evidence recorded in the Tīlakāmatavjñā, which states that Sarvadarā, the father of Dhanapāla, who composed it during the reign of the Paramāra king Bhūjādēva, set out to visit ārthas to wash off his sins of breaking a promise.\footnote{3}

A river was generally regarded sacred and a dip in its waters is said to be highly meritorious. The Ganges, the Yamunā, the Vētravati and the Sarasvati are some of the rivers mentioned in our inscriptions. The first three of these are too well-known to need any comment. Narmadā too often figures in our records.\footnote{4} The Vētravati, flowing by Bhilsā or Vīdishā, is said to wash off the sins of Kaliyuga. The Vasantatā bath inscription of Pūrṇapāla describes a stream of the name of Sarasvati flowing by Vatanagara in the Sīrōḍi region as an abode of Brahmā and leading to heaven for those who take bath in its waters.\footnote{5} Another river bearing the same name is said to be flowing near Sarasvatipattana (modern Surāvā in Shivpuri District) and on its banks the sage Dadhichi performed penance.\footnote{6}

A confluence of two rivers was regarded more sacred in our age, as even in modern days, and of this we have some examples in our epigraphs. Here we may cite the well-known instance of the Chandellā ruler Dhaṅga who had forsaken his life at the sacred confluence of the Ganges and the Yamunā at Prayāgā\footnote{8} and there obtained eternal bliss. Two other confluences described in our inscriptions are (1) of the Narmadā and the Kapilā (or Kuvilāra) at Omkāra-Māndhātā and (2) of Purpū and Patāmapāda near Vasantagāth in the Sīrōḍi District,\footnote{9} about which we shall say something more, below.

In our inscriptions we have also references as Tīrthāmbhōbhīśk etንe and manāmādhyādharā-Garigāḍi-mahānādi-jale,\footnote{10} showing the sacredness of the ārthas and the rivers in our age. The Narwar stone inscription of the Yajnapāla Gaṇapatiśēvē, dated 1298 A.C., tells us that his Chief Minister Vijayaśāh obtained two sons through his devotion to the two rivers after which he named them as Gāṅgādēva and Yāmīnadvē,\footnote{11} respectively.

---

\footnote{1}{Ujjain, though not actually mentioned by the word ārtha in any of our inscriptions, figures so in the Vīṣṇuvatīrtha-kalpa of Jina Prabhāṣtri (ed. by Jina Prájña, Bombay, 1956, pp. 1 ff.) and also in the Purāṇas (e.g., Skanda-Purāṇa, Ch. LXV), where it is said to have possessed a number of ārthas (kōṣṭ-ārtha). Kālihājā is also mentioned as a kōṣṭ-ārtha in one of the epigraphs (No. 106, 1. 15), and its antiquity is known from its reference in the Purāṇas. The Vāman Purāṇa (Ch. 84) also refers to Nīlakanta Mahādeva at that place. It may, however, be stated here that the word kōṣṭ, used to denote the number of the ārthas at both these places, viz., Ujjain and Kālihājā, has to be taken not in its literary sense of crores but figuratively, meaning several, for which cf. the expression samsā-agama-tirtāhī samatūraikārasya in our No. 82, v. 11. Amarōvā is mentioned as a ārtha in our No. 49.}

\footnote{2}{No. 178, vv. 14-15.}
\footnote{3}{p. 2.}
\footnote{4}{For example, see No. 45, 1. 14.}
\footnote{5}{No. 44, 1. 10.}
\footnote{6}{No. 62, v. 24.}
\footnote{7}{No. 176, v. 2.}
\footnote{8}{No. 114, v. 55. It is known as jala-samāsthi.}
\footnote{9}{Respectively No. 30, 1. 10, and No. 82, v. 10. Another confluence - that of Mahā with the Narmadā, is mentioned in No. 15, v. 10.}
\footnote{10}{No. 40, 1. 8 and No. 157 respectively.}
\footnote{11}{No. 179, v. 16. Cf. the statement about the birth of Jagadēva to Udayādēva due to his devotion to Hara.}
Our inscriptions mention a number of tirthas, for example, the Kalakalēśvara-tirtha near Nāsik where Yāsovarman, a feudatory of the Paramāra king Bhōjadeva, made his donations to a Jaina saint, and the Sōnavati-tirtha, near Bhṛiguśekha and the Amarēśvara-tirtha, near Māṇḍhātā where the Paramāra Arjunavarman bathed while before issuing grants.1 Kōti-tirtha at Kālaṇjara figures in the Chandella grants.2

Here we may add an interesting example of the Piśāchadeva-tirtha, mentioned in our inscription No. 4 (1. 13), a dip in the water of which was popularly believed to ward off the evil influence of a piśācha.

Giving an account of the Rājasthān-Gujarat region from our inscriptions, we may now relate how a place came to be regarded as a tirtha and also how legends centred around it in course of time. This is clearly shown by the Girvad stone inscription of Pratēpasimha of the Sirōhi branch of the Paramāra house. Following the well-known bardic tale of the origin of the Paramāras at Ābū, it relates that the god Rāma, while returning to Ayodhya after killing Rāvana, made a temporary halt at Mt. Arbuda, the hermitage of Vaśishtha, and to announce there the chastity of his consort Śītā, he installed a deity, Śuddhāśvara by name, at Girvad, on the confluence of the Pīrṇa with the Paśanada, and since then this place was regarded as a tirtha. The inscription also tells us that Rāmachandra declared many other places there as tirthas.3 This account goes to indicate how tirthas were coming into existence and how attempts were made to endow them with a hoary antiquity.

Some other sacred places known from our epigraphical records are Śrīmāla, Kāshhāradā, Nānā and Muṅgthala - all around Mt. Ābū, with its Brāhmaṇical and Jaina shrines inviting people in large numbers. Śrīmāla, as we know from the inscriptions included here, was a great cultural and religious centre where a fair in Aśvina was held every year.4 From Nānā we have two epigraphs (Nos. 68 and 78), the first of which refers to a plot of land reserved for the Brāhmaṇas and the second mentions the famous temple of Nilakaṇṭhāśvara at that place. Kāshhāradā (modern Kāyadrā) was a sacred place with the temple of Śiva;5 and Muṅgthala, from which we have an inscription included here,6 is mentioned to have been a sacred place in one of the Ābā inscriptions.7 In fact pilgrimage to holy spots and shrines, rivers, mountains, towns of ancient fame with the idea that it would bring salvation seems to have been specially recommended in our period.

To give examples from the Gvallior-Shivpuri region, we note that one of our inscriptions says that Čāchāṅgadeva, the god-son of the Yajvapāla king Gōpāla, worshipped Kēdāra (in the Himālayas) and Śōmēṣa (in Saurāśtra), and purified himself by visiting some of the other utṛhas also.8 From another inscription of the same house we learn that Vijahada, the Chief minister of a king whose name is not mentioned in it, by his devotion to the river-deities Gaṅgā and Yamunā, obtained two sons, whom he named Gāṅgadeva and Yāmunadeva.9

Concluding this section we may remark that along with bhakti, the cult of Vrata, Dānas and Tirthas, i.e., fasting, alms-giving and pilgrimage and so forth rightly to be

---

1 No. 16, 1. 12; and Nos. 48-49 respectively.
2 For example in No. 108, 1.15.
3 No. 82, vv. 3 and 12.
4 See above on p.
5 In our inscription No. 67 only this temple is mentioned; but according to the Kharataragacheṭha-
   brīhadgurūvaṭi, it was a Jaina centre of pilgrimage. See E.C.D., p. 266, n. 186.
6 No. 71.
8 No. 178, vv. 14-16.
9 No. 179, v. 16.
called the Purāna-dharma arose in our period not only in this particular region where the significant contribution of Bhōjadeva must have exercised great influence on the public mind, but also in the other regions of the country as is apparent from the Vratakhaṇḍa and Dānakhaṇḍa of Hāmādī in the south, the Vividhatīrthakalpa of Jinarābhavāsti in Gujarāt1 in the west, and the Adhunāsāgara and Dānasāgara of Ballālaśēna in Bengal.2 It appears that in an age this kind of ceremonialism and ritualism had spread all over India, as also noted by Albērā,3 and that it assumed shape to such an alarming extent that it practically replaced spiritual religion and debased the original proselytising Hinduism, from about the eleventh century onwards, much affecting Śaivism, Vaishnavism, and so on, which held sway over the country up till at least the rise of the Paramāras in the west and the Chandellas in the east, along with the other dynasties represented by our inscriptions.

LITERATURE

A general survey of the literary activities of our period goes to show that the output was indeed admirable and embraced almost all branches of knowledge, though it lacked the charm, elegance and originality of the preceding age. It is also creditable that in spite of the disturbances caused by foreign attacks, scholars in our region continued their creative activity, following, of course, the pattern set in the previous age.

Making a regional survey of the literary contribution of the age, we find that to Mālavā goes the credit of producing ample literature, beginning from the time of Vākpati Muija and ending with Arjunavarman, reaching its zenith during the reign of the illustrious Bhōjadeva. In this connection, we have first to note that the Paramāra rulers were not only great conquerors but also lovers of literature, and some of the kings belonging to this dynasty, for example, Vākpatirāja, Bhōjadeva, Naravarman and Arjunavarman, were poets of high rank. Ujjain and Dhārā were the chief centres of literary activities during our period.

The first of the kings to be mentioned here was Vākpati, a talented poet himself. From the Udaipur prakāśi we learn that he cultivated eloquence, poetry of high order and the art of reasoning and had a complete mastery over the lore of the Śāstras.4 Padmagupta, the court-poet of Sindhurāja, bestows fulsome praise on him, describing him as the very root of the creeper, Sarasvati, and also saying that the later poets “walked on the path trodden by the prince among poets”. The same poet also adds that “after Vikramāditya departed and after Sātavahana went (died), the divine Sarasvati found rest with this friend of poets”.5

None of Vākpati’s complete works has so far been available, though he is said to have written the Muija-pratidhāvavastha, which, from the title and some abstracts quoted in the Asiatic Researches,6 appears to have been a geographical description of India.

---

1 He was a contemporary of Muhammad bin Tughlaq. Singh Jaina. Gauravamālā, Bombay, 1956.
2 Hist. of Bengal, Vol. I, Dacca, 1943, p. 35. His Vratāgama, is yet unknown, see I.H.K., Vol XXVI, p. 330. Similarly, the Tīrtha-khaṇḍa of Hāmādī is still unknown. Bhūta Lakshmīdhara, a minister of king Gōvindachandra of Kanauj, is also known to have written on allied subjects, for which see S.E. p. 332. In this connection it may also be noted that sections on all those cells, viz., veda, dāna and tīrtha appear to have been added to the Purāṇas in the early part of our period, i.e., in about the 9–10th centuries. For details, see A.I.K. p. 203.
3 Sachan, II, p. 162.
4 No. 24, v. 13. In the records of the Western Chalukyas, his enemies, he is called kavi-varāha; see, for example, Ind. Ant., Vol. VIII, p. 11.
5 N.S.C., XI, v. 93.
6 Vol. IX, p. 176.
Five stray stanzas composed by this princeley poet are quoted by Jarha in his Sūkṣmukāvya, three by Kshemendra, one each in his Auciśyavishālakarcha, Suvīttatalaka and Kaivalyadhūkara, two by Vallaabhadeva in his Subhadhiravā, one in the Śrīngadharaṇapaddhati and two by Dhanika in his commentary on the Daśarūpakta. Besides these quotations, some verses attributed to him are found in the Prabandhachintāmāni, Bhūjasprabandha, and some other works which are of doubtful nature.

The statement of Padmagupta which we have referred to above indicates that Vākpati was also a patron of men of letters, which is further justified by the fact that Dhanañjaya, the writer of the Daśarūpakta, which is a work on the Nātyaśāstra, his brother Dhanika who wrote the Kāvyanirṇaya and a commentary on the work (Daśarūpaktrañālakā) and was also a minister under the king, and Halfydha, the commentator on Pīngala's work on metrics in which he describes the king as 'the tree of paradise that grants the wishes of all applicants', were all his proteges. In addition to these, Dhanapala, the author of the Pāyulacakha and the Tilakamalija, enjoyed the favour of this king, who conferred on him the title of Sarayward, as we learn from the last of the introductory verses of the latter of these works. Amritagati completed his Subhadhiraratanasandoha in the reign of Muñja in v. 1050, the date being equivalent to 20th December, 993 A.C. (See Ind. Ant., Vol. XIX, p. 361, No. 168).

In the reign of Sindhurāja, the younger brother and successor of Vākpatirāja, Padmagupta alias Parimula composed the beautiful Sanskrit mahākavya entitled Navasāhasrikacharita. The work consists of eighteen cantos and is based on a historical event. The story of the theme is Sindhurāja's aid to Sākhisūla, the Nāga ruler of Chakrakṣa, who sought it to defeat some of his enemies, and consequently, the wedding of the former's daughter with the Paramāra king.

The work is in the classical style, and the skill in giving the story a poetic garb and successfully handling interlacing events are all noteworthy. The lucidity of the style along with the harmony of sound in the composition and the Vaidarbhī style of the composition often make the poet representing Kālidāsa himself. It is, however, peculiar that except that he mentions his father's name as Mṛgāṅkakadatta, as we read at the end of each of the cantos, the poet is silent about himself, as many other Sanskrit poets. In the eulogistic portion he shows special regard for Bhartrīhīmā, whose time is not definitely known but who is known to have been the writer of an epic, the Hayagrīvavadha. But, from Padmagupta's special interest shown for Hāṭakāśvara in the work, he may have been perhaps one of the Nāgara Brāhmaṇas who are generally devoted to this deity; and it is also likely that his home was somewhere in Bastar which he describes so vividly, in detail. This conjecture, however, remains to be verified or refuted.

Padmagupta makes a veiled reference to Sītā, a poetess who composed songs eulogising Upendrā, the founder of the Paramāra dynasty. Mērutūngā, in his Prabandhachintāmāni (p. 43) describes Sītā, a poetess, as a contemporary of Bhūjadēva. If both these scholars refer to the same poetess, she appears to have flourished before Sindhurāja closed his reign, on the evidence of Padmagupta, and to have been living

---

1 For the last of the references, see vv. 66-67 in op. cit.; and for the rest, F.B.P., pp. 382-83. Vallaabhadeva's statement that Śrī-Harshadēva-majja-Vākpati clearly shows that Harsha was the same as Śyāka, the father of Vākpati.
2 For the review of both these works, see A.B. Keith, Sanskrit Drama, pp. 292-93. Dhanañjaya calls himself the Mahātātakṣha of Utṣaparāja.
5 N.S.C., XI, v. 77.
at least for some of the initial years of Bhōja's reign. None of her works has come down to us.  

Sindurāja's successor was his illustrious son Bhōjadēva, a renowned versatile scholar, who was one of the three polymaths of the age, the other two being Kṣhēmendra of Kashmir (middle of the eleventh century) and Hēmacandra of Gujarāt (about a century later). We have over forty standard works to his credit on a variety of subjects including literature, poetics, grammar, lexiconography, philosophy, Dharmaśāstra, medicine, astrology, astronomy, architecture and engineering. The Udaipur praśasti calls him kavirāja and in the Pānāhēda inscription, a record of one of the junior branches of the Paramāras, he is mentioned with the epithet vidyānīdhi. 

An account of some of his known works is given in the following paragraphs. In the domain of Kāvyā, he composed the Avanikārmatātaka the Khadgasatātaka and the Kōdaṇḍakāvya, all inscribed on stones found by K.K. Lele in 1902-03 A.C., at Dhār. The first of these works is in Prakrīt, with Oṁ namo Śivō in the beginning in Sanskrit, and is engraved on two slabs, each containing 109 verses. The work is devoted to eulogise the tortoise incarnation of Vishnu. The first was written by Bhōja himself and the second by one of his protégés. The remaining two works are on small fragments, though the numbers of the last verse of the Kōdaṇḍakāvya can clearly be read as 575, as already remarked by Lele. Bhōja also composed the Śrīngāraṇaśārikātā, which takes its name after Śrīngāramaṇājari, a courtesan to whom advice is imparted by her mother in thirteen prabhāndhas. The work imitates the style of Subandhu's Vasavadattā, Bāgā's Kādambari and Dandin's Dvāramukhavcharita, and being narrated by king Bhōja himself, at the request of his admirers, it describes different forms of attachments of men and expounding principles to be followed by a courtesan. Each of the stories has a moral at the beginning and also towards the end.

Another work in the field and generally ascribed to Bhōja is the Champa-Rāmāyana also known as Bhōja-Champa. The work deals with the story of Rāma and is divided in six kandas, following the arrangement of Vēmikī, the first five of which were composed by Vidarbharāja, as stated at the end of each of the kandas, and the sixth by Lakshmanasūri, which also gives an additional information that the first five kandas were composed by Bhōja. But there is no evidence to identify this Bhōja with his namesake who was the Paramāra king. On the other hand, the expression Vidarbharāja, without

---

1 For a different view about her time, see P.B.P., p. 326.
2 In his work entitled Savarkrit Poetess, Part A, I.B. Chaudhury (Calcutta, 1941), cites four verses by Sīti. It is not known whether this poem was the same as mentioned by Kāmagrapta.
3 For a list of his works, see Catalogus Catalogorum, I, 418; II, 95; III, 90; H.A.L., XCVII f.; H.S.P., 249 ff.; H.D., I, 276 ff.; Bhājāra, 69 f.; E.I., I, 231 ff. and P.C.M., p. 50. Also see Madras University Publication No. II, given in the beginning of the Svarutīlīgāṭhābhāvana, ed. by Raghavan. All these lists show some variations with reference to the number of his works. Also see P.B.P., p. 316, where Bhōja is stated to have written 84 works.
4 No. 24, v. 18 and No. 85, v. 16, respectively. In the latter of these records the name of the ruler is lost but from the description he was no other than Bhōja himself.
6 Also see A.S.I., A.R., 1934-35, p. 60.
7 Ed. by Kalpalata Munshi in Śrīhī Jaina Granthamāla, Bombay, 1959. This work is not mentioned in the Cat. Catalogorum.
any name at the end of each of the first five kāndas, tends to prove that the composer of this work was distinctly a different person.¹

That Bhōja contributed in the field of grammar is known from the expression Šabdārikīnī...aṇuṣṭaṇam...vidvīdhāti in the verse quoted below while describing his Rājamaṇḍala. In his Siddhaṭṭhākāmūḍhi Bhāṭṭōjī Dikshita quotes him; and the Jain grammarian Vardhamāna also bestows high eulogy on him in his Gaṇarattanamahābodhī.² His work on grammar was very popular as we know from the Prabhāvavakācharitā which states that when Jayasimha Siddharāja triumphantly entered Mālāvā, at Ujjain he was shown the different parts of the educational institution then existing and one of them contained extracts from Bhōja’s grammar.³ Later on, at the request of Jayasimha, Hēmachandra compiled a grammar entitled Śiddha-Heṃachandrai, on the same lines.

Bhōja appears to have written a grammar of Prākrit also, as we know from a list seen by Jinaḥjī.⁴

In the field of poetics Bhōja composed the voluminous work known as Sarvasvacanākāṭhābharana.⁵ This work also deals with dramaturgy and establishes śringāra as the most prominent rasa which is further expounded by him in his Śringāraprakāśa, a treatise on poetics and dramaturgy in 36 chapters.⁶ Giving references to some earlier writers, it contains more illustrations in Prākrit than in Sanskrit,⁷ unlike the Sarvasvacanākāṭhābharana.⁸

1 Following Aufrecht, D.C. Ganguly (H.P.D.), p. 278 and P. Bhātā (P.B.P., P. 520) take the work as by the Paramāra Bhōja. But this view appears to be far from correct. It is not known if both these scholars had an approach to some other edition of the work, enabling them to attribute it to the Paramāra king. Moreover, the only edition of the work that was accessible to me is as stated above, and it distinctly shows that the work has six and not seven kāndas as mentioned by Bhātā.

2 For the former, see aton Bhōjā in Vārtika No. 2553 on Pānini, VII, iv, 68; and for the latter, Cf. Rāmāyana-Śakal-Śaṅga-Chandra-gūmā - dig-vatra-Bhaiṛi-Hari-Vāmanā-Bhōja-mukhyāḥ

mēdhāvīnāḥ pravara-dipak-patrī-yukṣāḥ prāīpairaḥ = nīśēdeva-pāda-dvīpyā jayantī ||

3 P. 185, vv. 70 and 74–76.

Anyadā Siddharāja = pī jīva Mālāvā-māndalam | samipagama tamaṇī dh = śāstraḥ darśanaḥ dadāya || 70 ||

Anyadā = Avanti-kōṭi-vidvānaḥ nisāntaḥ | darśinām hita-śāstraḥ prakāśi hita-hita | pustakam || 74 ||

Kum = tāṇā = ni prapanchhī saṃti, tē = pi vyākhyān | bhōja-vyākhyānam by = tītech = chalabha-gātathra pravartane || 75 ||

Aṣṭā bi Mālāvā-kīdāsī vidvach = chakra-sīkṣanām ||

śabdā-lakṣākāra-dāsīvija-prakāśa-kātraṇī nirmanām || 76 ||

Chikhiṣa-śāstra-śāstra-raśa-vast-udayāncha ||

āṅga-āṅgaṇīk dhvīṭama-marpaṇa-samśuddrikā | 77 ||

Graṇṭhān nimitta-vyākhyāna-prakāśa-chhajnaṁ śruta ||

yuktam c = ayuksanave = tīha-gātāram Māghamālāya || 79 || (P. 185)


5 Kāyamāṭī Series, No. 94 (1934) and edited by Raghavan, Madras, 1963. From the Pattana Catalogue Manuscript, published in G.O.S. No. LXXXVI, p. 37, we know that a commentary on this work (Sarasvaracākāṭhābharana) was written by Agelā.

6 Edited by V. Raghavan, Madras, 1963. Raghavan states Bhōjadēva as the first writer who embraced both branches, viz., those of poetics and dramaturgy (see p. 9). Bhātā mentions another work of the same name on Grammar, see P.B.P., p. 316, n. 8.

7 Dr. Raghavan holds that “Considering the subject dealt with in both the works, we can safely say, as far as poetics goes, the S.P. adds substantially nothing new which is not contained in a brief manner in the S.K.A. self” (S.P., p. 70).

8 See L.H.Q., Vol. V, No. 4, pp. 770 ff, where S.K. De has shown that Prakāśavaraśa’s Rasāṅgāvatākāra often imitates Bhōja in naming the akāśikāras.
INTRODUCTION

Bhōja has also given us works on lexicography. Kahiravāmin, who wrote a commentary on the well-known Amarakośa, often refers to him as a grammarian, lexicographer and commentator. Another work of the king which is entitled Nāmamālikā, has been edited from a manuscript found at Mysore.1

In the field of Jyotisha the celebrated king wrote four books, viz., the Rājamārtanda, in which he styles himself a Mahārajaśāhīrāja, the Rājamrigaṅka, in which he speaks of himself as being honoured by the host of kings (urvi-pati-vrinda-vandita-pāda), the Adityapraçārapariśaddhānta and the Vidvajjauvalallabha, in which he takes to himself the credit of vanquishing the king of Dāhala, Karmadeva,2 who was his contemporary.

In the domain of Philosophy Bhōja’s contribution is indeed versatile. His work entitled Rājamārtanda which is also referred to by Chandraprabhasūri in his Prabhūvakaśarita, is an exposition of Patañjali’s Yāgastus and in this work the author compares himself with the sage. One of the introductory verses of this work also give an indication of his composition on grammar and medicine.3

That Bhōja also wrote on the Saṅkhyā system of philosophy is known from citations of his work by Vāchaspati Miśra, in his Saṅkhyauttavakavumādī. This work, which was entitled Rājaśāhīrāja, has not come down to us. His work in logic is known as Nyāyaśāhīrāja4 and in Yogā, the Rājamārtanda, as just seen, is an excellent commentary on Patañjali’s Yāgastus. That he also composed a book on Dharmasāstra, entitled Purūravamārtanda, is known from the extracts cited by Vijñānēsvara, in his Mitakshāra, a commentary on the Yājñavalkyasūtra, and also by Jīmuśāvatārana, a Bengali writer, in his Dāyabhaga.

Aurefht also refers to Bhōja’s Chāruvayya and Vyavahārasamuchchaya; but neither of these works of the king has come down to us.5 Vyavahāraśāmāṇari, which is a book on Dharmasāstra, as the name suggests, is also ascribed to Bhōja and referred to by Vimalabodha, a commentary on the Mahābhārata.6 His Vyavahārasamuchchaya is a work on Jyotisha in relation to Dharmasāstra.7 It is not known if this work is identical with the one mentioned just above.

In the domain of Śaivism, Bhōjadēva wrote not less than two books; they are the Tatvaprakāśā and the Siddhāntamangala,8 both of which were intended to expound the principles of Śaivism, particularly as followed in Kashmir and different from another school of Śaivism, known as Lakulīśa Paśupata. He is referred to by Mādhava in his

1 Ed. by E.D. Kulkarni and V.D. Gokhale, Poona, 1935.
3 The verse runs as follows:
Salāhāra = nausānamadī vīdadhavi Patañjale-kurvatā vīttān Rājamrigaṅka-sahājākam api vyāṣanavatā vaidyakē vākṣeyo vīmadī vaidyakē vākṣeyo vājaśāhīrāja-bhavatā vāyanā va yēn = ṛddhirā = tasya śāt-Raṇa raṣiga maḷa-māripatīr = vāṣe ṛddhirā = tasya śāt-Raṇa raṣiga maḷa-māripatīr = vāṣe
Also compare: Phanādhipatikā = stūreśu vīttān vīmadī ।
4 Published by the Bengal Asiatic Society, Calcutta, 1922. The work is also referred to by T.G. Kale in his work Bhārataya-Rasāyana Sāstra (Marathi), p. 106.
5 Another work of the name of Chāruvayya was written by the Kashmirian polymath Kāhemendras, for which see S.E., p. 305.
7 See P.V. Kane’s article in J.D.R. We have two other works of the same name, one of which was written by Harigaṇa and the other by Raghunandana, as enlisted in H.D., Vol. I, p. 631. Bhōjadēva Dhārēśvara, is styled śāhīrāja by the Māṭikshāra (on Ybj. S., III, 24) and sīra by the Sṛṣṭiśāhīrāja (II, p. 257), as also shown by P.V. Kane in H.D., Vol. I, p. 276. This shows how highly he was respected by later writers in the field of Dharmasāstra.
8 For the first of these works, see Jat. Ant., Vol. LIV, pp. 154 ff. also see K.C. Pande, Abhinavagupta, Varnani, 1935, p. 107. The work is also published by the T.S.S.
Another voluminous contribution of Bhoja is his Samarāṅganaśṛiśūlaḥ, dealing with vāstuśraṇa, i.e., architecture and art-craftsmanship. Besides laying down the principles of civil engineering and civil architecture, the work gives the details of town-planning, house-architecture and temple-architecture. Under the first head the work speaks about surveying of land, selection of site and examination of soil (bhūti-parikṣa), system of measurement and knowing the different categories fit for temples, houses and palaces, gardens, etc., and in the end it gives detailed canons for building structures of secular and decorative architecture. The section contributed to building architecture includes in its treatment the construction of houses for the king, the nobles and the common men, with stables for horses and the other domestic cattle, the assembly-hall and quarters for the royal priest and other officials and the sundry requirements for equipping them, e.g., the art of mechanical construction (yāntra-guhaṇa), such as pleasure-machine, war-machine and aeroplane. It also lays down principles of constructing household furniture. The section devoted to temple-architecture is also dealing with sculptures and their iconometry.

Three works dealing with medicine are also ascribed to Bhoja. That he wrote the Rājaviṃśāṅka on this subject is evident from his own statement. The second of these works, viz. Ayurvedasarasvasva is unknown; and the third is the Rājamārttika, which has already been referred to above and which devotes a portion of it to the subject. In this work Bhoja calls himself an expert in pacifying the enemy who has gone astray (udvrittatru-pradaṭamana-pata), which is also equally applicable in case of a disease. The last of his works mentioned here has been published. Bhoja is often the source of Mādhavācharya in his Rājaviṃśāṅka and also of Bhāvamitra in his Bhāvaprakāśa.

Bhoja as a writer on music is referred to by Śrīvīghādeva, a protege of the Yādava king Simhaṇa (1210-1247 A.C.), in his Sāṅgītaraṅgini and in Sāṅgītaśtra by mahaṭṭa Kumbhā of Udaipur. In the field of administration he composed the Chit：<span class="redacted">n</span>l</span>aka</span>n</span>mi</span>tiā</span>stra</span>. Another of his works entitled Yukti</span>k</span>ā</span>patt</span>ara</span> deals with polity, elements of war, manufacture of weapons, ships and vehicles, construction of forts, and besides these, it contains useful information on diverse subjects of secular interest, such as construction of buildings, articles of furniture, and ornaments and precious stones. From references in this work it is also known that the king may have written separate works on the art of warfare and on curing the diseases of the cattle. On the same subject he has also given us a book entitled Śālīhita which deals with how to test horses and on curing their diseases.

We have already mentioned above his works like the Aṣṭāṅgaṇaśāstri, the Kha</span>d</span>g</span>a</span>s</span>a</span>ṭa</span>ka</span>, the K</span>o</span>śa</span>nd</span>d</span>al</span>g</span>ī</span>v</span>y</span>a</span> which are all ascribed to the celebrated Paramāra king

2 It would indeed be an interesting attempt to see how far the characteristics laid down by Bhoja in his work have influenced temple architecture in Mālwa.
3 See the second foot of the verse quoted in p.190 n. 3 in his H.D., Vol. 1, p. 276, Kane took this work as on astronomy and also on medicine.
4 See Bhūjēdeva’s Literary Contribution (in Marāṭhī), by Lelé and Gak, Dhar History Office, 1931, p. 7.
5 Cf. the verse:
Rudrāṭāḥ mahāya-bhūtpālo Bhoja-bhūtvallabhaḥ = mahaṭṭa
Paramatma cha Somaḥ Śaṅkara-mahaṭṭaḥ
Quoted by G.H. Ojha in his Rājputnī-cakā-līlā, I, p. 30. Also see p. 8 of Sāṅgītaraṅgini, ed. by Kumhān Rāja, Jodhpur, 1940. For the first of these works, see E.H.D.P. 194, n. 33.
6 Edited by N.N. Law, Calcutta Oriental Series, 1917.
8 Edited by E.D. Kuikarni, Poona, 1953.
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Bhōjadēva. They are all in Mahārāṣṭrī Prakrit, which was gaining status and popularity in point of literary trends and expressions in our period and are good specimens of the literature of the time.

The composition of a work entitled Vídva.janavallabha and dealing with questions based on diverse topics is also ascribed to Bhōjadēva, as we learn from its colophon. The work is divided into different topics and is still unpublished. It is possible, though not certain, that it was written by the versatile Paramāra king of that name. The reading is Śrī-Mahārājādhirāja-Bhōjadēvēna-virachitē.  

The review of his works shows that Bhōja was indeed a literary genius and composed works on several subjects - secular, religious and philosophical. He also established schools and equipped them with libraries, as we know from the Prabhāvakačarita, a reference to which has already been made above. Some of his works, e.g., those on anka, svapna and śāmudrika, as mentioned in v. 77 of the passage quoted by us from the same work, have not come down to us, but despite this all, we find that he was regarded an authority on many subjects and he is quoted or referred to by several later writers and poets in their works on different subjects. His assembly was adorned with learned men and poets, whose works will presently be noticed. The Prabhāvakačarita compares his assembly to that of heaven. This reminds us of the normal practice of old, as laid down in the Kṛṣṇaamārha, that kings should hold literary courts, in order to promote cultural activities. The Śrīgaranjanajarikalita, as we learn from its introduction, was narrated by the king himself, at the request of the learned persons who assembled and approached him. An inscription from Dvīpureṇḍra tells us that the Jaina saint Śāntishēna defeated his literary opponents in an assembly presided over by the king. We have also an example of a Jaina scholar named Dhanaśvara sūri who gained victory in Bhōja’s literary assemblage.

The origin of holding literary discussions in the Paramāra court goes even earlier; for we have a case on record to show that one Jīnēśvara (name?) won glory over his scholarly opponents in the assembly of Muṇja. Here we may also cite a later example of the erudite Śamudrahēṣā sūri, who is said to have acquired efficiency in logic (tarkavidyā) in Mālāwa and had a retinue of his scholarly disciples; he pleased Naravarman in Dhārā by his lectures in the presence of learned audience.

Competition in samasyaśūrī, i.e., composing a verse from its last words given, appears to have been very common in Bhōja’s court. The Prabandhachintāmaṇī, and some other works that are available, record a number of instances, one of which may be mentioned here. Knowing that a Pandita had all the members in his house learned, at Dhārā, Bhōja visited his place, and to test their ability, he gave certain words to each of them, asking them to compose a verse using those words at its end, which they all

2 Also see op. cit., p. 156, vv. 131 and 143; p. 157, vv. 151 and 153.
3 Besides those already mentioned in proper places, he is also quoted in Mitākshara and by Mallinātha, in his commentary on the Śūlapādadvada, V, v. 60 (twice). In his Rasikasandhīvīyana, Arjunavarman quotes a verse, the authorship of which is ascribed to Bhōja. See the edition of Durgāprasad and Parab, B19, p. 23.
4 Cf. Śrī-Bhōja-bhāṣpa-sabdiḥ, svaṇa-sabdiḥ-sabdiḥ; on p. 157, v. 163.
5 Ch. X. (pp. 54-55).
6 No. 154, v. 28.
7 Petten Cat. Manus. published in G.O.S., No. LXI, p. 345
8 Cat. of Palm-leaf Manus. in Cambay, Pt. II, published by Oriental Institute, Baroda, 1966, XV p.344, v. 8, and p. 353, vv. 8-10, respectively.
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did successfully. Another way of poetic competition was that of praśnātara, i.e., a verse full of questions and replies and composed on the moment; and still another was ardha-kāvya-padya, i.e., a verse each half of which contains a separate composition. All these verses, though some of them may have been later, go to indicate the interest of Bhōja in the propagation of knowledge.

Thus, while giving a sketch of Bhōja's literary activities, we may also answer the question, viz., whether he could find time to compose literary works and also to do justice to the other literary activities mentioned here when he was heavily burdened with the administration of the state and also engaged in protracted wars with the neighbouring kings. All these considerations might one suggest that at least some of the works ascribed to him may have been composed by scholars and Pañjits of his literary assembly. Be whatever it may, but even accepting this view, his general supervision and getting the works prepared speak highly of his admirable scholarship and remarkable interest.

The above account goes to show that Bhōja made Dvārakā a seat of learning and held his literary court in the Sarasvatī-mandīra, also known as Bhātari-bhavanam and Sāradā-sadana, as it is mentioned in an inscription of Arjunavarman and popularly known as Bhōjalaṁātī. He consecrated it an image of the goddess of Learning. One of the members of his court was Sūrāchārya, as we are informed by the Prabandhachintanā. Another member was Uṣṇa, a son of Vajraṇa of Ananda-pura and a Vedic scholar. He wrote his Mantrabhāṣya, a commentary on the Vājasaneyā Satkātra, while living at Avanti. And still another member of the king's assembly was Chittapa, a disciple of Kādambara. The Śūlāhūrīvālī of Vallabhādēva has a verse mentioning Chittapa as a poet attached to Bhōja's court. A number of stanzas of this poet are found in the Sanskrit anthologies and some other works, for which attention may here be invited to the introduction of

---

1 Cf. Tava pratāpa-palākṣa-jaṅgala Himālayaṁ nāma nagāhīrījāḥ । chakāra Mēnā virāḥ-bhṛtārīghī praśñā-kāvya-sāraṅgam sarīrum । (As composed by the Poet's son),

and Jal yaya sāru na jāyau daśamukhu ikku sanrū । janaṁ viśamblī chināvatā kavāṁ vīraṁvānu navrū ।

as by the poet's wife. As for the composition of the other members of the family, see F.C.M., Bhōja-Prabandha, pp. 27-28.

2 For example, Kiyaṁ = mātāṁ jālum viṁśi qūnā = udāghanam narādhipā । kathāṁ s-vyānam = avasthum tē?na bhuśvaṁ✈ĩshāh ।

3 Ibid., p. 26. Here are questions and answers between a Brāhmaṇa and the king.

3 For example - Bhōja: Yēśhāṁ vallabhanāśo keśuṁgam = api keśuprām keśusādūci ।

Dvāraṁ stakarāṁ ś śat prāḥām = uktā = eva satyasaṁkritāḥ ।

Kulachandra, a digambar a sage, near by. Asvākham nām vallabhaṁ na vīrastas = tēn-sōbha-yān ganāśīnāṁ = indiśī jādi darṣāṁ-āsāṁ = aśa ν = ēśhō ν a vāavitāḥ ।

4 For example, see J.B.O.R.I., Vol. XVII (1935-36), pp. 388 ff., where P.A. Mankad compared the peculiarities both in the subject matter and method of treatment and has come to the conclusion that the Sanandigamanaśākshāna and the Yuktikālputara have emanated from different individuals (p. 370).


6 Introduction, p. 2 (cf. kṛṣṇa-Bhōja-mantraśākha).

7 R.G. Bhanderkar's Report on Search of Sanskrit Manuscripts, 1882-83, Appx. III, p. 91. Also see Peterson's 4th Report on the same, p. 17 where two more works of the same scholar are mentioned, viz., a commentary on Rīgveda-prātiṣṭhäna, and another, known as Niganabhāṣya on Yaṣṭīrveda.

8 See Prabhāvatikartara, i. p. 149, v. 288.

9 As suggested by Dr. Raghavan in S.P., p. 7.
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F.W. Thomas' edition of the Kāvindravachanasanamuchchhaya. This poet is known to us also from a stanza of the Śadhukitkarārāṇita (III, 36) and also as the composer of the khaṇḍa-kāvyā inscription included here.2

Still another notable member of Bhōja's literary assembly was Dhamapāla, a son of Sarvadēva. He had migrated to Dhārā from Sānkhāya in Madhavāśa, i.e., U.P. probably during the reign of Vatpati, by whom he was called Sarasvatī.4 By caste he was a Brāhmaṇa, who, some time later, accepted Jainism. He had a great influence on Bhōja; and, as we are told, to satisfy his curiosity, he composed a prose romance entitled Tilakamāñjari. The work is written in a fluent narrative prose, occasionally interlaced with stanzas, but more often interspersed with long descriptive passages full of figures of speech and double entendres resembling those as found in Bāṇa's Kādambari and Subandhu's Vīśvavaddhā, appears to have inspired him. It reflects on the contemporary socio-political conditions prevailing during the time of Bhōja.5 The other works of this writer will be enumerated below, in the paragraphs giving an account of Jaina scholars and their works.

In addition to those mentioned here, there were some other scholars who composed their works in Bhōja's time, in Mālwā, and are either less known or unknown. By way of an example, we may mention the name of Dāšābala, a Buddhist from Valabhi, who composed in the time of this king, a work on astronomy entitled Chinnātmancāranikā, which he claims can be grasped only by those who possess high intellect.6

Having given a glimpse of Bhōja's court-poets and literary scholars, we now pass on to the next princely poet who was Naravarman, the nephew of Bhōja and a talented person. He composed the Nagpur Museum stone inscription,7 which contains 58 verses, some of which are in metres rarely to be found in inscriptions, such as Prāśū, Rathākadbhūtā and the still less known Pānichachitrāna, and the composition, which is in the Gaudī style, is ornamented and highly embellished, often using figures of speech. Apart from its historical significance, the literary value of this inscription is inestimable. To this prince is also attributed the composition of the Sarpabandha inscriptions found at Dhār, Ujjain and Un.8 The poet Chittapa, about whom we have already spoken above in our account of the literary persons of the time of Bhōja, continued to live during the reign of Naravarman, when he composed the eulogy of the Sun-deity which is mentioned above.

After Naravarman closed his reign, the Paramārā supremacy was temporarily eclipsed due to the annexation of a great part of Mālwā to the Chauṭāliya empire, as we have seen in the political history of the kingdom, but from the time of Vindhyavarman who

1 Published by the Asiatic Society of Bengal, Calcutta, 1912, pp. 37-40, to which our attention was drawn by D.C. Sircar in Ep. Ind., Vol. XXX, p. 218.
2 This title also goes to suggest that Chittapa, who was an eminent court-poet, may have been then generally known as Kālīdāsa, or this title may have been conferred on him by Bhōja himself, like that of Sarasvatī on Dhamapāla or Muja. This suggestion gains ground from an extract from the Catalogue of Manuscripts, Madras Government, 1906, p. 1175, which states that the poet Nichula alias Yōgichandra, at the instance of his friend Kālīdāsa, wrote a commentary on a work entitled Nāṇṭhakabhadātana, written by Bhōja. This shows that the scholar Yōgichandra was honoured by the title Bhōja in imitation of the court of Vikramāditiya in which Nichula and Kālīdāsa also are known to have existed. And considering further that Bhōja may have called some of the scholars of his court by the names of Bāṇa, Māgha, etc., the riddle of the names of all these persons who flourished in different times but mentioned all together in the Bhōjaprabandha may be easily solved. This view was propounded by K.K. Lele in his article in Marājhī, on Bhōja's literary contributions, published from Dhār in 1931 (pp. 26-27).
3 No. 37.
5 A thesis on this subject submitted by N.M. Kanara and approved by the M.S. University, Baroda, was kindly shown to me by Pt. K. Mulavanā, Director of the I.D. Institute, Ahmedabad. It is still unpublished.
7 No. 33.
8 Nos. 25-27.
succeeded in recovering it and in reviving his kingdom in the closing years of the twelfth century, literary activities were resumed. Biihâna, the Minister of Peace and War under Vîndhyaavarman, composed the fragmentary Mânû inscription which pays homage to Sarasvatî, and two of Arjunavarman’s and one of Devapâla’s grants were composed under his guidance. Another scholar who was patronised by Vîndhyaavarman was Sûhâpa; he was living at the king’s court at Mânû and wrote a commentary on Kâdâmbara’s Vîrtata-râkârâ in V. 1246 or 1190 A.C. He was a Dânkhâtiya Brâhma, a son of Bhâskara and grandson of Vîlûditya, who was himself a good poet.

The eminent scholar of this period was Pârâjita Aûdhrâra, who was a contemporary of Vîndhyaavarman, Subhâtaavarman, Arjunavarman, Devapâla and Jaitugidéva. He was a son of Sallaksha, and born in the Sapâdalaksha country, he migrated to Mâlwa when Muhammad Ghori invaded the country in 1192 A.C. He wrote a commentary on Rudrâja’s Kâvâyâlakâra, Aṣhâta-ahârya-dvâryâta which is a commentary on the Vâghbâta-sarîhîta and some other works which are all of sectarian interest which will be noticed below along with the other Jaina works.

The reign of Arjunavarman, the grandson of Vîndhyaavarman, witnessed a revival of poetic activities. The king himself composed the Rasikasannâjivana, which is a commentary on the Amanukâṣataka; and the royal preceptor, Madana, who was highly honoured by him by the title Bâlasarasvâti, composed a Nâjikâ, a play in four acts, two of which have come down to us. This work is entitled Pârâjita-ahârâ, alias Vîjaya-prârâ, and was staged for the first time in the temple of the goddess Sârâdâ. It is played at the capital of the Paramâras, on the occasion of Vasantotsava and Chaitra-parva, to celebrate the victory of Arjunavarman over Jayasimha, his Chaulikya contemporary of Gujarât, which is doubtless a historical reference. The language of the play is Sanskrit, or Prakrit, as per requirement of the dramatis personae, following the rules of Nâtayasûtra, and the style is lucid and charming. The poet appears to have been considerably influenced by Râjaâkhara, the author of the Karpârâma-jar, and the last verse of his composition, beginning with kimapi (11. 80-81) reminds us of the Naishadhyâyâcharita of Sûrîsharsha. Each of the acts in the play bears a distinct name. It is unfortunate that the latter portion of it is lost.

In his work the poet Madana informs us that he was a son of Gaûgâdharma and belonged to the lineage of Gauḍa Brâhma. He was the preceptor of Arjunavarman whom he describes as trividha-vira-châdâmanu. Madana also composed another work known as Bâlasarasvarîya or Bâlasarasvarâlakârîya, which has not come down to us, and the three inscriptions of Arjunavarman, referred to above. The Rasikasannâjivana cites some of his verses; and, as already remarked by Hultsch, ‘he aided his royal pupil very materially in the compilation of the commentary on the Amanukâṣataka’. Some of his isolated verses of the subhâshita type are included

1 No. 185
2 Nos. 47-48 and 51 respectively.
3 B.U.J., Vol. XX (1951), XXI (1953) and XXII (1954), Part II of each.
5 Edited by Dargaprasad and Parse, Bombay (1916). Kâvyamâla, No. 18.
6 Found by K.K. Lele in 1903, engraved on a black stone (1.73 by 1.54 metres) attached to the northern wall of the principal Meher in the mosque with the writing turned inside. Edited by E. Hultsch in the Ep. Ind., Vol. VIII, pp. 96 ff., and re-edited by S.K. Dikshit, in a booklet, Poona, 1916. The work is fragmentary, giving two acts only.
7 Called Bhîrâs-thâvâna in L. 6 and Sârâdâ-prârya sahâna in L. 3 of the play.
8 Compare L. 16 with Karpârâma-jar., I, v. 16.
9 See Canto XII, v. 75.
10 In II. 7 and 83, we find only vira-châdâmanu.
12 Ep. Ind., Vol. VIII, p. 88. In his Rasikasannâjivana Arjunavarman quotes from the works of Bhaṭṭa Rudra, Anandavardhana, Vâtisâya, and Mâmra, etc., showing his erudition.
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by Jalhanë in his Sūktimuktāvālī, ¹ and from this it appears that he also composed some other works which have so far not seen the light of the day.

In our study of religious conditions prevalent in Māla during the period, we have already noted that Jainism flourished all through this period in this region, side by side with Brāhmanism, and we find Jaina scholars incessantly intent on advancing literary activities. Here we have to note that the Paramāra rulers not only followed a liberal policy in matters of religious pursuits, but also extended their patronage to Jainism, as we know from the interest of Bhoja himself, to satisfy whose curiosity about Jinaśārāma, Dhanañjaya composed the Tilakmarajjī from that of Naravarman, who highly appreciated the extraordinary poetic talent of the Jaina scholar Jinaavallabha, ² and, to mention here one more example, from that of Arjunavarman, who had a very high regard for his teacher Madana, who was himself a disciple of the Jaina savant Aśādhara. Citing these examples, we note that under the royal support Jainism vigorously flourished in Māla During the period under review, a number of Jaina writers came forward with distinctive literary contributions of their own, some of which, however, are merely of sectarian interest. With these general remarks, we now proceed to study some of the prominent Jaina writers of our age.

Chronologically, the first of these scholars was Dēvasēna who composed the Dvīsanaśātra, a treatise on philosophy, while residing at Dhārā, on the tenth day of the bright half of Māgha in V.S. 990 (933-34 A.C.). The work is a compilation of the gāthās of his predecessors. ³ We do not know whether this scholar can be identified with his namesake who is mentioned as the grandfather of Durlabhaśēna, who, according to the Dubkund inscription of the time of Vikramśīma and dated V.S. 1088, vanquished his opponents in a literary debate in the presence of the Paramāra emperor Bhoja, though a consideration of the chronology appears to favour the view. It is also of interest to note here that this work was composed exactly 15 years before Siyaka II issued his Harsōla grant.

Dēvasēna is known to have composed two more works, viz., Tattvāstātra (the essence of reality) and Ārādhanaśātra, the essence of worship. ⁴

Of the reign of Vākpati-Munjja we have at least three Jaina writers. One of them was Harishēna who wrote his Dharmaparikṣā in V. 1044 or 987 A.C. The work is divided into 32 chapters each containing 20 to 25 verses. ⁵ Another of these writers was Mahīśēna, a court-poet of king Vākpati and the preceptor of Sindurāja's mahatma Parāja, at whose request he composed the Pradyumnaśaritra in 14 cantos. ⁶ And the third of these scholars, who was perhaps the most prominent among them, was Amīragati who claims to have been honoured by Munjja, Sindurāja and Bhoja. He was a disciple of Mahīvāsēna and a grand-disciple of Nēmīśēna. He composed his Subhāshīrasandōha in V.S. 1050 or 993 A.C. when Munjja was on the throne, as we learn from its v. 922. ⁷ The work, which deals with Jaina ethics, contains 922 stanzas divided into 32 sandōhas (chapters), each containing about 20 to 25 verses dealing with topics of general interest, e.g., anger, greed, age, purity and so on, but being a staunch Jaina, he devotes 117 stanzas to the duties of a Jaina, which appears to be the main purpose of the work,

1 These verses are collected by S.K. Dīkhit in his work mentioned above, on pp. 55 ff.
4 Ibid., these too are in Prakrit.
5 Thee was also a Jaina ascetic bearing this name and known from the Arthāsāstra inscription of V.S. 1129 (No. 80). On chronological grounds this saint appears to have flourished towards the close of the eleventh century A.C.
7 Edited by Bhavatā Sastri and K.P. Panib in Kāvyamālā Series, No. 82 (1933).
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calling it śrāvaka-dharma-nirūpaṇa. The thirteenth sūndhāra (Śaucha-nirūpaṇa) contains in all 22 stanzas, out of which 17 are devoted to disregarding tīrtha-sūtra and the rest 5 to internal purification (antah-suddhi), which is explained, in it to be more important, and thus the work is of some interest for a student of the social history of the time. The significance of the work in the field of political history consists in showing Muñjā to be on the throne up to 993 A.C. and thus seven years after 986 A.C., his last known year when he issued the Gaonī grants.  

Amatitāgati is known to have composed some more works, Upāsakāchāra, Dharmaparikṣhā (V.S.1070), Pañchasamagraha (1073) and a few others, some of which have not so far been discovered. 2 They are all of sectarian interest and of little interest from the historical point of view.

In our notice of the literary works of general interest produced during the period, we have mentioned the name of Dhanapāla who was a contemporary of Siyaka, Vākpati, Muñjā and Bhōja and who, under the influence of his brother Sōbhana, adopted Jainism. Besides the works mentioned above, he has some others to his credit. He wrote a lexicon of Prākrit words entitled Pāśylakṣchhinīnāmadāla, 3 in V.S. 1029 or 972 A.C. when Siyaka II sacked Mālkhed. He also composed Savarpāya-Mahādīnya, 4 a work containing 15 verses in Prākrit, Mahāvīraśatū, Rishabhapachātikā and a commentary on Chaturvīrātikā, which is the best known work of his brother Sōbhana. 5 Like some of Dhanapāla’s works, this too is in Prākrit, containing 96 verses devoted to pay homage to the 24 Tīrthaṃkaras, Yakkhas, Vidyādēvī, Rōhini, Kāli, Ambikā and some other deities. The work is interspersed with Sanskrit verses, using rare metres as Dvīpadā, Nārakaṃkah and Arṇayadānaka. 6 It was composed at Dīhā, where he poet was living with Dhanapāla and his sister named Sundari, as he himself informs us in it. 7 It is a devotional poem like some of the works of Dhanapāla and has little historical interest.

Bhōja’s reign was also distinguished by some other poets and scholars of minor rank, viz., the poet Vīra (V.1019) and the court-poet Śrīchandra, both of whom composed some poems in Sanskrit. Nāmichandra was a Jain philosopher of the time. 8 Prabhāchandra, another Jain scholar who lived in Dīhā during the reign of Bhōja and his successor Jayasiṃha I, was one of the leading philosophers of the time; his work in the same field and known as the Pramāṇyakamatiśamātirītiṣṭha, has come down to us. 9 Another scholar, Nāyanaṃdi, composed the Suvardāsvarṣṭītā, Sukalavivāhītā and Ardhaśā, which are all of sectarian interest. 10 Jinavallabha, a contemporary of Naravarman, wrote the Mahāvīraśatū, a poem consisting of 30 stanzas which are readable both in Sanskrit and Prākrit (sama-Sanskrit-Prākrit). 11 All these works, some of which are still unpublished, are of sectarian value and of much little use for the historian.

In our sketch of the literary activities of the general type in our period, reference has already been made to the illustrious name of Panḍita Āśādhara, the most eminent

1 Nos. 6-7.
2 See Jaina Sūhyova aur Jabāra (Hindi) by Nathurama Premi, p. 409.
3 Edited by G. Bühler, Göttingen (1899).
5 Edited by H.R. Kapadia, in all the Kāvyamālā series, VII (1890).
6 Ibid.
7 As seen above, his father’s name was Sarvādeva, according to the Tilakamāyini, whereas the Sarvāktaavasaptāti (pp. 74-75) mentions him as Sūmachaṅdra.
8 Most of these works are still unpublished and are mentioned only in some Catalogues. My reference to these writers is from P.B.P., pp. 129-130.
9 Edited by Mahendranāgar śāstri, Nīnayaḍgar Press, Bombay, 1941. In this respect, also see P.B.P., p. 329, n-3, where some other works also are mentioned. They are all sectarian and worthless for historical purposes.
10 The first of these works is published by the Research Institute of Prakrit Jainology and Akṣara, Valāśi, Bhar.
literary figure of the first half of the thirteenth century A.C. He was living in Nalakachchhapura, modern Nalchihā lying about 25 kms. south east of Dhār (Lat. 22° 26’ N; Long. 75° 29’ E.), and was a profound scholar. His education and scholarly activities made his residence a centre of erudition and teaching. Dēvachandra studied grammar under him; Viśākakṛiti attained from him mastery over Tarkaśāstra; Vinayachandra learnt from him the doctrine of the Jainas, and Madana, the Rājaṇugra of Arjunavarman, studied from him the art of poetry.

A large number of works dealing with Jainism have also been attributed to this scholar; they consist of devotional poems, commentaries and the doctrine of Jainism.1

The most famous and popular work of Āśādhara is the Dharmāṅgīrī, in which he describes the essence of dharma in nine chapters. This work is divided into two parts, called the Sūgara-Dharmāṅgīrī (meaning for the householder) and the Anagāra-Dharmāṅgīrī (meaning for the recluse). On the first of these sections he also wrote a commentary, calling it Bhāvyakumudacandrikā, in V.S.1296 or 1239 A.C.; and on the second part, a commentary in V.S.1300 or 1235 A.C., adding that it was completed in the reign of Dēvapāla’s son Jñānagīda. Both these commentaries were written, as he also tells us, in the temple of Nēmināṭha at Nalakachchhapura.2 One of his works entitled Jñayajñatākāśa was composed in V.S.1285, i.e. 1228 A.C., expired, and another, Triṣṭhāṣīmśrītāśṭra, in V.S. 1292 (1235 A.C.).3 Some of his works are historically useful, as we have mentioned in the section dealing with the political history of the time.

While coming to Māvlā from his native land, Āśādhara appears to have brought with him a retinue of friends and scholars. One of them was Dāmādīra, who composed a poem Nēmināṭhachārī, in honour of Nēmināṭha, the 22nd Tirthāṅkara, in V.S.1287, i.e. 1230 A.C., in the reign of Dēvapāla. This savant was a son of Mālhaṇa, who belonged to the Khaṇḍāvā clan and he migrated to Salakānagāpura, modern Sānkānpur near Nalchihā, the new home of Āśādhara.4

Our general survey makes it amply clear that during our period the literary activities of the Jainas were intense, mainly in the sphere of literature and philosophy. This was all due to the royal patronage, as we have seen above.

Studying the literary pursuits conducted during the reign of the junior branches of the Paramāra kings, we find that the poet who wins our applause was Prahlādana, a Yuvarāja and younger brother of Dhāravarsha, lord of Chandrāṇaeti. In the Mt. Ābū prakāśa he is described as an incarnation of Sarasvatī,5 and the Kiritkaumudi of Sōmēśvara represents him as Sarasvatī’s son who relieved her sorrow caused by the death of Muniya and Bhōja.6 Eight of his verses are quoted by Jalhana in his Sūkittimārttakā, and an equal number of verses attributed to him are cited in the Śārṅgadhara-paddhati;7 and from this it is obvious that he was a poet of admirable ability. He wrote the Pārthaparākrama, a vītyottas on a military spectacle, which was staged on the occasion of the festival of the investment of Achaḷēśvara, the titulary deity of Mt. Ābū.8 The story is taken from the Virāja-parva of the Mahābhārata, describing the recovery by Arjuna of the cows of the Virāja king by defeating the army of the Kauravas who were the raiders. The theme of the vītyottas has a reference to the repelling of the army of Prithvirāja III when he led a night attack on Dhāravarsha in the former’s struggle with Bhumī II of Gujarāt, as seen above, in the political history of the house.

---

1 For a complete list, see H.P.D., pp. 293 f. and P.B.P., p. 332, n. 2 and p. 333, n. 2.
3 Vide Jainā-Prakāśa-Saṅgha, ibid., p. 139.
5 v. 14, Śrī-Prahlādana-devaḥ-bhūtṛ śūkṣamā śrīgāthāṁ śrīpradidhīmānāṁ |
putrāṇām sarvasvātih pariścāma jay-āryeḥ | v. 14, Śrī-Śrībha-śrīśrībha śāśaṅkānī mūṇāyan vartavyatī katham |
Prahlādayāna ś-āḥfādā pumān-śakṛt Sarvasvātih |
6 v. 15.
7 The verses are cited in G.O.S., No. IV, (1927) appx. 1 and 2, respectively.
8 Edited in G.O.S., ibid., Baroda (1917).
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The drama has the merit of smooth composition and clearness, as claimed by the poet himself.

Regarding the literary activities carried on during the reigns of the other royal dynasties of our period, the information is rather meagre and restricted only to that of the Chandellás. One of these few literary compositions that may be mentioned here is the Prabodhachandrodabha, a drama written by Krishna Misra in six acts, the theme of which is to show "the defence of the Advaita form of Vishnu doctrine". The form is allegorical and the work describes the victory of Discrimination (Prabodha) over Confusion (Moha), which is, indirectly, the victory of one Gopala over the Kalachuri king Karna-deva who had routed the Chandella army during the reign of Devavarman, the immediate predecessor of Kirtivarman, capturing a large part of his kingdom.¹

The drama gives Gopala the entire credit of saving the Chandella sovereignty in this catastrophe and reinstating Kirtivarman on the throne; and from this it is evident that Gopala, who is otherwise unknown was a military leader who organised the campaign of the Chandella king and won the victory for him. The work also describes Gopala in the expression "on whose lotus-like feet were reflected the crestjewels of the circle of the feudatory princes",² which also shows that he was the head of the feudatory princes, who too may have sent their forces in the struggle which appears to have been very fierce when it describes Karna as a powerful infatuation (moham-tvorfutam); and in this hour need Gopala, who is said to have resembled Discrimination (Viveka), rose to the occasion and routing Karna, rescued the Chandella kingdom.³

The victory appears to have been glorious; for, we further learn from the drama that it was staged before Kirtivarman who could not have been offended thereby, as it was true.⁴

About the literary activities of the later period, we find that Paramardin, who was on the Chandella throne from 1116 to 1202 A.C. was himself a poet. He composed the long inscription paying homage to Tripurari (Siva).⁵ We also have some minor types of dramatic specimens of his time, all written by his minister Vatsaraja, who is, however, unknown from epigraphic sources. No definite date can be assigned to any of these works, but they seem to have been deliberately composed to illustrate six out of the ten types of Sanskrit drama.⁶

One of the series mentioned above is the Karpurarcharita, a bhāya or a comic monologue in which the gambler Karpuraka describes his revelry, gambling and love with a courtesan. Another of these works is the Hātasyahitamaraṇi, a prahansa or a farce in one act, in which a preceptor of the Bhagavata school is ridiculed. Resembling the other comic specimens of this type, it embodies no action, for it is produced only with the sole aim of creating laughter. Another work that we owe to the same writer is an iḥātmiga called Rukminivarana, which is in four acts, dealing with, as the name suggests, the success of Krishna in taking away Rukmini and thus depriving Shripala of her, his promised bride. Still another work of Vatsaraja is the Tripurāratha Dima, dealing with the well-known destruction of the capital of Tripurāsura, by Siva, who is for this reason called Tripurār. It is in four acts. Vatsaraja has also given us a Samvākāra entitled Samudramanathana which presents the story of churning the ocean by the gods and the demons. It is in three acts; and still another specimen known as the Kirtitarjuniva-Vityoga, which deals

¹ For the story of the drama, see A.B. Keith, The Sanskrit Drama (Oxford, 1924), p. 254 f.
² See Prologue, 1, 3.
³ Viveka - eva nirūya Karnaṇā mohān = iva Śrī-Kirtivarman-ārīpatāḥ-bodhayay-eva-bdayah kritāḥ 1, v.
⁴ Also compare No. 113, v. 26 and No. 145, v. 3.
⁵ This was first suggested by H.C. Ray in his D.H.N.L.
⁶ No. 140.
⁷ All edited in G.O.S., No. VIII (1918), Baroda.
INTRODUCTION

with the well-known story of Śiva’s struggle with Arjuna, as described in Bāravi’s Kīrtārjunīya. The play is heroic. It was written later than the other five plays and in the reign of Trailokyavarman who was Paramardin’s successor, very probably representing the king’s success over his enemies.

Attention may be drawn here to a Jaina work composed during the reign of Paramardin. A verse in the Dhanyakumāracharitā, written by a Jaina scholar named Guṇabhadra, reads as follows:-

Śāstram-iddaṃ kriyam rājye rājñah śrī-Paramardinah
pūre Viḷāsā-pūrve cha jin-alayār-virājite. 1

From the mention of Viḷāsapura, which figures in three of Paramardin’s grants,2 we can safely identify both these rulers.

We may conclude this section with the remark that apart from the works mentioned above, we have specimens of genuine poetry composed by court-poets who wrote in highly cultivated style using figures of speech like Upanā, Utpreksha, Rāpakα, Vvaitrekα, Apgamni, Aitīaykti, and what is particularly noteworthy, the double entendre (Śkṣha), which is possible only in Sanskrit and which has made it an ideal language.3 Some of the best specimens of the epigraphic literature of the time, all embellished with flight of fancy and imagination, are:- The Udaipur prāśasti, the Nagpur Museum stone inscription, the eulogy of Sun-god by Chhitappa, the Māndhār grant of the time of Jayavarmaṇ, the Vasantaṅgād inscription of the time of Pūrnapāla, the Arthṅa inscription of Chāmunḍārāja, The Khajurāhō inscription of Yāsvnarm and the renewed Khajurāhō inscription, the Kāläjār stone inscription of Paramardidēva, the Ajayāgaṅgh stone inscription of the time of Bhpajēva, and the Gvālir stone inscription of Mahipāla4 - all giving us best specimens of the literature of the time. It may, however, be remarked here that the end of our period was marked by a process of decline when literary productions began to be merely imitative of the earlier models, lacking “vigour, inspiration and originality”. Even the inscriptions which we have mentioned above as the best specimens of Sanskrit are examples of the stereotyped literature of the preceding age; and as rightly remarked by a scholar, “the creative age was over by the tenth century, and the process of decadence had already set in”, not merely in our region but throughout the country.

ECONOMIC CONDITIONS

In our attempt to portray the economic structure of the period under review, we shall, as in the other cases, mainly confine ourselves to the epigraphic sources, and on very rare occasions we shall refer to the material available in literature, which is so ample as to form a separate sort of inquiry. And while doing so, we shall, first of all, note the wide economic variations owing to the geographical and the other factors existing in the different sub-divisions of the vast region represented by our inscriptions. There sub-divisions consist mainly of three different parts, viz., (1) the fertile tract of Mālwa, roughly stretching to the north of the Narmadā and bounded by the Chambal on the west and the Bētwā on the east; (2) the Vindhya region, extending along the lower reaches of the Yamunā and comprising mostly of a wild area intercepted by hills, deep ravines and narrow valleys, with its comparatively poorer soil; and (3) to the latter’s west and northwest, the region around Gwālīor, which stretches to the vast Gangetic plains in its north and east, and presents, more or less, the features of both these regions. We have also to note that with all these topographical variations there are other factors also, e.g., those

2 Nos. 129, 132, 134.
3 See S.E., p. 300.
4 Respectively, Nos. 24, 33, 37, 60, 62, 86, 98, 114, 125, 140, 149 and 155.
of the natural resources, of the kinds of the soil, of the river system and along with these of the climatic conditions, owing to which this vast region presents wide economic differences.

The main bulk of people lived in villages, and the chief support of life in our period was agriculture, as it was throughout India from very early times. Therefore, while dealing with the rural economy, it is necessary to say a few words regarding the ownership of land which has been a theme of keen controversy among scholars. Here we have to note that the peasants, who had their permanent settlements in the villages, continued to till the land without any disturbance so long as they paid land-revenue to the government. It is thus evident that the ownership of land was vested in the crown. The same is also shown by grants made to temples, monasteries and individuals, when the king explicitly announced his order to the residents of the village to pay to the donee of the royal charter all the dues that he used to receive. From this it is evident that what was transferred in such cases is only the royal prerogative of demanding the land-revenue and the other dues, in cash and kind. What thus appears to be transferred in all such cases is only the simple possession, with privileges to demand the revenue which the peasants formerly used to pay to the king, who alone continued to retain the absolute ownership or proprietary right. The copper-charters issued on the occasion were only to constitute the legal evidence of this simple possession, as just seen. The donees were also probably exempted from paying the land-tribute and the other taxes which the residents of the village had to remit to the royal treasury from time to time. In case of the grants of villages, the donees were entitled to receive the royal revenue or dues in the form of bhāga, bhāga, kara, etc., the details of which we shall see below.

Some of the Chandella grants put the relevant details of the donated village, more exhaustively, as in the following words: "with water and land, with mango and madhuka trees..., with stones and bricks, with treasure of mines and salt-pits," etc., etc., and they also record the king's instructions that "the donee may cultivate the land himself, or through an agent, may donate or sell it," and so on. These details tend to show that the king also transferred to the donee the ownership of the soil, and, in view of this, we may also hold that in cases where such details are missing, it was only the royal share of the revenue, and not the ownership of the soil which was transferred. None of the Paramātra inscriptions is explicit on this point.

So far we have no record to show that the donee had the right of turning out the cultivators of the field donated to him, so long as they continued to pay the dues to him, or of driving out the people of a village or of disallowing them to enjoy the privileges as hitherto. In such cases it too was not obligatory on the donee to make arrangements for the lodging and boarding of the royal officers and officials, as we learn from the expression a-chātra-bhāta-pravēṣyanī or the like, which is generally found in royal charters making donations of villages. And in the case when villages were donated, the donee was also entitled to the legitimate royal share of the dues from minerals, grass or trees and such other objects mentioned in the grants. He was, of course, not empowered to impose any new tax upon the people of the donated area, and this also shows that the king was the absolute owner of such lands and villages.

The Bhārat Kalā Bhavan grant of Madanavarman is an important document to show the king's absolute ownership of land, and the relevant details of it may be considered here. From this charter we learn that one Dīkṣhit Nārāyaṇaśarma received from the king some grants in exchange for two other plots of land which were formerly in his possession,

1 Cf. the expression sarvam-bhīyaḥ samunattvayi, for example, in No. 106, and in many of our grants. Also bhūgā-bhūgā-hiranya-liś-dādānāhī sukhām-bṝyttm in No. 100, v. 10.
2 For example, see Nos. 106, 118 and 151. The details in all these grants show minor variations.
3 In this connection, also see H.D., Vol. I, p. 383.
4 No. 119.
one of which was donated by Nādīka, a priest attached to one of the queens of Madanavarman, and the other by Sōmekā, a son of the Thakkura Ṣripūla. The record further states that another Brāhmaṇa of the name of Sahajāravārman received from the king a land in exchange of the one which was already in his possession in two villages and donated to him respectively by the chief queen and another queen, both of Madanavarman, with his prior approval. A consideration of all these details goes to show the absolute ownership over the land of the king, who alone could make all the exchanges mentioned in the record and also issue fresh documents in this respect.

That this practice was current in Mālwā also is shown by the Nagpur Museum stone inscription which states that Naravarman exchanged two villages donated previously by his brother Lakshmadēva, who was then only a governor, in favour of Lakshmidhara, and that the king’s permission had also to be obtained by any of his subordinates intending to donate a village is also shown at the instance of Anayasimha, a sādhārapa under the Paramāra king Jayasimha-Jayavarman, as we learn from one of the grants from Māṇḍhata.

Here we may also consider a few instances from some other regions to throw light on the problem in hand. The Bhimnāl inscription of V. 1217 states that Krishnērā, a ruler belonging to the junior branch of the Paramāras, donated a field for the maintenance of a temple which was repaired by the residents of the place, and the Mahārāja Vikramasimha of the Kachchhaphāṭ dynasties presented some land, along with some other objects, to a temple built by some gōśṭhīnās in his capital Dubkund. The Ingnōdī stone inscription of V. 1190 records the donation of a village named Āgāsīyaka, to a temple, by the Mahārāja Vairāgī of the Vijayaśālī dynasty, with the clear instruction that whatever be obtained by way of the revenue and the other income from the village should be presented to the deity in future. All these instances lead us to conclude that it was indeed the prerogative only of the king to make donations of land or villages.

We have of course, records of donations made by queens and some of the subordinates of the king; all these appear to have been made from what constitutes the personal property of the donor, as we learn from the expression svā-bhūkta-ṛjya. It would thus appear that in all such cases the king’s prior consent was not necessary.

There are, however, a few instances which do not appear to be governed by the rule of the king’s prerogative of the ultimate ownership of land, e.g., when he donated a plot of land in favour of a temple, or an agrahāra village in favour of Brāhmaṇas, with the explicit mention that “it is for the use of the public, or of the Brāhmaṇas”. In such cases it appears that the king no longer desired to retain his absolute right over the land or the village. We have another type of instances pointing to the corporate ownership of a certain community over a land, as we note from the expression Brāhmaṇabhūmi = īyam, and the case appears to have been similar. It is also interesting to note here that a step-well excavated at Vasantagāḍh by a dowager queen Lāhīnī, and another by the gōśṭhīkara of Bhāguḍ, clearly mention in the respective records that “they were presented to the public.” Nevertheless, from the expressions used in the respective records, the wells appear to have been properties of joint village-ownership.

1. As known from the expression amaṇḍ-amīvatā dastavāt in ibid., 1, 27.
2. No. 33, v. 35.
3. See the expression Dhārīṭhīdān-drājśīrādā in No. 60, 1, 87.
4. No. 92, 1, 18.
5. No. 154, 1, 56.
6. No. 158, 1, 9.
8. No. 63, 1, 14.
9. No. 68, 1, 8.
10. As n. 8 above.
ECONOMIC CONDITIONS

We have two more examples, both from the Vindhyā region, in favour of supporting the crown-ownership of land. One of them is the Kālāñjī stone inscription which records the donation of two halas of land by Kirtivarman’s preceptor Varsudēva, to a mason who constructed the mandapa of a temple at that place, probably by way of wages. And though as a Rājaguru he exercised great influence over his pupil-sovereign, he beseeched the royal officer in charge of the affair (Śri-karavādihipa) to give his (formal) consent to the donation (and also to regularise it). The other case to be considered here relates to the mortgage of the village Alaurā by the ascetic Śāntasīva, a son of the Rājaguru Vimalaśiva, to the Rājaka Dharēka, in the reign of Trailokāvarman. As a son of a Rājaguru, this ascetic too may have exercised great influence on the reigning king, but what is particularly noteworthy is that the document, besides mentioning the king, records the names of the Śaṅdhisigrama, the Keśa-pāla and the Arthaśekha, who were all then “present on duty”. All three of these officers are concerned with the affair, and they are named here as royal representatives to accord their final sanction to the transaction. In the end the record also cites the names of some persons as witnesses, including two paṭṭikālas and two Thakkuras. All these details indicate that the consent for mortgaging the village through its leading men was also indispensable in such cases. This sort of consent appears also to have been implied while drafting the Ingonā inscription of Vijayapāla and the Rōpi grant of Dévarāja of Bhimāl, both of which end with the names of witnesses, some of whom are royal officials and the others leading men of the villages; this also shows the usual practice of announcing the affair to all concerned.

Theoretically, the subordinate rulers were not empowered to donate land, as we have seen above, but in actual practice, we find that some of them actually did so. Siyaka, as a Rāshaṇkāja feudatory, three of the feudatories of Bhōja, viz., Vatsaraṇa, Jāsorāja and the Rājaka Amma, and the Abu ruler Dharāvanisha, who was a subordinate of the Chauḷūkya throne, are some of the well-known examples. It would thus appear that in practice the privilege of making land-grants was enjoyed by some of the higher types of feudatories and was related to the degree of dependence or semi-independence of the feudatory rulers, of whom there were more types than one.

In our inscriptions we have references to the following types of land:— (i) kṣēṭra (cultivable), (ii) tūshara (barren), (iii) kacchiḥta or sakṣerā (contiguous to water), (iv) śāḍvāla or grāṭa (grassy, for grazing cattle), and (v) vāsa (habitable). Besides these two more kinds, viz., aprahata (fallow) and sarkaḍa (full of sand or pebbles or both) are also known from literature. Hēmāchandra mentions classification of fields according to their qualities, viz., those which are fertile, those unfit for cultivation, those lying fallow, and those with a saline soil. He also mentions some other classifications of land, for

1 No. 110, vv. 4 and 6.  
2 No. 143.  
3 The first of these has already been referred to above and the second is No. 91, 11. 19-20. The names of witnesses are recorded here in addition to the usual practice of announcing the grants in the presence of all.  
4 See No. 1-2, 8, 15-16 and 67, respectively.  
5 In our inscriptions sometimes the word kṣētra is used (as in No. 9), sometimes kṣētra-bhūmi (as in No. 21) and sometimes only bhūmi (as in No. 73). Incidentally, here we may draw attention to Basak’s and Parīkṣa’s interpretation of the term kṣētra to denote a cultivable field. See respectively, Ep. Ind., Vol. XVII, p. 348, and Ind. Ant., Vol. for 1918, p. 305 (text, p. 304) as S.K. Maiti has pointed out in Economic Life of Northern India (Calcutta, 1957), p. 23.  
6 No. 100, 1, 12, and No. 107, 1, 13.  
7 No. 8, 1, 10, and No. 83, 1, 32.  
8 No. 68, 1, 21.  
9 No. 130, 1, 14.  
10 See S.K. Maiti, op. cit., p. 23.  
11 Abhidhānačintāmaṇi, as referred to in S.E., p. 316. The use of halas for measurement of land, so often found in our inscriptions, probably may be taken as also implying that the fallow ground had to be brought under cultivation.
example, according to the crops grown on them and also according to the seeds sown on them.\(^1\) Almost the same sort of classification of soil is given in the *Abhidhānataratnamāla* by Halāyudha (II, 3-6) who was a protege of Vākpati-Munī.\(^2\) And from all these references it appears that these classifications may have been current in Mālwā and the adjoining regions.

The different plots of agricultural land were marked either by natural or by artificial barriers, whether in Mālwā or in Bundelkhand.\(^3\) We have a few instances from the adjoining areas of Rājāstān where fields were marked on all the four sides by images of cows.\(^4\)

The system of measuring land was not uniform throughout the vast region represented by our inscriptions, and we have instances to show that it differed from one to another locality. For example, in Mālwā proper, in the adjoining region of Bānwāḍā to its north-west, and in that of Nāsik to its south, *nivartana* was the standard measure of land.\(^5\) This term has been differently interpreted by scholars, for example, whereas according to D.C. Sircar, it is 240 X 240 square cubits, i.e., about 3 acres,\(^6\) and according to Pran Nath it is equal to one acre,\(^7\) Mirashi, referring to Kauṭilya (II, 20) and the *Lilāvati* (I, 6), has pointed out that several *nivartanas* appear to have been in vogue, e.g., according to the former it is 20 rods in length and in breadth, i.e., 400 sq. rods, and according to the latter, it is 30 by 30 *dandas*, i.e., 900 sq. rods.\(^8\) Mirashi’s statement is supported by Bālambhaṭṭa’s commentary on *Mārkhaledharaṇa*, which itself is a commentary on the *Yājñavalkya Smṛti* and which mentions two kinds of *nivartanas* - one measuring 200 *bastus* and the other 100 *bastus*.\(^9\)

Fortunately, we have two records to enlighten us with reference to its actual measurement as then current in Mālwā. The Dēwas and the Kadambpadrakā grants,\(^10\) both of which were issued by Naravarman, respectively in V. 1152 (1095 A.C.) and V. 1167 (1110 A.C.), mention a *nivartana* equal to 42 rods lengthwise and as many rods breadthwise, and it is also stated there that the measuring rod was marked by 96 *parvas*. A *parva*, as we know from our ancient sources, is the smallest unit of practical linear measurement being almost equal to three-fourth of an inch;\(^11\) and working on this basis, the length of a rod can be calculated to be 72 inches or 6 feet or 18.28 metres. Accordingly, the area of a *nivartana* would be 6X6 sq. feet 42 times or 42X42 *dandas*; and taking the two *dandas* on either side as to be left fallow as a boundary mark of the plot,\(^12\) we get 40 by 40 sq. *dandas* for actual sowing, which is perfectly in accord with that which was then current also in the neighbouring region of Nāsik under the early Kalachuris.\(^13\)

---

3. For example, see No. 16, I. 17 (for Mālwā) and No. 118, II. 8 ff. (for Bundelkhand). In the former of those regions it is still known as *Kāṅkana-padari*, as we have so often seen.
4. No. 64, I. 13, and No. 65, II. 12-13.
5. See No. 30, I. 18 and No. 34, I. 13 for Mālwā; No. II, I. 16 for Bānwāḍā; and No. 16, II. 18, 20 and 22 for Nāsik.
7. *A Study in the Econ. Conditions of Anc. India*, p. 83. This view, along with that of D.C. Sircar, is also quoted by P. Bhattacharya in *P.B.P.*, p. 308.
10. Nos. 31 and 34, respectively.
12. It is called *Kāṅkana-padari* in Mālwā, as we have expressed a number of times.
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From all that is stated above, it would also appear that the standard measure of nivartana, which was already in vogue in the region around Nasik, was borrowed by the Paramara rulers of Malwa, and in this region too its use gradually disappeared after the reign of Naravarman (1134 A.C.), subsequent to which we have not even a single inscription using this word. It may also be stated here that we have no knowledge of the standard measure of land then current in the region under any other dynasty.

Leaving a few cases of the restricted use of nivartana as just seen, land was generally denoted in terms of halas, a hala signifying as much of it as could be ploughed in a day by a single pair of bullocks. The donated plot of land often shared the same peculiarities as of the other plots under cultivation in a village, but being virgin or even uneven, it had to be made cultivable by such means as may be devised on the occasion. Often it was bounded by streams or rivulets, low lands, trees and such other marking boundaries as in the neighbouring village.

One of the Paramara grants has the expression Brāhmaṇa-mūpyakīya-bhū-hala, showing that there existed some sort of tables for measuring a hala and probably also that a Brāhmaṇa was generally entrusted with this affair at least in that particular locality.

Along with mentioning the intended extent of and in the form of halas, occasionally the amount of seed required to sow it was also expressed in our inscriptions. The Dēpalpur grant of Bhōjadeva, for example, records the donation of four halas of land to be sown with 34 prasthas of seeds; and one prastha, as we know from the dictionaries, was equal to 4 kudēnas or 48 handfuls, as a measuring capacity. That these measurements also varied in the different localities in the region is also shown by our records stating the extent of a kudāva as it was then current in the Nilagiri-mandala.

The Chandella grants more often record the quantity of seed required to sow the land measured by a hala, e.g., 7 1/2 dōnas of seed required to sow a plot measuring 10 halas, as in the Augāsi grant of Madansvarman and also in the Pachhār grant of his grandson Paramardin; and this measurement is fully corroborated by the Mahōbā grant of the latter of these kings which mentions exactly half the number of halas (i.e., 5) with half the quantity of seed (3 3/4 dōnas).

That this practice was in vogue also in the region around Gwālior is known from the Dubkund inscription of the time of the Kachchhapaghattra ruler Vikramasimha, which mentions a field to be sown with four gōnīs.

We have no means to ascertain the sowing capacity or the actual procedure of measuring a field as it was then current in any other region, but we may presume that almost the same practice prevailed there also.

In our records we also find the use of some other words to denote the extent of land, but we have no means to know their precise meaning. For example, the word

---

1 For Mālwa, see Nos. 8, 13, 21 and 55; for Bundelkhand, Nos. 110, 118, 125 and 126; and for the Sīndhi region, Nos. 68 and 62. This measure is not found in inscriptions from any other region. As Mirashi has already recorded, this is said to be equal to five acres. See C.I.I., Vol. IV, p. clxxii.
2 Brāhmaṇa-mūpyakīya-bhū-hala) in No. 13, 1, 12.
3 In No. 39, 1, 1.
4 No. 13, 1, 13.
5 See No. 45, 1, 27.
6 See respectively, No. 118, 1, 7, and No. 131, 1, 8. Also see No. 130, ll. 11-12.
7 No. 130, lI. 11-12.
8 No. 154, 1, 56. Gōnī is a measure of capacity equal to a dōna or 4 tāhalkas, or 1024 handfuls. Also see S.K. Maity, op. cit., p. 39. The measures from Bundelkhand are all for kōdrava, a kind of millet that the poor eat, and the seed is sown broadcast. For the system of measuring cultivable land in terms of its sowing capacity in the neighbouring regions in our period, see C.I.I., Vol. IV, p. clxii; E.C.XII, 40 (1040 A.C.); Tbiš, V, Ak. 142 (1162 A.C.), etc.
pada is used in two of the Chandella grants,1 and this word, along with two others, viz., arishi and vamaka, is mentioned in some of the grants from Mâliwâ.2 Of these all, pada or pada is known to be the length of a human foot, which is approximately 12 arungalas or 9 inches or 22.86 cms., and the measures denoted by the other two terms are not fixed. All these words appear to have denoted parts, the dimensions and the precise significance of which may have been precisely settled at the time of donation, as desired.

One of the Chandella inscriptions also mentions hasta as the unit of measure in connection with housing land;3 it is conventionally the distance from the tip of the elbow to the middle finger of an adult and it is said to be equal to 24 arungalas or double of pada.4

We have no reference showing the methods of agriculture, but from the numerous references to hala it is evident that ploughs drawn by oxen were the common means resorted to in our period. A spade, or hoe, locally called bakkar and now in vogue in almost all the parts of this vast region, may also have been in use, though we have no reference to it. One of the records mentions khalâ (threshing floor), indicating that corn was threshed. We have no direct reference to irrigation; but from the mention of canals, tanks, lakes and wells and their repairs in our records5 we can surmise that the importance of artificial irrigation was well recognised. A wheel known as araghata,6 was used for raising water from a well.

During the time of famine the state took measures to avert the calamity and this example was followed by pious and wealthy people.7

As to the agricultural products, our inscriptions incidently mention the following: kôrrava (a kind of millet), tila (sesame), vihi (paddy), mudga (kidney beans), kanika (eumin seed) and môranda.8 Of these, kôrrava and môranda appear to have been produced more profusely and extensively in Bundelkhand and in areas where the rainfall is scanty. Godhûma, though mentioned in only one of our inscriptions found at Dubkund, in the Shâvpir District,10 appears to have been extensively cultivated throughout Mâliwâ also, as today.

---

1 No. 119, II. 25 and below; and No. 126, II. 17 and below.
2 See Nos. 60, 45 and 81 respectively.
3 No. 130, I. 14.
4 Sukra, i, 387-414. According to the Mâtkâśi on the Yaj. Sm. (I, 210), 30 dayûs, each 7 hasta long, make a nîvitrana.
5 The lakes at Bhojpur, Udaypur, and Dèpâlipur, named after Bhoj, Udayâditya and Dèvâpâla, respectively, and those known as Râhila-Sâgar, Kirata (Kriti)-Sâgar and Madana-Sâgar, known after the Chandella kings of these names are the well-known instances. For lakes at Khajurâhô and Mahâbâd, see A.S.I.R., Vol. II, pp. 415 and 439. For epigraphic references, see No. 6, I. 8 (sumastas-pûgakas = sahif), No. 60, v. 59, No. 125, vv. 47-48 and No. 133, v. 3. References to constructing and repairing wells are numerous. It may also be pointed out here that from the Khajurâhô inscription of V. 1011 (our No. 98) Dr. S.K. Mitra has tried to show that in its v. 25 there is a reference to "the construction of embankments to divert the course of a river, evidently for the benefit of the peasantry concerned." (E.R.K., p. 180). But the actual expression is svah-Sêsihâ-raddha-rôdât, which means only that (at the time of the march of the king's army) the course of the heavenly river was blocked (due to the dust raised and accumulated in its water).
6 See No. 82, I. 37; No. 83, I. 34; and No. 84, v. 78. It is not a Persian wheel, as generally taken.
7 For example, see No. 130, I. 11.
8 No. 8, II. 9-10.
9 For example, see No. 130, I. 11.
10 No. 154, I. 56.
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Of the fibrous products, we have references to the cultivation of cotton and ānâja (hemp), both of which are very often recorded in our inscriptions.¹ The textile industry in Malwa flourished with conspicuous success.²

Sugarcane appears to have been cultivated abundantly throughout the region in our age also, as at present, as we find the word ikṣu occurring very often in our records. Mango and madhūika (Madhuca indica) are generally mentioned in connection with the donated villages in Bundelkhand, but they appear to have been grown plentifully in some other tracts also. The latter of these products was used for preparing intoxicating liquor. Kalyapāla (wine-dealer) figures in one of our inscriptions.³ from Vindhyā region.

Cattle-rearing was also followed by some of the population, as we know from references to pasture-lands attached to villages and products like milk, butter, ghee, etc. Forests, salt-mines, mines of precious stones and treasure trove were great resources of income to the state. Of all the minerals, iron was the most useful in every day life for manufacturing agricultural implements, such as spade, sickle and plough share and also for preparing weapons of war. This metal, which is mentioned in almost every grant from Bundelkhand,⁴ may have been worked out in the other territories as well. The iron pillar at Dhār, which is now unfortunately broken into three parts, is said to be a creation of our age.⁵

The art of working metals was pursued with great success. Among the metals we have references to gold, silver, brass, copper etc., besides iron which has just been mentioned. Gold and silver were generally used for ornaments, to decorate the different parts of houses and temples to which we have numerous references, and also for constructing images for worship.⁶ That the copper-industry was thriving in all the parts of the region in our period is known from the copper-plates, with reference to their engravers, and from the utensils of worship recorded in detail in some of our inscriptions.⁷ We have references to working in riti (bell-metal), kānṣya and pittala⁸ (brass), showing that this industry greatly developed throughout the region.

The temple-building activity which was prevalent during the period throughout the entire region, and the superb grace exhibited in sculptures profusely to be found in the whole region, furnish evidence of the general development of stone architecture. This is also supported by the Samardāṅgasīra-rādra and other contemporary works. A record from Gwalior, dated V. 1150, shows that a temple was equipped by the king with stone-cutters, stone-polishers, diggers of wells and tanks and their builders, along with carpenters, engineers and artisans.⁹ The high-water mark achieved in the field of stone architecture is also testified by the description of temples and stepped wells constructed during our period.¹⁰

Work in precious stones also flourished highly in the period under review, as we know from scattered references to it in our records. The Gwalior inscription of the Kachchhapaghātta Mahipāla which we have referred to above, states that the deities installed by him in the temple were decorated with ornaments studded with precious stones.

¹ For example, in No. 84, v. 72; No. 118, l.16; and No. 130, l. 25.
² According to Chau Jū-kūn, as referred to in S.E., p. 518.
³ No. 84, v. 74. Sup-trees (āśava-) and safflowers (kuruvha) are often mentioned in Chandella grants, e.g., in No. 118, l. 16.
⁴ E.g. sa-tōha-lavan-śkaruwh; also cf. No. 155, v. 76.
⁶ For example, in No. 92, 11, 13-14; Nos. 82, v. 33; No. 155, v. 36; No. 82, vv. 86-82; and No. 96, v. 5.
⁷ See, for example, No. 155, vv. 83 ff.
⁸ Ibid.; also see No. 126, l. 124.
⁹ No. 155, v. 101.
¹⁰ The following technical terms may be quoted here from No. 62-:
Sudhūṣja-anudhīn ruchīrōn supādirān sāil-ōṣṭākaṃ cha sthīra-simhakaṇṇam (v. 20).
An inscription from the Vāgada region describes a gold-smith as dexterous in testing rubies, and still another, from the Mandav District, records a donation to a temple by makers of pearl-strings. We have the well-known example of the Śiva-loka of emerald installed in a temple at Khajurahō by the Chandelā ruler Dhanīga. And combining all these stray evidences from the different parts of the whole region, we notice that working in precious stone, which was the occupation in our age of some of the people at least, was carried on with conspicuous success.

With reference to the other professions and crafts, our inscriptions incidentally mention rūpakāra, sātradhāra, vaidya, aśva-vaidya, nāṭika, dhāvara, tālīka, and some others. The professions of all these persons appear to be hereditary and they worked in their houses testifying to the existence of cottage-industries. An idea of how most of these industries were thriving in those days can be had from the affluence of wealth of an oilman who, according to an inscription from Mālā, built a Śiva temple at Jhālrāpiṭhan, in the Jhālāwād District of West Mālā, now included in Rajasthān.

The products of the home-industries mentioned above were all brought for sale to the local markets, which are known to have been flourishing. For example, an eleventh century inscription from the Sirūbhā area describes the market at Vājēpura thronged with sellers and purchasers assembling there from the surrounding places, and to give another instance, the market at Dubkund (Shivpuri District), the capital of the Kachhāpāghita Mahārājā Vikramasimha, has, more or less, the same description in another epigraph. Some other flourishing marts will be noticed below.

A glimpse of the market (āpana) of those days can be had from a statement in the Khajurāhō inscription of V. 1011, describing it as divided into lanes and shops of merchants. The articles of trade, as we find in an inscription of V. 1137 and from the Vāgada territory, consisted of corn, vegetables, candied sugar, jaggery, Indian madder, cotton and cotton thread (or cloth), coconut, salt, areca-nut, butter, sesame oil, and utensils in the shops of braziers, distillers and also cattle-fodder.

The record just referred to mentions all these articles in connection with tolls and sales tax imposed on them, some of which were local products whereas others were imported. It also records levying of taxes on some industries, such as of braziers, distillers of wine, gambling houses, oil-mills and water-wheels and also a cess on caravans of traders. But it is silent as to the way of collecting all these dues. We have, however, two records, one of which is from the Sirūbhā area and the other from the Gwālior District (from Gwālior itself), both of which use the term manḍrapīkā, also stating that a portion of the income from it was to be made in favour of the deity installed in a temple at each of the places. Manḍrapikā thus appears to be the place, a pavilion in the market, where sales and the other taxes were collected on articles before they were displayed for sale.

Commerce was generally in the hands of the Jaina community and the prominent people belonging to this community occupied respectable position. The Khajurāhō inscription of V.S. 1011 mentions one Pāṭilla of the Grahapati family as held in high esteem by the Chandella king Dhanagadēva. We have another record from Arthiṅgā, stating that

---

1. No. 87, v. 5.
2. No. 55, l. 32.
4. No. 22, l. 3.
8. No. 84, vv. 69 ff.
9. Respectively, No. 82, l. 38 and No. 155, v. 73.
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one Sahaja of that place, who built a temple there, commanded high respect in the palace. Instances can be multiplied; and here it is also interesting to note that a record from Dubkund (Shivpuri District) states that two brothers of the name of Rishi and Dāhāda were raised to the position of śṛṣṭhitā by the Kachchhapagātha king Vikramasimha. None of our inscriptions says anything about the work of these venerable persons, but they appear to have provided banking facilities as in some parts of the country even in modern days. They may also have regulated trade and industry.

The artisans and traders had their own guilds and corporations, to look after the general management of the whole affair and probably also for controlling the market. The Śērgadh inscription of 1017, 1018 and 1028 A.C. mentions a talilikarōja, which has been translated by Dr. A.S. Altekar as the chief of the guild of the oilmen. The fragmentary Mōḍī stone inscription of V.S. 1311 refers to the donation of one Arjuna who belonged to the family of Naigamas, and this term, according to Dr. Bloch, stands for corporation of guilds. In some of our records we have the term śṛṣṭhitā, as already seen above; and, as interpreted by Dr. D.C. Sirce, it stands for guild-presidents.

A number of guilds are mentioned by writers of legal works of our period or near about; but the very few references to them in our inscriptions may probably be taken to indicate their decline, perhaps because of their local nature or want of proper organisation of their activities. They appear to have been more common amongst the lower class of people (antyajas), as we know from Alberīfī, who mentions guilds of "fowlers, shoe-makers, jugglers, basket and shieldbirds, and weavers".

Traders are also known as moving in groups, as evidenced by the expression vanimandaikā, as already seen. It appears to have been due to the fear and oppression of robbers infesting the high-ways, as we also know from one of our inscriptions which says that Bhīllas, Sābasas and Purtandas were troublesome to the people and the state.

We have no epigraph to indicate foreign trade, though its existence in our age is known from some of the literary sources.

Concluding the account of the general economic life of the entire region in the period under review, we have to observe that the people following the different vocations

1 No. 86, v. 9. For the Bhillā region, see No. 93, 1.3.
3 Ep. Ind., Vol. XXIII, 138. Incidentally it may be noted here that there is nothing definite to show that the person who made these grants did so "not in his individual capacity but on behalf of the guild of the talil of which he might have been the chief representative," as suggested by Dr. Altekar. Attention may also be drawn to the attempt of some scholars to show the existence of the guild of oilmen at Hāṭhpurī from our No. 22, ll. 2–3, for which P.B.P., p. 306; but the expression used here is talilikāyānī patrajike, which means only that the person, who was a patrajika of the village, belonged to the caste of oilmen.
4 A.S.I., A.R., 1900–04, p. 104. For the inscription, see No. 55, I. 45.
5 Select Inscriptions, Vol. I, p. 284, n 6. It can not be known if the word saṅgha in jina-pati-jina-saṅghat Itilantāna varisūrya (No. 86, v. 3) and varga in jainavargā-dhunandhān (No. 119, v. 38) may also be taken in the sense of a guild. Still another similar example we have in puraprīṣṭa-jina-varga-dhunandhān in No. 159, v. 38. All these instances are doubtful. Here we may refer to Mēdhatithi (c. 900 A.C.), a commentator of the Manusmṛiti, who clearly distinguishes a guild (śṛṣṭi) from a saṅgha, by stating that the former of these consisted of people following common profession, such as tradesmen, artisans, money-lenders, and so forth; and the latter was a community of persons following the same pursuit, though belonging to different castes (jāt) and regions (dīrta). See his commentary on Manus, VIII, vv. 41 and 210. Also see A.I.K., p. 405.
6 Mēdhatithi on Manus, VIII, 41.
8 See No. 150, v. 22 (for Vindhyā), and S.M.K., p. 84 (for Mālwā), but the condition was more or less the same throughout the region. A picture of the life of these aboriginal tribes is given by Sompolna, a Kashmirian writer of the eleventh century, in his Kāshṭhantāghava, e.g., in XIII, p. 39 f.; XX, p. 62 f. Vanīś-manḍālakā, mentioned in No. 82, v. 72, is probably a traders' association.
9 T.M., p. 103; S.M.E., pp. 20 f.
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mentioned above enjoyed high material prosperity, though the level was bound to vary in some of its parts influencing it from the west as well as from the east. The village folk who were content with their limited wants of life, tried to make their villages beautiful by individually as well as jointly by their interest in excavating wells, planting gardens and erecting temples. The internal trade seems to have been as well prosperous and the traders and the craftsmen organised themselves not only by devising their own corporations but also by making pious endowments and voluntarily imposing tolls upon various articles of trade.\(^1\) The industrial development gradually resulted in a vigorous growth of towns and cities, and we have references to big towns like Ujjain, Dhār, Vidishā (Bhīṣṭā), Bhōjpur, Shērgadh, Mālīshmati, Chittōd, Candrāvati, Arthūnā, Bhinmāl, Kirāḍū, Jālōr, Mahōbā, Kālaṇjā, Gwālōr and Narwar, some of which were religious centres, others good points of defence, and some of commercial or religious importance. The cities like Ujjain and Dhār are described in the Sāmarānganasūtradhāra\(^2\) as centres of all activities and wealth. A glimpse of the flourishing condition of a city or town can be had from the writings of Padmagupta, who describes Ujjayinī as surrounded by a rampart and full of opulence, with splendid houses containing precious windows, wells, tanks and gardens on the banks of the Ṣiprā, and emulating the capital of Indra.\(^3\) In equally glorious terms he speaks of Dhār, the other capital of the Paramāras.\(^4\) Kālaṇjāra, one of the strongholds of the Chandellas, besides Mahōbā and Ajayagadh, was a flourishing town, as we know from some of the inscriptions from that place. Talapājaka (Talvādā) in the Vāgada territory, Vatapura in the Sirōhi area and Dubkund in Gwālōr region, are all described in our epigraphs as towns (puras) with flourishing marts and extensive commercial activities.\(^5\) Narwar, the capital of the Yajnapālas, is described as enjoying the prosperity of the capital of the heaven.\(^6\) It is true that the poetic description of all these places, along with those of some others occurring in our records, are mostly in general terms and contains exaggeration; but their former glory is attested by the relics to be seen even today above the ground and also excavated on some of the sites, along with those now housed in our museums.

Big towns had suburbs attached to them.\(^7\) There is also evidence to show that effective arrangements were made to guard city gates and their surroundings.\(^8\)

EXCHANGE AND CURRENCY

We may close this section by mentioning the types of money current in our period and the coins struck by the princes of the royal houses dealt with in this work.

The coin known as *drāmma* is often alluded to in our inscriptions, particularly from Mālwa and it neighbouring regions of Vāgada, Sirōhi and Bhinmāl. But from the inscriptions themselves we have no means to ascertain its metal and weight in our period. *Drāmma* is generally known as the Sānskritised form of the Greek *drachma*, the standard weight of which is 67.5 grains.

Citing instances from some of our inscriptions, we find that the Kālvan grant of the time of the Paramāra Bhōjadeva records the presentation of fourteen *drāmmas*, along with some other objects, to the illustrious Manī Suvarntadeva, by the Rāṇaka Amma,\(^9\)

---

1. As we know from No. 84, vv. 68 ff.
2. Ch. X, vv. 102 ff.
4. Ibid., vv. 90-91. Also see the beginning of S.M.K. and S.S., CH. XXX.
5. See No. 88, v. 4; No. 159, v. 19 and No. 62, v. 23 respectively. Cf. Mānasātra, Cha. IX-X: e.g., janāh parivritam kayaya-vikraya-kāribhij and bahu-karmakār-syuktaṁ nagaraṁ tad-udāhritam
7. No. 44, i. 28, where N.P. Chakravarti took the word *tula* in the sense of a suburb, and No. 45, i. 26.
8. Cf. No. 150, vv. 13, 16-17 and 22.
9. No. 16, i. 23; also see No. 95. The last line mentions the gift of one *drāmma*, by a king, per year.
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and the Mōdi fragmentary inscription dated V.S. 1314 = 1258 A.C. mentions the presentation of one dramma per month in favour of a temple at that place. These instances go to indicate that the dramma used in them must be of silver, or gold. For to give one copper dramma by a king in the first of these instances and by a wealthy person in the second appears to be funny. Naravarman is known to have granted two Purattha drammās daily from the custom houses at Chittor for the maintenance of two vidhīchāiyas. From Śridhara’s commentary on the Gomīṭhastra, we learn that one dramma was equal to five Rupees, and according to the Purattha-prakrandhasanīgraha, a Purattha dramma was equal to eight ordinary drammās. Thus dramma seems to have been a gold coin in these particular cases, though sometimes a copper or silver coin. Possibly, dramma—was a general term to denote any coin.

To consider instances from the areas adjoining Mālwā, the Girvaṇ stone inscription of the time of the Paramāra Pratāpasinha, dated V.S. 1344 (1285-86 A.C.), mentions the tax of ten drammās from each of the surrounding villages, for the naivēdyu of the deity installed in a temple at that place, and the Arthānā inscription of V.S. 1136, or 1080 A.C., records the tax of a dramma on a brazier’s shop, a gambling house, a group of merchants and ḍhau-ṭanū (?), per month, and a special tax of one dramma to be collected on Īchitra and Panīvrtaka. The Bhīmāl inscription of V.S. 1239 = 1183 A.C. mentions the offer of a dramma each, per year, by some persons to the Sun deity installed in a temple there. All these instances show that this term was more often used for silver and gold coins.

Rūpaka and Viṁśṭopaka are other denominations of coins mentioned in our inscriptions. The Arthānā inscription of V.S. 1136(1080 A.C.), which we have already referred to above, alludes to Rūpaka and Viṁśṭopaka. According to Vishnugupta, quoted in Hēmādri’s Vraukhaṭā, one rūpaka was equal to one seventeenth of a svanā. R.C. Agarwal has shown that the word rūpaka was in some cases identical with dramma, and also that rūpaka coins were in circulation in Rājasthān during the 10-11th centuries A.C. Similar may have been the case in the contemporary Mālwā region which adjoins to Rājasthān on one side, and on the other, to the region of the Yadavas where Hēmādri composed his work in the latter half of the thirteenth century A.C.

The coin denomination Viṁśṭopaka is mentioned in the Vidishā inscription of the Paramāra Trailōkiyavarman, dated V.S. 1216 = 1158-59 A.C., the Panatēhā inscription of Maṇḍalika of the Vāgada area, dated V.S. 1116 = 1059 A.C., and also in the Dubkund inscription of the Kachchhupaghāṭa Vikramasinha, which is dated V.S. 1145 or 1088 A.C. and which comes from the Gwālior region. As the word shows, it was equal in value to the twentieth part of a dramma; and as it is said to have been taxed on a bull load, it seems to have been a copper coin. According to D.R. Bhandarkar, it was a copper coin of the value of one-twentieth of a dramma.

1 No. 56, 1, 48.
4 op. cit., p. 13.
5 No. 82, 1, 38.
6 No. 84, vv. 73-78. Dramma was perhaps identical with Rūpaka see J.N.S.I., Vol. XIX, p. 117.
7 No. 93, 11, 8-10.
8 For Rūpaka, see J.N.S.I., Vol. XIX (1957), pp. 115 ff.; and for Viṁśṭopaka, No. 84, v. 76.
9 Ibid.
10 Ibid.
11 Respectively, No. 42, 1, 8; No. 83; and No. 154, 1, 56. Thakkura Phēru, who composed his first book in 1250 A.C., mentions 20 viṁśṭopakas = 1 dramma. See E.C.D., p. 319.
12 Camichael Lectures, p. 208. Also see C.I.I., Vol. IV, p. cxxix.
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Above we have referred to the coin denomination known as Vrishavinshāpaka. From the context it seems to have been a coin stamped with the effigy of a bull and perhaps the same as the vṛishabha coin of the Shērgaḍh (Kōt) inscription of V.S. 1075 or 1018 A.C.¹ It is interesting to note here that the Krishnarāja Rāpaka, which was stamped with the figure of a bull, was current in a wide territory including Mālwa and Rājasthān.²

These coins struck with the royal effigy were also current in our period in Mālwa and the surrounding area is shown by the Ambā inscription of the time of Naravarman, dated V.S. 1151 or 1094 A.C. It records the construction of a tank by a Brahmaṇa named Vikrama, at the expense of 2,500 tānkuas³ which were rājya-muḍrita. They appear to have been silver coins, and we also know that the word tānka or tānkuaka was then used in the general sense of money.⁴

The popular coins known as Gadhā (Gadāyana or Gadāyanaka), which were current over a wide area comprising Mālwa, Rājasthān and Gujarāt, along with some other adjoining parts such as Bundelkhand (Ind Ant., XXXVII, p. 182) appear to have been in circulation throughout the Paramāra kingdom in our period. They were mostly of copper and of silver-plated copper, though specimens of pure silver have also been known. One of this type which bears the legend Śrī-Ōṅkāra in two lines in the Nāgarī alphabet of the 11-12 centuries⁵ A.C., have been found in abundance in Mālwa; and it is not unlikely that some of the Paramāra kings, who held their sway around the region of Ōṅkāra-Māndhātā may have issued these specimens in honour of the deity to whom they were devoted. It is significant to note here that as many as five of the Paramāra grants known so far were issued from Māndhātā, ranging in dates from V.S. 1112 (1056 A.C.) to 1317 (1260 A.C.).⁶

COINS OF THE PARAMĀRA KINGS

Taking the case of the coins struck by the individual dynasties of rulers included in this work, we find that only two or three of the Paramāra rulers have so far struck coins.⁷ Some of the rulers belonging to this house do not appear to have realised the importance of striking money in their name, and its seems that the coinage of the neighbouring territories was probably current in their kingdom.

UDAYĀDITYA

A gold coin bearing the three-lined legend read by R.D. Banerji as Śrīmad-Udayādēva on its obverse and the representation of the four-armed seated Lākṣmī on the reverse, was described by R.D. Banerji in the J.A.S.B., Vol. XVI (1920), p. 84, ascribing it to the Paramāra Udayāditya. But according to V.V. Mīrashī, the type and the legend are like those of the coins of the Kalachuri Gāṅgēyādēva.⁸ On a solitary specimen illustrated in the J.A.S.B. by Banerji, the legend is worn and the name cannot be definitely read; and thus nothing can be proved or disproved. It is possible that Gāṅgēya’s gold tānkuas

¹ Ep. Ind., Vol. XXIII, pp. 139 ff. our No. 23.
² See C.I.I., Vol. IV, p. dxxixii; also see J.N.S.I., Vol. XIX, p. 120.
³ No. 30, v. 5.
⁴ The standard weight of a silver tānka was 172.8 grains. See Habibullah, Foundation of the Muslim Rule in India, E.C.D., p. 304. We also read about a hemasatrukka, see ibid, p. 305.
⁵ See J.N.S.I., Vol. XI, p. 38, where the type was first published.
⁶ Nos. 18, 49, 51, 57 and 60.
⁷ It is, however, curious that we have not so far succeeded in discovering any coin of the well known and powerful ruler Hādīyādēva.
were current also in the region of Māligā, and the type may also have been copied by Udayāditya, only in the change of the name, if it is attributed to him. Thus we have to admit that no definite evidence is available to decide the point. Mirashi himself has admitted that the legend on this coin is "somewhat crudely executed".1

In my search of old coins, I was lucky to notice a gold specimen of the same type as described above, in a necklace which is daily worshipped, in possession of a Shri Padamsingh Shyamsukhā, a coin-collector of Indore. The legend on the obverse is very distinct and I read it as Śrīmad-Udayādeva, in two lines. The third and the fourth aksharas cannot be read otherwise. It is possible to ascribe this coin to the Paramēra ruler Udayāditya. Pl. III, 1.

Jagaddēva is known to have been the next ruler to issue coins in his name. The Nagpur Museum contains three coins struck by him. They were all discovered in the Central Provinces and acquired for the coin cabinet of the Museum, in 1912. The discovery of these coins was first reported in the J. N.S.I., Vol. IX, p. 75, and they were described by V.P. Rode, the Curator of the Museum, in the Proceedings and Transactions of the All-India Oriental Conference, XIIIth Session, held at Nagpur, in 1946 (pp. 57 ff.) and then in the Centenary Volume of the Museum (1964), p. 152 and Pl. XXV, Nos. 15-17.

One of these coins is of pure gold and two of base gold. All the three coins are circular, of the diameter of 1.8 to 1.9 cm.; and the average weight is 3.69 grammes. The reverse is blank. The device on the obverse is described as below:

For punched areas; the one at the top has the Nāgarī legend Śrī Jagadēva; the two side areas show a symbol formed by curved lines and dots which appear to be a crude representation of the old Kannāḍa letter Śrī. The bottom area contains a symbol formed by a rectangular area over which rises a tower-like thing representing probably a temple.2

Though a powerful feudatory of the Western Chālukyas, as we know from the Dôngargaon and the Jainād inscriptions,3 Jagaddēva was placed in charge of Berar and the northern portion of the Nizām’s dominions by his overlord Vikramāditya VI. I agree with Rode that this prince enjoyed the privilege of issuing coins in his own name.4 Pl. III 2-4

Udayāditya’s son, Naravarman, is also known to have issued coins in his own name. The type has been described in the J. N. S. I., Vol. XXX. p. 208 and Pl. IV (3-4) by R.K. Sethi who published two coins, one in gold and the other in silver. Both the coins are round, and the gold coin (No. 3) shows the diameter .8" and weighs 5.6 grammes, whereas the silver coin (No. 4) has the diameter .7" and it weighs 3.0 grammes. The obverse of both these specimens bears the figure of Lakshmi, seated in padmāsana, and the reverse has the legend in two lines; (1) Śrīman-Nara; (2) vat(r)maddēva. The gold coin is in mint condition but the silver coin has both its sides blurred in the photograph, probably showing that it was for long in circulation. It is also clipped around the edge and thus it appears to have lost some of its weight. Pl. III 5, 6, 7.

---

1 Ibid. In the legend on photo-plate A, No. 4, of C.I.I., Vol. IV, the third and the fourth aksharas, which are partly off the flan, seem to be more like dada rather than -darga and thus the coin appears to have been struck by Udayādēva (Udyādityadēva) rather than Gāṅgeyadēva. Thus I am tempted to agree with Banerji in attributing this coin-type to the Paramēra Udayāditya.
2 I am thankful to Shri. Rode who kindly allowed me to examine the specimens and include them here.
3 Nos. 28-29.
4 Rode, op.cit. The find-spot of these coins is not recorded.
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COINS OF THE CHANDÉLLA KINGS

In the Chandélla dynasty, Kirtivarman is known to have been the first king to mint coins. His coins are in gold and circular in form. On the reverse they have the figure of Lakshmi, identified as Parvati by Cunningham, who published Chandélla coins, with illustrations in his Coins of Medieval India (1898), p. 79 and Plate VIII.1 The obverse has the legend in three lines. The type may be described as follows:-

A. Size in diameter: 18 cm. wt. - 63 grains.
   (base)

   obverse- Inside a circle of dots, the legend in Nāgari
   characters in three lines:

   Śrīmat-Ki-
   rttivarmana-
   ṭeva

Reverse-Inside a circle of dots, the figure of four-armed Lakshmi, nimbate, sitting cross-legged.

The coins of this ruler are of two denominations, viz., drammas and ardha-drammas, according to Cunningham, who has noted that the larger gold coins of this ruler generally weigh upwards of sixty grains, rising to sixty-three, and the smaller gold coins, the type of which is the same as described above, are of thirty-one grains, a half-dramma. Pl., 8. He also remarked that the type was copied from the money of Gāṅgēyadēva of Chēḍi.

As noted by Smith in the Ind. Ant., Vol. XXXVII, p. 148, the drammas of Kirtivarman are not very rare, but of his half drammas there are only three specimens - one in the Indian Museum, one in the British Museum and one in Hoey's cabinet. One unique half dramma of this ruler is referred to by Dr. A.S. Altekar in the J.N.S.I., Vol. IV, p. 33.

The Chandélla kingdom was some time in occupation of the Kalachuris, whose coins probably became extensively current in Bundelkhand. This explains that Kirtivarman's coins are exact copies of those of Gāṅgēya. The Lakshmi type was originally introduced by Gāṅgēyadēva and it became so popular in North India as to be adopted not only by the Chandéllas but also by the Gahadavālas of Kanauj, the Tūmaras of Delhi and even by the kings of distant Kashmir.2 This type appears to have been adopted by the Paramāras. Most of the Chandélla kings were Śaivas but the device of Lakshmi is generally found also on their copper-plate grants.

Sallakshanavarman

This ruler continued the type introduced by his father, Kirtivarman, but his coins appear to have been of slightly base gold. In his C.M.I., Cunningham described two gold coins of this ruler, one of the larger and the other of the smaller type (a quarter dramma), illustrating them both on Pl. VIII, Nos. 14-15. On both of them his name appears as Hullakshan, instead of Sallakshan. Five of his quarter drammas were Pl., 9-10 noticed by Smith.

---

Sallakshana is also known to have issued copper coins, on which the figure of Lakshmi is replaced by that of Hanuman under a canopy.\(^2\) According to Cunningham, it weighs 61 grains.\(^2\) The type is described as below:-

**AE** Size in diameter - 1.5 cm, Wt. - 61 grs.

**Obverse** - Śrīmātā-Ha-
llakshana-var-
mma-deva

**Reverse** - Hanumān under a canopy. \(\text{Pl.}, 10-12.\)

A copper coin is generally called a *pana*, the standard weight of which was 80 *raktikas* or 146 grains; but the coin described above weighs only 61 grains. Here it may be noted that the recorded copper coins of Gāṅgēyādēva, from which the above-mentioned type appears to have been imitated, do not weigh more than 60 grains and perhaps they were half *panas*.\(^3\) According to Cunningham, the coins of this king are rare.\(^4\)

### Jayavarman

Jayavarman’s coins, as also noted by Cunningham, are rare.\(^5\) They are all in copper, except one which is in silver, and is in the British Museum, and close imitations of the *drāmma* of his father, Sallakshana. Two varieties of them have so far been known.

(a) **AE** Size in diameter - 1.5 cm, Wt. - 60 grs.

**Obverse** - Śrīmāj-Ja-
yavarman-
deva

**Reverse** - Hanumān, as above. \(\text{Pl.} 13\)

(b) **AE** Published by A.S. Altekar, in *J.N.S.I.*, Vol. IV, p. 33, as described by him, the coin bears the legend beyond Śrīmājjayavarman-deva, on the *obv.*, and plate II, 19 and the figure of Hanumān, flying, on the *rev.* It is roughly round, with diameter 5". The coin is die-struck and weighs 30 grs. It is an *ardha-drāmma*. \(\text{Pl.}, 14\)

Jayavarman is known to have struck only copper-coins, but Cunningham recorded a unique silver specimen with the name of this ruler and coming from James Prinsep’s collection.\(^6\) According to Cunningham, the coin bears the figure of the goddess on one side and the legend giving the name of the king, in three lines, on the other. It is not illustrated.

In my numismatic search, I noticed a silver coin of the same type, in possession of a local coin-collector Shri. Padamsingh Shyāmasukhā, who found it at Vīḍīshā. The

---

1. The figure is that of Hanumān also according to Smith (*C.I.M.*, Vol. I, p. 25), A.S. Altekar (*J.N.S.I.*, Vol. IV p. 33), and V.V. Mirashi (*C.I.I.*, Vol. IV, p. clxxvii); but in *J.N.S.I.*, Vol. XXVIII, pp. 68 ff, M.G. Diksiti argues that the figure which shows no tail may be identified as of a warrior. But in a facing figure one cannot expect the tail to be depicted. For other details, see *Num. Notes and Monographs*, No. 12, p. 38, n. 2.
4. See *C.I.M.*, p. 79, No. 16.
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coin is roughly circular in shape, 11 mms in diameter, and weighs 33 grains. It is a half dramma.

The name of Jayavarman occurs once in the genealogical list of the Chandellas and is repeated twice in that of the Paramâra rulers of Mâlwa. And therefore the attribution of the coin remains uncertain. Its findspot too does not help us in this respect.

Pl. 15.

Prithvirâman: This ruler is known to have struck coins in copper only. The type is designed as below:-

AE. Size and diameter - 1.4 cm. wt. 41 grs.
O. - Legend with the name of Prithvirâmanadêva.
R. - Hanumân under a canopy.1

Pl. 16

Madanavarmân

This ruler struck gold coins, both of the larger and smaller size, and also copper coins. His gold coins show the same transition from base gold to silver gilt and silver that we notice between types 5 and 8 of Gângâyadêva.2

Pl. 17-19

Cunningham noticed 4 gold (one large and three small) and two copper coins of this king, in his A.S.I.R., Vol. II, p. 458, and 1 gold dramma, 3 gold quarter drammâs and a quarter copper dramma, in ibid., Vol. X, p. 26 and Plate. He described, with illustrations, all these types in his C.M.I., p. 79 and Pl. VIII, Nos. 19-21. In 1906, V. Smith described one base gold dramma of the king, in his C.C.I.M., p. 253. It was found at Khajurâhô, No silver coin of this ruler has so far been known, except those noticed below.

The type of gold and copper coins is respectively the same as described above. The British Museum has a copper coin of this ruler, which shows the figure of a four-armed seated goddess, and the legend on the other side, giving the name.3

In 1910, a find consisting of 48 silver coins of this ruler was received from Panwâr, a village in the Teoshtâr tehsil of the former Rêvâ State (now a district in Madhya Pradesh). The find consists of 8 large (c. 60 to 62.75 grains) and 40 small (c. 14.17 to 16.07 grains). According to R.D. Banerji, who noticed the find in J.A.S.B., 1914, Vol. X (N.S.), 1914, pp. 199 f., these coins are exact copies of the larger and smaller gold coins, with the name of the king on one side and the seated goddess on the other side. A doubtful silver quarter dramma is reported to have been in Hoey's collection.

Pl. 20.

Paramardin

For the long reign of Paramardin, we have only a solitary specimen, of base gold, weighing 61.4 grains. It is of the usual seated goddess type and is published by Hoernle in the J.A.S.B., 1889, Pt. I, p. 34 and Pl. XXVI. It is said to have been discovered at Khajurâhô. It is the same coin which is described in the C.C.I.M., Vol. I, p. 253. I have no means to ascertain whether it is the same as published in Numismatic Notes and Monographs, No. 12, p. 76 and Pl. X, 15, where the figure is said to be very crude.

2 Ibid.
3 N.S. Bose, Hist. of the Chandellas, p. 183.
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In his C.M.I. (p. 80), Cunningham says that he possessed four copper coins which appeared to bear the legend with the name of Paramardin; but neither he could read the legend nor are the specimens illustrated. Thus we have no means to decipher the legend.

Trailokyavarmen

This ruler continued the gold coins of the type with the figure of the goddess on the reverse, and also the copper coins of the usual Hanuman type. The figures on both these types is extremely rude. One of his copper coins was found in the Bandā District.1 In his I.M.C. Smith has described one gold coin of this ruler, on p. 253, Pl. 21

Recently, a gold coin of this ruler was published by S.K. Sullery, in J.N.S.I., Vol. XXXIV, pp. 262 f. and Pl. xiv, 4. He informs us that the coin was obtained by G.S. Yadav at Ajayagadh. The specimen is in base gold; it is round, showing a diameter 18.28 mm. and it weighs 4.053 gms. Its obverse has the three-lined legend in bold Nāgārī characters- (1) Śrīmat-Traś; (2) lōkya-vā; (3) r-modēva; and the reverse bears a crudely carved figure of the goddess Lakshmi, seated, with traces of loop above.

Viravarman

For Viravarman we have only two gold coins, one of which is described in the C.C.I.M., Vol. I, p. 254 and Pl. XXVI. It was found at Khajurāhō and is of the usual type as described above, pl. 22. The other coin of this ruler was found at Trīpuṛi and has been described by V.V. Mirashi, in the J.N.S.I., Vol. XVI, pp. 236 ff. and pl. The legend on it, as read by Mirashi, is Śrīmad-Viravarna-dhārādeva.2 The coin is .7" (1.78 cm.) in diameter and weighs 46 grains. PL 22-23.

COINS OF THE YAJVAPĀLA KINGS

The coins of the Yajpavālas of Narwar were first published by Cunningham in his C.M.I., pp. 92-93 and Pl. X, Nos. 4-10, calling the princess “Rajput kings of Narwar”, and following him, by V.A. Smith, in C.C.I.M., Vol. I, pp. 262 ff., under the heading “Dynasty of Narwar”. Some more coins were subsequently noticed by M.B. Garde and R.D. Banerji, respectively, in the Ind. Ant., Vol. XLVII (1918), pp. 241, and J.A.S.B., (N.S.), Vol. XVI (1920), pp. 79 ff. A few stray specimens were subsequently published in the J.N.S.I. Vols.

All these coins are in copper, or bullion, roughly circular in shape and of the diameter of about 1.5 cm., as Banerji has pointed out, and bear a representation of what has been described as the early Chālamāna horseman on the obverse and the three-lined legend on the reverse. Three of the kings belonging to this dynasty are known to have issued coins in their own names; they are; Chālaḍadēva, his grandson Āsalladēva, and the latter’s grandson Gopanapatiḍēva. Here we may give a general description of each of the type, of these coins:

---

1 C.C.I.M., Vol. I, p. 253 and Pl. xxvi, 9. Smith also says that Rodgers had earlier noticed a duplicate of the same (ibid., p. 253, n. 2), but it could not be traced.
2 The word dhārādeva, as bhūdeva, means a Bhārata and not the lord of the earth, for which dhāraṇipati is generally used. And hence the expression has been explained as ‘the king as a divinity on earth’.
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Chāhādādēva

(a) Obverse - Śrīmata- Chāhādādēva

Date 129x, (unit lost)

Reverse - Rude horseman, no legend.
C.M.I., p.93; pl X, 5. Pl. 24

(b) Obverse - Horseman; legend Śrī-Chāhādādēva

Reverse - Bull; legend Śrī-Sāmanasādēva N.C., 1908,
Pl. XXIII, 419-20.

(C) Obverse - Horseman; legend as above.

Reverse - Recumbent humped Bull; legend Astivari Śrī-Samasādādēva.
C.M.I., p. 92, pl. X, 4. Pl. 25-26

Cunningham read two types of legends on the reverse of these coins, as shown above. Both these types of coins also differ in that on second type the bull has a trefoil tassel on its collar but it is missing on the other type. H. de S. Shortt held that Chāhādā's coins with the name of sāmanā are his independent coins (after the death of Ittuṭmish) and those of the first type were issued by him as a tributary of the Sultan.1

Āsalladēva

obverse - Rude horseman, to right.

Reverse - Śrīnādā

salādēva

Date (S. 1330); another specimen, Ibid. 8

with S. 1312. Pl. 27-28

While publishing coins from the Lalitpur hoard in the J.N.S.I., C.R. Singhal showed that the dates on these coins are given in two different ways: (a) Sam followed by two numbers standing for ten and digit; thousand and hundred are omitted. (b) All four numbers given.2

Gaṇapatidēva

obverse - Rude horseman.

Reverse - Śrīmata


Coins of this dynasty are generally found in Narwar, which was its capital, and also in the surrounding region. A collection of 791 coins, found in (the former) Gwālīor State was sent by the Resident of Gwālīor to the Indian Museum for examination. Of

2 J.N.S.I., Vol. XXII, p. 193. On a coin published by him in ibid., C.R. Singhal read Āsallā in place of Āsallu as the name usually appears.
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these, 250 coins were found worthless for numismatic purposes, and on the remaining coins, R.D. Banerji, who examined the collection, found that "the design is that of the horse, caparisoned, with a small fish in front, and the whole design is enclosed in a pair of concentric circles, the space between which is filled with a number of zigzag lines". The design on the reverse, according to him, consists of two parallel squares, the intervening space being occupied by similar zigzag line.

Banerji has also illustrated the coin in Pl. XII, i. The dates read by Cunningham on the coins of Chāhāḍādeva are: V. years 129x, 1303, 1305, 1306 and 1311. In addition to these, the dates found by Banerji on those of the Gwālīor find, for this king, are: V. 1302, 1303, 1304, 1307, 1308, 1311, 1312 and 1316.

The coins of this royal house are very helpful in reconstructing its history, when we have no inscription of the time of Chāhāḍādeva, whose period can be ascertained only by his coins. His latest dated coin, as noted by Banerji, bears the date V.S. 1316 = 1259 A.C., and the earliest of the coins struck by him is dated V.S. 129x, on which the unit figure is lost. The same scholar also held, that taking this year, i.e., 129x to be latest possible 1299, Chāhāḍa's first known year is 1250 A.C., which also receives corroboration from the Muslim sources.

Cunningham has recorded two coins of Åšalla, dated V.S. 1327 and 1330; but from the Gwālīor find Banerji also noted for this ruler the dates (V.S.) 1315, 1318, 1319, 1322, 1333x and 134x. Thus we know that Chāhāḍa was succeeded by his grandson Åśalla in V.S. 1316, and this also shows that the former's son Nīrvarman predeceased him.

Cunningham has recorded one coin of Gamapati, dated V.S. 134+, as he read it. But the date on the the illustration given by him is illegible.

We have no coins that can be assigned to any other dynasty whose inscriptions have been included in this work.

We have no coin issued by a ruler of any other of the dynasties included here, perhaps with the singular exception of Virasimha of the Kachchhapaghāṭa dynasty of Nalapura, who is known to us from a copper-plate grant dated V.S. 1177 (1120 A.C.) and we propose to discuss the coin-types attributed to this king.

A gold coin found in the Gorakhpur District was published by V.A. Smith in his article entitled 'Numismatic Notes and Novelties', in the Journal of the Bengal Asiatic Society, Vol. LXVI (1897), p. 308, and Pl. The specimen shows, on the obverse, a two-lined legend in Nāgāri characters, read by Smith as (1) Śrīnāḍ-Vira (2) sīṁha Rāma, and, on the reverse, the figure of the seated Lakṣmi; and being unable to attribute it, he regarded the coin as a puzzle. Prof. V.V. Mirashi, who scrutinised the legend in it, held that its last letter is not ma but va,7 and taking the last two letters as rava, as derived from the Sanskrit rājan, meaning a king, he attributed the specimen to Virasimha of the Kachchhapaghāṭa dynasty of Nalapura, to whose time the palaeography of the legend belongs.

---

1. C.M.I., p. 90.
3. For details, see Banerji's article, referred to above, p. 83.
4. Ibid., Pl. XII, 9-14. The first of these years is perhaps a misprint for 1316, which is also the latest known date of Chāhāḍādeva, from his coins, as mentioned above.
5. C.M.I., p. 93, No. 10, Pl. X.
7. It is difficult to agree with Mirashi in his reading of this letter, which appears quite similar to ma, the second akṣara in the first line.
8. I.H.Q., Vol. XVIII (1942), p. 71. We have, however, no evidence to show that the title rava was used with the name of this king.
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Referring to another gold coin, which is smaller, .45" in diameter and weighing 13.8 grains and published in the same Journal, Mirashi is inclined to hold that this piece, which is a quarter-suvarns, was also struck by the same ruler. It is of a different type, showing the legendVirasinhadēva on its obverse, and the figure of horseman on the reverse.

This coin was found at Gwālīor, which supports its attribution to this ruler. And the provenance of the first of these coins does not go against the view held by Mirashi, since we know that gold coins travel long and are found even outside the territory in which they were current.

In his grant referred to above, Virasimha claims imperial titles, and it is possible that he may have struck both these types. Mirashi has also pointed out that in an earlier age several Gupta kings issued gold coins of different types; but in our age the figure of the seated Lakshmi was generally associated with gold coins and no specimen in this metal, with the figure of a warrior, has so far been known from any part of India. Thus Virasimha appears to have designed a new type, which was copied by Chalhāda on his coins in copper.

SOCIAL CONDITIONS

During the period under review, the Hindu society had become more or less stationary throughout India, and therefore the picture given in the following pages would not appear as altogether new. Nevertheless, it is desirable here to make a general resume of the social conditions prevalent in the region in our age, confining ourselves to the epigraphic records; and it is on very rare occasions that we have supplemented the description from the contemporary literary sources. For as I have often stated, the latter kind of work is so vast and of such a varied type as to form a subject of an altogether independent inquiry, and I shall not be justified in compressing it all in the limited space at my disposal.

The caste system is a social institution having a strong grip on the public mind, so far as to exert its influence even on the political and religious thoughts. The idea of the different castes is so deeply rooted in the Hindu society that it is current even to-day, more or less in the same form as in the days of its origin. In our age, as even in modern times, more stress was laid on jāti (birth) which makes heredity more predominant than varṇa which signifies culture, character and profession.

The conventional number of castes is four, namely, Brāhmaṇa, Kṣatriya, Vaiśya and Śūdra. Our period, however, is notable for showing a tendency to multiply the number of sub-castes. Al-Idrisi, who wrote in the beginning of the tenth century A.C., mentions the number of castes as seven, but Al-Birūnī, a writer of only a century later, states the number as sixteen.

Of all the four fundamental castes mentioned above, the social status of the Brāhmaṇas of our period was considered to be the highest in all the kingdoms under review, as in the other parts of the country. The Brāhmaṇa community commanded reverence of all the other castes, as it happens to have been in charge of temples, educational centres and religious institutions. It may also be recalled here that in our age attempts were being made to deduce civil and religious laws to a system, and most of the works dealing with them were written by the Brāhmaṇa proteges, as we have

---

1 Ibid., for 1936, Num. Suppl., No. XLVI, pp. 25 ff., and Pl.
3 See respectively, Editio, Vol. I, pp. 16-17, 76; and Suchau, Vol I, pp. 101 ff.
already seen above in the section dealing with literature. This high status of the Brahmanas, which was in vogue from the time when the Smritis came in force, entitled them to enjoy several kinds of privileges such as receiving money, cows, free gifts of land, food, housing, exemption from taxes, and so on. In the grants they are mentioned with the prefix Paññita, Bhattra, or with such honorific terms and with the suffix sami or svarnir.

In our period the Brahmanas were distinguished by the Vedas, śākhas and gōtras. The Gaotir grant of Vākapatrija, for example, is particularly interesting in this connection as it introduces each of the donees by mentioning his original place, name, father's name, Veda with śākha and gōtra with pravara. Thus we find that out of twenty six donees in all, who are mentioned in it as migrating from far and near places, four were Rigvedins eleven Yajurvedins and an equal number of them were Sāmavedins. We also find that the Rigvedins had each a separate gōtra, the Yajurvedins were all of different gōtras, except two of whom were of the same Bhārgava gōtra; and of the Sāmavedins, two were of the Vasishtha gōtra, two of Śāndilya; and the rest were all of the different gōtras.

This way of mentioning the Brahmanas can be noted also from the Chandella records and from those of the other dynasties, and this distinction continued down to the end of our period, though some of the details mentioned above are found lacking in some of the grants.

From about the middle of the twelfth century A.C., some of the Brahmanas were also known after their duties, for example, Śukla, Pāñkha, Paññita, Dikshita, Avasathin (a teacher), and so on, besides Dvivēda, Trivēda and Chatuvēda, all these terms being mentioned in a grant of 1225 A.C. and also in some others. Some of the still later Paramāra and Chandella grants mention the titles like Thakkura, Nāyaka and Rātra attached to Brahmanas' names. Some of these were later on known to have become surnames, along with Nāgara, Śrīmadhī, Dikshinātya etc., which terms also are mentioned in some of the later grants. Besides all these we also note that it was in our period that the sub-castes of the Brahmanas were also multiplying, as we can gather from the terms like Chaturjātakīya and Vaiḍhyakīya, attached to the names of some of the Brahmanas.

It may also be observed here that almost to the end of our period the family names were not stereotyped in the Brahmana families, since we find that in a number of our grants the donee, his father and his grandfather have the same distinctive designation. For example, in the very first of the Paramāra grants, the donee, Nīlā Dikshita is stated to have been the son of Lalla Upādhyāya; in another grant, Agniḥorin Madhava is mentioned as the son of Pañkha Hariśarma and the grandson of Dvivēda Vēda; and in still another, one of the donees, Dvivēdin Gōvardhana, is mentioned as the son of Paññita Vidyādhara and the grand-son of Chatuvēdin Bhūpatsarma.

---

1 Cf. similar attempts in the Deccan, of Vijnānēśa and Hēmāddri in the field.
2 Cf., for example, 'Vaiśnava' view referred to by Bhūja in the North and Hēmāddri in the Śrīvīra. See Vaitakhandha, p. 20. Paraśanāmatā vaidā vindā Vēda = taparābhināshyāvaiśīya brāhmaṇā jīvayā śrī-śrīnayakaha hētavah
4 No. 6, II, 14 ff. Since this grant mentions most of the donees to have migrated to Mālwa from far-off places like Raṅga, Uttarakula, Madhyadēśa, Śrīvīra, Kēśa, etc., it seems that the statement of Al-Biruni that a Brahmana "was obliged to dwell between the River Sind in the north and the River Charmanvati in the south." (Surāca, Vol. II, p. 134) was confined only to some regions of the country.
5 For example, see Nos. 63, 100, 107 and 157.
6 Nos. 51, 115 and 120.
7 See Nos. 1-2, and No. 40, 1, 12, respectively. In No. 36 we have the expression dvijayya Mādhava-śrihāsya. This person may have belonged to any of the first three castes.
8 No. 8, I, 7. Chaturjātakīya is explained by D.C. Sircar as belonging to the administrative board of four (Ep. Ind., Vol. XXXIII p. 104), whereas by P. Bhatia, as a member of the assembly of those well versed in astronomy (P.B.F., p. 239).
9 No. 57.
10 No. 60, II, 103-104.
INTRODUCTION

What has been stated here is also to be found in the Chandella grants. For example, one of them mentions the donee Sahujal as a Pandita, his father a Thakkura, his grandfather a Dvivēdin and his great-grandfather an Āvasathika. In another Chandella grant, the donee, Pandita Ananda, is stated to have been the son of Chatuvēda Narasimha. A Paramāra inscription from Sirōhi area mentions its writer as Vyāsa, who was the son of an Upādhyāya.

The daily routine of a Brāhmaṇa house-holder was to perform the Śmārtta sacrifice and to observe the other kinds of religious duties. He devoted himself to the study of the Vēdas, Vēdāṅgas and the other Sāstras, including literature and art. That some of the Brāhmaṇas were not only conversant with these branches of knowledge but also experts in expounding them in public assemblies is also known from some of our inscriptions. This sort of pious life made them entitled to be addressed as bhu-dēvas, as we know from a number of our records, and in one of them even a Vaiśya calls himself as bhu-dēva-bhaktā. A Brāhmaṇa was generally known to be impartial, as is evident from a royal charter dated V.S. 1192 (1135 A.C.), according to which the task of measuring land was entrusted to him (Brāhmaṇa-māpyatiya-bhu-hala-dvaya).

In this respect it is also of interest to know that some of the Brāhmaṇas were recipients of more grants than one. For example, Sarvānanda, who received only one of the shares in a Paramara grant, was also the donee of a village according to another grant; Viśvarūpa, who migrated from the south, was the donee of as many as three grants, one of which consisted of land and the other two of three villages; and Govinda, the spiritual preceptor (Purūhitā) of the Paramāra king Arjunavarma, was the sole recipient of all the three grants issued by him. From this account it is evident that the Brāhmaṇas of our period were indeed very rich, and it is also known from our records that some of them utilised their wealth in works of public interest, for example, in building temples, excavating ponds and undertaking some other works of the type.

The attitude of the society towards the Brāhmaṇa community, however, appears to have changed in our age. For whereas Medhātithi, who flourished most probably in the ninth century A.C., forbids not only corporal punishment but even a money-fine to be inflicted upon a guilty Brāhmaṇa, Vijñānśvara, who wrote in the reign of Vikramāditya VI (1076-1126 A.C.), was of the opinion that the privilege was applicable only to a learned Brāhmaṇa. This evidently shows that the conduct prescribed by the Śmārtas as to be followed by the Brāhmaṇas of the preceding age had become somewhat loose in our age. This also shows that some of the Brāhmaṇas resorted to some other types of avocations; and this may be dealt with here, in brief.

We have instances of Brāhmaṇas entering in royal service. They worked as Rājagurūṣ and priests (Purūhitas), who administered the affairs of religion and piety, and often drafted royal grants. They also picked up administrative and military service, high and low. To give a few instances out of the many, we know that Madana, the spiritual preceptor of the Paramāra Arjunavarma, drafted all the three of his grants; Vāsudēva

---

1 No. 119, 11, 16-17.
2 No. 126, 1, 20.
3 No. 63.
4 See Nos. 107, 108, 1, 17.
5 No. 50, v. 8.
6 No. 38, 1, 1.
7 Nos. 6 and 7.
8 Nos. 31, 39 and 40.
9 Nos. 47-49.
10 For example, see Nos. 30, 63 and 136.
12 On Yj., II, 4.
was the Rājaḍūru of the Chandella Kirtivaran. Gāṅgādēva was the Prahlāda (doorkeeper) of the Paramāra king Jayavarman II, Yaśōdharā was the Purūhitā of the Chandella king Dhaṅgū. Sangrāmarshiṅhā is mentioned as the Mahāprahlāda of Madanavarman; and we find priests attached to Madanavarman's queens also. Bilhaṇā was the Minister for War and Peace (śāntavigraha) under the Paramāra kings Vindhyāvarman, Arjunavarman, Dēvapāla and Jaitugī; he also drafted some grants. Anata was a Minister under the Chandella king Kirtivaran; Dēlhaṇā was a Minister under the Ābū Paramāra king Pratāpavasimha; and Vāmana was a Śāntavigraha under the Vaiśaṅga Paramāra king Vijayaṇāja. Some of the Brāhmaṇas also worked as royal messengers (dītakas) i.e., conveyors of royal messages (about sanctioning grants).

Ours was a warlike age and it must naturally have requisitioned the services of some of the Brāhmaṇas who liked that profession. We know well of the instance of the Brāhmaṇa general Gōpāla who brought victory to the Chandella king Kirtivaran, as the Prabhodhachandrādaya tells us. Madanapāla was another Brāhmaṇa general under the Chandella Madanavarman, and Vikrama under the Paramāra king Naravarman. All these are only a few of the numerous examples that we find in our inscriptions. Thus the statement of Manu who allows Brāhmaṇas to use weapons only when in distress, appears to have been modified in our age when we find a number of Brāhmaṇas picking up the military service of their own accord.

Some of the Brāhmaṇas also appear to have adopted the profession of agriculturists, as implied by the expression krīṣhāṭī karmavataṁ vṛt, which is repeatedly mentioned in our grants. But we have not even one instance in our epigraphs to show that a Brāhmaṇa had adopted the profession of the Vaiśyas, though we learn from the Śrīngārāmaṇājirikāṭa that a Brāhmaṇa of the name of Mādhava did good business in Sīmhalavipā. In two of the copper-plate grants we find the expression utkīraṇa = idānapain (Pañcita) vṛt. And since this title is here found attached to the name of an engraver, it may be concluded that some of the Brāhmaṇas may also have adopted this profession, unless we presume that the word is either loosely used in such cases or it is put only with the intention of showing the efficiency of the engraver.

The Kshatriyas were next to the Brāhmaṇas in the social scale. An inscription from Baḍḍī (Shivpuri District) mentions the Kshatriyas almost at par with the Brāhmaṇas, which shows that in some of the regions the conditions differed.

Our epigraphs do not throw much light on the social status of this caste, but we know that all the kings themselves were Kṣātṛiyas, as some others belonging to the contemporary ruling families. We have however, also to admit here that the mention of the word Kṣātṛiya occurs rather late in all our records, wherever it is found. It is also possible that some of the clans which were warlike by nature or which preferred the profession of arms were also incorporated in this caste.

1 Nos. 47–49; and No. 110, respectively.
2 See No. 37, and No. 114, v. 56, respectively.
3 No. 114, II. 2–3.
4 No. 129.
5 See Nos. 47–51; No. 125; No. 82, and No. 90, respectively.
6 No. 1, 1. 26; No. 2, 1. 28; and No. 38, 1. 13, which are only a few examples.
7 No. 129, 1. 19; and No. 30, respectively. Madanavarman received the gift on an eclipse, with the mention “for the benefit of the parents (of the donor) and one’s own self”.
8 S.M.K., p. 28. He may have done it through an agent, for which cf. Al-Beruni’s statement in Sathati, Vol. II, p. 132.
9 Nos. 48–49.
10 Cf. Kshērō vamade viva jayaḥ mahādeva-sthitam-śriḥ in No. 101 v. 10.
The Kshatriyas read and learnt the Veda but did not teach them. Their duty was to protect the other varnas and to die on the battle-field was considered to be the highest bliss. The Kshatriyas followed the Paurânic form of religion, as we know from the practice observed by the kings while making donations. The concluding verses of our grants are actually borrowed from the Smritis and the Purânas.

The members of this caste had no gôtra of their own, and generally they adopted the gôtra of their Purônâias, as enjoined by the Mitakshara2 and some other works. From our inscriptions we know of a solitary instance of the Kshatriya general Anayasimha whose gôtra, along with the provaras, is mentioned in a record.3 He appears to have had the status of a Minister and probably of the Chief Minister, as he is said to have been in charge of the (royal) seal.4 Another Minister belonging to the Kshatriya caste is mentioned in an inscription from the Shivpuri District, dated V.S. 1336 (1279 A.C.).5 These instances undoubtedly show that during our period the members of this caste not only took part in warfare but also occupied high posts in civil administration. Like the Brâhmanas, whose instances we have seen above, some of the members of the Kshatriya community of our period may also have followed the profession of agriculturists. This is shown not by any of our inscriptions but by some of the later Smriti writers like Gautama and Parâśara, the former of whom allows a member of the Kshatriya caste to cultivate land through an agent, and the latter observes that a Kshatriya engaged in agriculture should worship Brâhmanas and gods, probably by way of an expiation.6 Thus it is possible to conclude that some of the Kshatriyas, though in rare cases, followed some other professions in our period.

The Vaiśyas, who constituted an important class of the society in our age, enjoyed a high status in the society in our age. We have instances to show that they were honoured by the royal families. Thus, Pahiila, who presented gardens to a temple of Jinanâtha at Khajurâhâ, was "an object of honour of the Chandella king Dhaqâga"; another Vaiśya, Sahaja, who constructed a Jain temple at Aharî in the reign of Châmuñjârâja of the Vâgaḍa royal court (mânyod râja-grihâ); and a record from the Gwalior region tells us that two brothers belonging to this caste, viz., Rishi and Dâhaqâja, were endowed by the Kachchhapagîta king Vikramasimha with the title of śrêshthi.7

The Smritis prescribe agriculture, cattle-rearing and trade to be followed by the members of the Vaiśya community; but in our age these people appear to have been devoted mainly to the last of these professions. They had their own associations.8 The Vaiśyas in our time were known generally by their family-names, such as Grahapati (modern Gahoi) and Dharkuta (modern Dhâka), but occasionally even after the place of their origin, as we know from the expression Nagaruvanik which appears in one of our records.9 They contributed liberally to charitable institutions, built temples and consecrated images, of which we have a number of instances in our records.10

1. See No. 33, v. 25; and No. 83, v. 29.
2. On Yajû, I, 53.
3. No. 60, 11. 125 ff.
4. Ibid. v. 56.
5. No. 101, v. 22.
6. Gautama, X; and Pûrû, Smriti, II, 18. Also compare the statement of Al-Bûrûni, viz., that to quit the duties and works of one’s own caste and adopt those of another caste is a sin (Sachau, Vol. I, p. 103).
7. See No. 99, v. 1; No. 86, v. 8; and No. 154, v. 24, respectively.
8. See No. 84, v. 77; and No. 154, v. 34.
9. See No. 133, v. 1; No. 92, 1, 8; and No. 90, v. 5, respectively.
10. Some of these examples are to be found in Nos. 17, 20, 35, 90, 92, 109, 123, 127, 133 and 159, which are from our region.
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The Vaiśyas were generally Jainas; but some of them followed the Brāhmaṇic form of religion, as we know from the instance of Kāśāva, who was a Vaiśya and who constructed a Śiva temple, and also from that of as many as five members of the Dharkuṭa family who were zealously devoted to the Sun.¹

The Śūdras stood at the other end of the social scale. In the earlier times they were required to wash the feet of the Brāhmaṇas and other guests and thus they were not considered as untouchables; but the increasing narrow attitude of the society branded these people with the stigma of untouchability.²

The lowest of the Śūdras were anyayás, among whom the Mēdas and the Bhillas were also included. Most of them lived in the forest. It is interesting to note that in some of the Chandella grants the Mēdas and the Chāṇḍālas are mentioned among those before whom the royal grants were pronounced.³ We have a singular epigraphic instance from the Sīrōhi region to show that in some tracts at least, slavery was forced on the Chāṇḍālas, who were not only captured but were also beaten like dogs and asses.⁴

There was another category of the Śūdras living in the forest. They were troublesome to the townsfolk and the travellers, whom they plundered and also to the traders by looting their caravans. These foresters are also mentioned in our inscriptions; they had to be subdued and brought under control.⁵

Reverting to the case of the anyayás, we find that the outlook of the society was not always uniform towards them. This is evident from the statement of Al-Bërhūnī, who states that they were not included even among the Śūdras but occupied a still lower level and were only members of a certain craft or profession. According to him, they were the fuller, shoemaker, juggler, the basket and shield maker, the sailor, fisherman, the hunter of wild animals and of birds, and the weaver. Besides these, he also mentions some other people who were not reckoned amongst any guild but were considered as one sole class.⁶ Al-Bërhūnī's statement deserves some credence as he was a contemporary writer, though the classes of the different kinds of the people mentioned by him are found to be occasionally overlapping.

The Śrīṅgārakathāmāñjari, which is another contemporary work, mentions fortune-tellers (ākunika), magicians (indrajañāka), those who followed mesmerism (mohana-vidyā), and besides these, oilmen (tālika) medicine-men (vaiṣaya), weaver (tāmuvidyā), keepers of gambling and slaughter houses, barber and hunter.⁷ Some of these terms are occasionally found in our inscriptions also, but the list from both the above-mentioned works, which is of course not exhaustive, gives at least an idea of the different sorts of professions followed in our period, almost throughout the region under study.

Our inscriptions have occasional references to workers in metal, stones, precious stones and also to artisans, engineers and to those who sold articles of daily use, as we have already seen while dealing with the economical conditions of the time. These professions may have been responsible for forming separate castes which multiplied in our age, already remarked above.

The term Kāyastha, which according to the earlier Smṛritis, inscriptions and general literature, signifies a royal office and as such designated a professional group, came to denote a caste some time in the latter half of the ninth century which is almost the

¹ No. 50, v, 10; and No. 92, 11, 11-12, respectively.
² For details, see A.I.K., p. 370 ff.; and S.E., pp. 475.
³ For example, see No. 119, I, 9, and No. 125, I, 9. Also see No. 141, (II), 1, 8.
⁴ No. 71, 1, 10.
⁵ No. 150, v, 22.
⁷ S.M.K., p. 84.
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dawn of our period. The members of this group were entitled to the ceremony of initiation and thence to all the privileges of a twice-born man.\footnote{1} The Môdi inscription of V.S. 1314 (1258 A.C.) prefixes the title Paññita to the name of Arjuna, who was a Kâyastha; and this shows that the members of this caste probably came to be reckoned as Brâhmaṇas in an age when even foreign tribes like the Śakas, the Gûjaras and the Hûpas were completely absorbed in the Hindu society, which also indicates that the caste-system had not then become very rigid.

The earliest known epigraphic reference to this caste, as far as known to me, occurs in an inscription from Valabhi, dated 871 A.C.\footnote{2} Towards the beginning of our period, the members of this caste rose into eminence, and they are also known to have occupied important administrative and military posts in its different tracts. As regards their origin, the undated Ajjyagadh stone inscription of the time of Bhûjavarman states that the Vâstavya clan of this caste derived its name from Vâstu, who resided at Takkârikh and a group of thirty-six towns which were "purified by the fact that men of the writer caste dwell in them"\footnote{3} The same record also tells us that the members of this caste held positions of importance under the Chandella kings Gaṇḍa, Kiritvarman, Paramardin, Trailokyavarman and Bhûjavarman.\footnote{4}

Another version is recorded in an inscription from the same place and dated V.S. 1345. It traces the descent of the Kâyasthas from the sage Kâśyapa, the son of fire (Jâtavâdesa), through his son Kuśa.\footnote{5} The same epigraph further tells us that Hârûka, who was born in the same Vâstavya clan, was a politician; his son Jhâla, a pious man; and the latter's descendant, Nâna, was a Minister under Bhûjavarman, by whom he was honoured. A still other inscription from the same place informs us that Jâjûka, who knew all the arts, Purânas, and the Dharmashastras and literature, helped the Chandella king Gaṇḍa, and his descendant Mahâsvara was of great help to Kiritvarman in his distress and established him as the sovereign lord of his kingdom.\footnote{6} Still another origin of the Kâyasthas is suggested by the expression kâyastha-âkhila-vidyâ, which occurs in another Chandella inscription of 1171 A.C., signifying that Prithividhara, for whom it is used, had mastered all the branches of Knowledge.\footnote{7} A Paramâra inscription of 1258 A.C. uses the expression kâyastha-vrâchas-cha-tirnâyâ, meaning that the person for whom it is used had his body firm,\footnote{8} that is, free from passion.

Whatever may have been the truth, we find that the members of this community were proficient in all the arts and sciences. We have also a number of records composed by them, besides the fact that they occupied high civil and military service in the government of the kingdoms of our time. We also have a number of records composed

\footnote{1} A.I.K., p. 372. The question has been discussed by P.V. Kane in his H.D. (Vol. II, Pt. I, pp. 75-77); and giving evidences from works including those of our period, viz., the Mûlâkṣhara (1070-1100 A.C.), Aparârâka's coll. on the Yajû Samantha (c. 1125 A.C.) and the Samriti-chandrika (1200-1255 A.C.), he concluded that the Kâyasthas who were originally royal officers had come to form a caste in medieval times. He also refers to Bhraspati (quoted in the Samriti-chandrika), according to whom these people, viz., the gandhakas and the bôhâkâs who formed the Kâyastha caste, were dvijas.


\footnote{3} No. 150, vv. 2-4. There is difference of opinion as regards the identification of this place. According to V.V. Mirashi, it is probably identical with the homonymous village in the Garh District in Bihar and was known as the home of the Brâhmaṇas. See C.I.I., Vol. IV, p. clvi. It is interesting to note in this connection that whereas only three Brâhmaṇas from this place migrated to the Chandella kingdom (Nos. 100, 107 and 118), as many as fourteen came to the Paramâra kingdom (Nos. 51, 57 and 60), and also that of the last mentioned, three were Bîgyâdins, five Yajurvedâns and two Sâmavedâns.

\footnote{4} Ibid.

\footnote{5} No. 149 of V.S. 1345. Also see No. 112, which is earlier.

\footnote{6} No. 112.

\footnote{7} No. 129, v. 6.

\footnote{8} No. 56, 1, 9.
by them. Some also earned their living by writing the prākṣasti on stone and still some others by engraving them.1

That the Kāyasthas held important posts not only under the Chandellas but also under the other ruling dynasties of the time is evident from references to them in our epigraphs, e.g. Bhuvanapāla was the Treasury Officer under the Kachchapagahāta king Mahiyāla;2 Vāmana was a Minister of Peace and War under the Paramāra king Chāmundaśāja of Vāgadā;3 Lōhaja was a Treasury Officer under the Yajvapāla king Gaṇapatiśāva;4 and Ruvrādītya and Ajayadēva were Ministers under the Paramāra kings Vākpatirāja and Jayavarman II, respectively.5

The Kāyasthas were employed in royal service, not only as scribes and writers of state documents and public accounts officers, but they also distinguished themselves as military leaders, examples of which are numerous in our records.

Like the members of some other castes of the time, the Kāyasthas were also often known after their original place, e.g., Māthura (from Mathurā) and Valabhya (from Valabhi).6 Those whose forefathers were originally residing at Takkārikā (also spelt as Takkārikā) bore the surname Śrīvāstava; and we have also the mention of the word Nigama,7 after which the Nigama clan was known. As the dictionary meaning shows, these people (the Nigamas) were either experts in expounding the sacred lore, or were efficient tradesmen. If the latter of these meaning is accepted here, it also appears that some of the members of this community were earning their livelihood by trade.

The high social status of the Kāyasthas in our period is known from the fact that in some of the Chandella grants they are included among those before whom the royal grants were announced.8

All the cases mentioned here were devoted to the duties of their respective office; and besides this, we have instances to show that they all led corporate life in the interest of the whole population of the place they lived in. An inscription from the Śrīhōli region informs us that the Brāhmaṇas of a place voluntarily contributed for excavating a stepped well at the village of Bhārūṇi;9 and we have also an instance to show when some of the townsman who were in charge of the management of a temple even collected self-imposed taxes.10

Joint-family system was generally in vogue in our age. In some of the records we observe that when an individual built a temple, the names of all his brothers, their wives and their sons are mentioned in the inscription recording it.11 But there may have been cases when the members of some families had their separate establishments. This inference may probably be drawn from the fact that out of the two Harsolā grants of Śtyaka, one was issued in favour of the Upādhyāya Lalla and the other in favour of his son Nīnā.12

---

1 See No. 110, l. 17; No. 15, l. 26-26; No. 90, l. 29 (he was also a Minister of Peace and War); Nos. 114; 136 160 and 175.
2 No. 156, v. 12.
3 No. 90.
4 No. 179, v. 27.
5 The former of these is known from the P.C.M. and the latter from No. 56. Lipikṣit and Kanākika are some other words which are perhaps synonymous of Kāyastha. See No. 175 v. 26, etc.
6 Respectively mentioned in No. 158 and No. 175, v. 27.
7 No. 56, l. 45.
8 For example, in No. 118, l. 6; No. 119, l. 9; and No. 126, l. 9.
9 No. 63.
10 No. 84, v. 68.
11 For example, in No. 159.
12 Nos. 1 and 2.
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The Bhārūṇḍ inscription, which is referred to above, informs us that while building a stepped well at that place some persons and their sons had made separate contributions.¹

A man generally married a woman of his own caste, though examples of marrying girls of other castes were not unknown. The Tilakamāṇ japari tells us of the marriage of a boy of the merchant community with the daughter of a sailor.² But such cases were exceptional and did not represent the general practice of the age, at least in the Brahmanical community, as it seems from the statement of Albērūnī, viz., that in his time the Brāhmaṇas did not avail themselves of this liberty and were invariably marrying women of their caste only.³

Every person had ordinarily one wife. No direct evidence is available to show that polygamy was an accepted practice in the general public in our age. We have no doubt some instances of kings who had more than one wife; for example, Sūndhūrāja married Śāśiprabha when he was perhaps already the father of Bhūja; Udayādiya who, according to the Rasamalla, had two queens, one of the Chaullikya clan and the other of the Vaghellā clan; and of his descendent Arjunavaran-man who married a Chaullikya princess as well as a Kuntala princess. From the Vindhyā region we have the example of the Chandella king Madanavarman who had not less than three queens, one of whom was the Mahishih or Mahādevī (chief queen).⁴ From the Tilakamāṇiapari we also know that some of the feudatory chiefs married more than one girl.⁵ But all these instances are not necessarily significant, for we do not necessarily indicate that it was an accepted practice among the general public.

A Paramārā inscription from the Vāgdā region informs us that Bhūshana, a devout Jaina, had two wives, viz., Lakshmi and Śīlā, the latter of whom is stated in it to have had a number of sons,⁶ but as no son of the former of them is mentioned, it may probably be concluded that this person married the second wife because the first was infertile. To give here one more example from an inscription from Sesa (Shivpuri District), we learn that Jaitrasinha, who was an officer under the Yajnapāla king Gopala, also had two wives;⁷ but besides the fact that this record belongs to a later period (1284 A.C.), the details are not recorded; and therefore it does not help us to arrive at any conclusion on the point.

Albērūnī, who visited India in 1030 A.C., observed in a general way that “Some Hindus think that the number of wives depends upon the caste; that, accordingly, a Brahman may take four, a Kshatriya three, a Vaiśya two wives, and a Sudra one.”⁸ These remarks, though pertaining to a time earlier than that of the record referred to above, appear to belong to some particular region and we do not know whether they were equally applicable in case of Malwa and Bundelkhand.

From stray references in the contemporary literature we know that in our time the women were well dressed and they bedecked their body with ornaments and flowers. An inscription from the Vaghā region, dated V.S. 1344 (1285-86 A.C.), describes the town of Arthūnā and its precincts as resonant with the jingling sound of the ornaments of

---

¹ No. 63,
² See T.M. (Rind edn.), p. 129.
⁴ See No. 119.
⁶ p. 177, viz., that the Śirōhi king Dhāṛavandha had two wives - Gījādevī and Śrīgādeśī; but this is due to the mis-reading of the first of the names, for which see our comments in the political history of the house.
⁷ No. 90, vs. 20-21. Also see No. 125, v. 34.
women residing there. These ornaments were mostly, as we learn from the Śrīgāmūtajārīkāla, and the Tilakāmiiṣapā, the varied kinds of ear-rings (sūkas, danta-pāra, kunḍala and karnapaṭa), armlet (kṣīyā), neck-garland, anklet nīpura, finger-ring, and so on.²

The rite of satī was no doubt in vogue; but from the whole lot we have only four examples, two of which are from Ajayagadh (Vindhya region), and the remaining two from the Shivpuri region,² probably showing that this custom was not only becoming extinct but was also confined to some of the tracts. The less occurrence of this rite seems to be probably due to its condemnation by some authorities who flourished in about our period.⁴ It was for the widow to exercise her option in the matter of self-immolation. Those who did not undergo this custom led the life of strict celibacy, some of them also looking after the property of their deceased husband and utilising it for public affairs; whereas some of them also worked as regents in the administration of their sons who were on the throne.⁵

The age-old custom of appointing maidsens for service in temples continued to exist in our period, as shown by a Kachchhaphātā inscription dated V.S. 1150 (1092 A.C.).⁶ This statement is supported by the Śrīgāmūtajārīkāla, which is attributed to Bhojiadeva.⁷ This work tells us that the courtesan should know the local dialect: she should be civilised in talks, distinguished in arts, alert in eloquence, expert in dancing, moderate in drinking, away from vices and great in sacrifice.⁸ She held high position in the royal court. In his Saravatikāshaṭikāraṇa Bhoja tells us that a courtesan should be conversant with all the sixty-four arts.⁹ Her office in the royal court is highly spoken of also in the Tilakāmiiṣapā.¹⁰ It thus appears that it is not only due to her charm but also due to her accomplishment that she came to occupy a responsible position in the society of those days.

These respectable members of the society were of course distinguished from the Vēṣyā or common women, comparable to the hetaera of Pericles’ Athens, or the geisha in Japan. They were taught singing, dancing and general etiquette. With their considerable talent and accomplishment, they were not only admitted to the royal court but also played an eminent role in the cultural society.

We now close this Section by giving an account of the festivals and means of amusement, besides those which have already been mentioned above in the Section on Religion and which were current in our time. Our epigraphs mention the Akṣaya-trīṣṭi, which fell on the third day of the bright half of Vaiśākha,¹¹ the Dēvaśayani and the Devatāḥā śrādadāśī falling respectively in the bright half of Āśādha and Kārtika,¹² and the Vaṣanta-ṛaṣṭram, the fifth day of the bright half of Māgha.¹³ Of these, the first and the third are known as the Yugādi tithis, the first day of the Trīṭa and the Dvāpara

---

1 No 82, v. 53.
3 Nos. 152-53 and Nos. 156-62, respectively.
4 See Aparāśikā (c. 1187 A.C.) on Yāj., 1, 87; and Mādhavīti on Manu, V, 156. According to P.V. Kane, Mādhavāṭiti most probably flourished between 825 and 900 A.C. (H.D., Vol. I, p. 225).
5 Vide Nos. 62 and 82, respectively.
6 No. 155, v. 74.
7 S.M.K., 8th Tale.
8 Ibid., p. 12.
9 S.K.B., p. 494. According to the Vaśiyani, a lexical work of about the 11-12th century, the gamiṣi (courtesan) is a king’s favourite (not married to him), versed in different fine arts. See S.E., p. 479.
10 Cf. Vaṇa-vaniṭhī-śrāvatikāla and -śriṭa-śravatikāla, on pp. 65 and 53, respectively.
11 Nos. 70, 90 and 114.
12 No. 158 and No. 68, respectively.
13 Nos. II and 124.
It is interesting to note that these festivals were also observed by the Jain community which consecrated images of the Tirthankaras on these auspicious occasions. The Vasanta-pañchamī, which is a sacred day associated with the goddess of Learning, appears to have been celebrated with great pomp and joy throughout the kingdom of the Paramāras, who were devoted to her. The Pārijitamānjarī, as we know, was staged for the first time at a spring festival, in the temple of the goddess of Learning, at Dhar; and Bhōja issued his Bānśwadā grant on the same day, which probably shows the recognition of his victory over Kōṅkāna, as already recorded in his Bēṭīnā grant, probably issued earlier.

Besides the Ėkādaśī, particularly the Devatāhārī and the Devasayami, our records also mention some other festivals like the Mahāvaśākhi (the full-moon of Vaiśākha), as a parva, the Rathasaptami, the seventh day of the bright half of Vaiśākha, and Dipātisava, i.e., the Dipāvali.

Another festival known as Damanaka parva is referred to in the Shērgadā inscription of Udāyaditya. It was celebrated on the fourteenth of the bright half of Chaitra when a branch of the Damana tree was offered to Śiva or Vishnu, with a prayer to him and to Madana for bestowing happiness and felicity on the whole household.

Here we may also briefly enumerate some of the festivals mentioned in the contemporary literature. Anangātisava, or Madana-trayādasi, is mentioned in the Tilaka-mānjarī, as celebrated on a grand scale by all the females of a town and particularly by the virgins. It is interesting to note here that the Paramāra king Trailokya Varman built a temple of Chandrabandhu (Madana) on the bank of the Vētravati (Betwā) at Vidishā. This festival is also referred to by Bhōja in his Śringārarāmakāśa, according to which, on this day the ladies of a place bathe, and bejewelled with fine saffron coloured dress, they worship the god of Love.

A large number of love festivals and their aspects are mentioned by Bhōja in his Śringārarāmakāśa Chapter XXIII. The division in which they are described is season-wise; for example, ten to be celebrated in the spring season; three in summer; six in the rainy days and as many as seventeen in the autumn.

It may also be remarked that besides all those mentioned here, poetic assemblies and staging dramas were some other means of popular amusement and pastime. Munīja and Bhōja are well known for their poetic conferences. We have instances of the Pārijitamānjarī and the Prabhodhachandrodāya which were staged to commemorate the victory of the Paramāra Arjunavarmā and the Chandella Kirtivarman, respectively; and the dramas written by Vatsarāja, a protege of the Chandella king Paramādin and also the Pārijhapaśramayāyīyoga composed by Dharavarsa's younger brother, Prahlādana, are the other instances of the type. According to the Samaṁganaśimṣṭithātra (Ch. XV, 18), the royal palace contained a separate chamber for singing, dancing and such other types of means of amusements.

We have also occasional references in our inscriptions and the contemporary literary works, to some other means of popular amusements, for example, playing with balls.

1 Nos. 90 and 124.
2 Respectively see Nos. 82, v. 38; 158; 46; 132.
3 No. 84, 1. 48. Also see P.C.M., p. 46.
4 Smttis-Kaustubha, pp. 19 ff., as noted by A.S. Altekar in Ep. Ind., Vol. XXIII, p. 134. It is our No. 23.
5 T.M., pp. 68, 243-44.
6 No. 42, v. 7.
7 S.P. Vol. IV, p. 853.
8 Ibid., pp. 649 ff.
Sociocultural conditions (kandukā-kriḍā), dancing, singing, excursions to gardens, gambling, hunting, wrestling, witnessing dramatic performances etc., showing thereby that they were current throughout our period in this region as also in the other parts of the country.

1 No. 136, v. 17. Also see No. 135, v. 74.
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GENEALOGICAL TABLES

All the dates given below are in the Christian era. Approximate reign-periods are given in brackets and the known dates under the respective names of the kings. Bearing in mind the maxim "History without dates is a grand-mother's tale", I have tried to give dates in all cases; and where no help is available, I have allowed the usual average of 20 to 25 years to each reign, with a fair margin for errors. In a few cases, the dates are highly speculative.

The names of those who did not come to the throne are given in italics.

I. PARAMĀRAS OF MĀLWA (c. 850? - 1310)

Paramāra

Upendra

Bappairāja (Vākpatirāja) alias Krishnarāja (895-920)
Vairisimha (920-945)

Siyaka (Siyāka, Siya) alias Harsha (Harshasimha?) (945-73)
--- Vadajādevī (Vajrā?)
949, 969

--- Vākpati II alias Utpalarāja,
Muṇja, Amōghavarsha, Prithvi-
vallabha, Śrivallabha
Mṛṇālavati (974-95)
975, 979, 982, 986

--- Sindharāja alias
Navasāhasānaka, or
Kumāranārāyaṇa
(995-1000)

--- Bhōjadēva (1000-1055)
1011, 1018, 1020, 1021,
1022, 1034-35, 1046

--- Udayāditya (1070-93)
1080, 1081, 1082

--- Jayasimha
Naravarman
1055-56; 1059 (1093-1134)

--- Lakshmadēva
Jagaddēva¹
(1112)

--- Śyāmaladēvi
Kalachuri

--- = Mōmaladēvi
1094, 1101, 1104-05, 1110, 1134

--- Gayākaraṇa
(1151)

¹ Did not ascend the throne in Mālwa.
GENEALOGY

Yaśōvarman (1134-42?)
1135

    | Jayavarman (1142-43)
    | 1134
    |    | Lakshmivarman (1143-55)
    |    | 1144
    |    | Trailōkṣyavarman (1158-59)
    |    |    | 1157, 1178-79, 1186
    |    | Vindhyavarmā (1187-94)
    |    | Hariśchandra (1155-86)
    |    |    | 1157, 1178-79, 1186
    |    | Subhaṭavarman (1194-1209)
    |    |    | 1215, 1218, 1225,
    |    |    | 1229, 1232
    |    | Arjunavarman (1210-15)
    |    |    | 1186?-1215
    |    |    | Dévapāla (1215-35)
    |    |    |    | 1215, 1218, 1225,
    |    |    |    | 1229, 1232
    |    |    |    | 1186?-1215
    |    |    |    | Dévapāla (1215-35)
    |    |    |    |    | 1215, 1218, 1225,
    |    |    |    |    | 1229, 1232
    |    |    |    |    | 1186?-1215
    |    |    |    |    | Dévapāla (1215-35)
    |    |    |    |    |    | 1215, 1218, 1225,
    |    |    |    |    |    | 1229, 1232
    |    |    |    |    |    | 1186?-1215
    |    |    |    |    |    | Dévapāla (1215-35)
    |    |    |    |    |    |    | 1215, 1218, 1225,
    |    |    |    |    |    |    | 1229, 1232
    |    |    |    |    |    |    | 1186?-1215
    |    |    |    |    |    |    | Dévapāla (1215-35)
    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    | 1215, 1218, 1225,
    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    | 1229, 1232
    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    | 1186?-1215
    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    | Dévapāla (1215-35)
    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    | 1215, 1218, 1225,
    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    | 1229, 1232
    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    | 1186?-1215
    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    | Dévapāla (1215-35)
    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    | 1215, 1218, 1225,
    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    | 1229, 1232
    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    | 1186?-1215
    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    | Dévapāla (1215-35)
    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    | 1215, 1218, 1225,
    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    | 1229, 1232
    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    | 1186?-1215
    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    | Dévapāla (1215-35)
    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    | 1215, 1218, 1225,
    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    | 1229, 1232
    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    | 1186?-1215
    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    | Dévapāla (1215-35)
    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    | 1215, 1218, 1225,
    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    | 1229, 1232
    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    | 1186?-1215
    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    | Dévapāla (1215-35)
    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    | 1215, 1218, 1225,
    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    | 1229, 1232
    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    | 1186?-1215
    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    | Dévapāla (1215-35)
    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    | 1215, 1218, 1225,
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II. PARAMĀRAS OF ĀBU
(c. 900-1300)

Paramāra

Utpalaraśja (910-30)
Aranyaraśja (930-50)
Krishnarāśja (1050-70)
Dharaqivarāśha (970-90)

Dhūrēśa (990-1000)
Mahipāla (1000-20)
Dhandhuka (1020-40)

Pūrṇapāla (1040-50)
1042, 1045
Dantivarman (1050-60)
Krishnadeva (-rāja) II (1060-90)

Yogarāja Kākaladeva III (1090-1115)

Rāmadēva Vikramasimha (1115-45)

Yaśoddhavala (1145, 1160)
1146, 1150, 1154

Dhārāvarsha (1160-1220)

1180, 1183, 1188, 1192, 1198,
1214, 1216, 1219

Sōmasimha (1220-40)

1221, 1232, 1235

Krishnadēva III (1240-1260?)

Pratāpasimha (1260?-1285)

Arjuna (?) (1285-95?)
(1290)

Prahlādana
III. PARAMĀRAS OF VĀGADA
(c. 925-1110)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vairisīhinha(^1) --</th>
<th>Dambarnasīhinha --</th>
<th>Name unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(930-55)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chachchha (Kaṅka) (955-970)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chanḍāpa (970-1000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Satyarāja (1000-1025)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limbarāja</td>
<td>Mandalika</td>
<td>(1025-1040)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1040-70)</td>
<td>1059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chāmunḍarāja (1070-1105)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1080, 1101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vijayarāja (1105-1110?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1108, 1109</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IV. PARAMĀRAS OF BHINMĀL-KIRĀDŪ
(c. 950-1185)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sindhurāja</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dūsala (or Usala?)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dharaṇīvarāha(^2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dévarāja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1002 (or, 1012 ?)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dhandhūka</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Krīshnaratṛa(^3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1060, 1067</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Sōchchharāja\(^4\) (1100-1125) |
| Udayaratṛa (1125-45) |
| Sōmēśvara (1145-1165)\(^5\) |
| Jayatsinhiha\(^6\) |
| 1183                 |

---

1 The Paramāra ruler of Mālwā, Dambarasīhinha is mentioned as his brother.
2 Down to this ruler the genealogy is the same as of the Ābu Paramāra branch.
3 Krīshna ratṛa or Krīshnādēva II of the Ābu branch.
4 Brother of Kākaladēva of the Ābu branch.
5 The portion of the stone is broken before the mention of this ruler, and his relationship with his predecessor is not known. But very probably he was the son of his predecessor.
6 He is mentioned as a Mahārājākula; probably a son of Sōmēśvara.
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V. PARAMĀRAS OF JĀLŌR
(c. 960-1125)
Vākpatirāja (960-985)
Chandana (985-1010)
Dēvarāja (1010-35)
Aparājita (1035-60)
Vijjala (1060-1085)
Dhārāvarsha (1085-1109)
Visala (1109-1119)
1109, 1119

VI. CHANDELAS OF JEJĀKABHUキT
(c. 800-1315)
Nammuka alias Chandravarman (?)
| 831

Vākpati (840-60)

Jayaśakti alias
Jejjāka or Jejjā (Jejjā)
(860-890)

Vijayaśakti alias
Vijjāka or Vijjā
(Vija)

Rahila (890-910)
Harsha = Kaṇchukā
(910-30)

Yaśōvarman alias Lakshavarman = Pushpā (930-50)

Krishṇapa (Krishṇa) = Asarva
Dēvalabdhi

1 It cannot be known when the reign of the former of these kings terminated and hence we have assigned total period to both these brothers as they are also mentioned together in the inscriptions of the dynasty.
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GENEALOGY

Dhāṅga (950-1002-3)
653-54, 955, 998, 1002

Gāṇḍa (1002-03-1018?)

Vidyādhara (1018-30)

Vijayapāla = Bhuvanadēvi (1030-50)

Dēvavarman (1050-60)

Sallakshaṇavarman (1100-1110)

Jayavarman (1110-1120)
1117

Madanavarman (1125-63)
Vālhanadēvi, Lakhamadēvi, Chandadaladēvi

Pratapā

1129-3-, 1130, 1131, 1134, 1136, 1138, 1151,
1152, 1155, 1157-58, 1162, 1163

Yasovarman II

Paramardin (c. 1166-1202)
1167, 1168, 1171, 1173, 1176, 1178, 1180, 1182,
1184, 1187, 1191, 1195, 1201

Trailokyavarman (1205-1240-41 or 1247?)
1205, 1208, 1212, 1240, 1241

Viravarman (12478-1286) = Kalyāṇadēvi
1254, 1261, 1267-68, 1279, 1281

Bhōjavarman (1286-89) 1288-89

Hammiravarman (1289-1311?) 1289, 1308-09, 1311
Kirātaraya (Kirātravarman II) 1544

Durgāvati = Dalpat of Gaḍghī Mandala (1546-1564)

1. The lower limit of the reign of this king is highly conjectural, S.K. Mitra takes it 1022 A.C. See the genealogical table in E.R.K. P. 238.
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VII. DYNASTY OF VlJAYAPALA (of Ringnød)

(c. 1090-1110)
Prithvipalā (1090-1110)
Tihunapalā (Trighvanapalā) 1110-30

INTRODUCTION

Vijayapalā (1130-50) 1 1132-33
Śīrapalā (1150-70).

Mahākumāra Amritapalā 1155

VIII. KACHCHHAPaghāTA DYNASTY2

(1) Gwālikor Branch (950-1105)
Lakshmana (950-970)
Vajradāman (950-980)
Marigalarāja (980-1005)
Kirtirāja (1005-1030)
Mūladēva alias Bhuvanapalā and Trailokyamalla

Devavrata (1030-1055)
Dēvapalā (1055-80)

Padminapalā (1080-1090) Mahipalā3 Mahipalā (1080-1155) Ratnapalā (1115 to?)

(2) Dubkuṇḍ Branch (1000-1110)

Yuvarāja

Arjuna (1010-1030)
Abhimanyu (1030-50)
Vijayapalā (1050-1070)
Vikramasimha (1070-90)

1088

1. This ruler and his predecessor are mentioned with the expression tat-pādaśūnya. The latter in each case may have been a son of the former. G.H. Ojha distinctly says so in course of noticing the Thakurdā stone inscription in the A.R. of the Rājputnāl Museum (1915-16, p. 3), but he has given no reading and the stone is now lost.


3. This ruler is mentioned as a brother of Padminapalā and a son of Śīrapalā.
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(3) Narwar Branch (1075-1125)
Gaganasimha 1075-90

Śradasimha (Śratisimha) (1090-1105)

Virasimha (1105-1125?)

1120

IX. YAJVAPĀLA DYNASTY (1217-1300)
Chāhāda (c. 1242-54)1

Nrivarman

Āsalla (1254-79)
(1262-63) from inscription; 1254-79 from coins) 1262-63, 1270
Gōptila (1279-89) 1279, 1281, 1282, 1283, 1284

Gaṇapati (1290-1300)
1291, 1292,2 1294, 1298 from inscriptions; 1298 from coins.

2. See L.N.I., No. 6228. Th stone is now not traceable.
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T.S. Ravishankar, M.A., and Jai Prakash, M.A.

The figures refer to pages, and n after a figure to foot-notes. The following other abbreviations also have been used: au = author; Br. Brāhmaṇa; ca = capital; ch. = chief; ci = city; co = country; com. = composer; de = deity; dt. = district or division; do. = ditto; dy. = dynasty; engr. = engraver; ep. = epithet; f. = family; fe. = female; feu. = feudatory; gen. = general; imp. = imperial; ins. = inscription, inscriptions; k. = king; lo. = locality; lm. = linear measure, land measure; m. = male; mn. = minister; m. = mountain; myth. = mythological; n. = name; off. = office, officer; pes. = people; pr. = prince, princes; q. = queen; reg. = region; rel. = religion; ri. = river; s.a. = same as; S. = Southern; sur. = surname; te. = temple; t.d. = territorial division; tit. = title; tk. = taluk; tn. = town; vi. = village; W. = Western; wk. = work; wt. = weight.

A

Abhayadeva, m., 117
Abhayakilakaṇā, au., 38a
Ābhin. m., 121
Ābhi, do., 119
Ābhi, off., 142
Ābhidhānakālaṁ, wk., 202a
Ābhidhānarañālaṁ, do., 211
Ābhimanyu, Kachchhaphāhältā, k., 23 and n, 126
Ābhi, ca., 25, 60, 162, 202
Ābhi, reg., 138-36, 168, 169
Ābhi s.ä., Mount Ābhi, tn., 3, 6, 15, 63, 64b, 68, 71-74, 164-65, 167.
Ābhi, mo., 197
Ābhi s.ä., of the time of Bhāmideva I, Chaulukyā k., of Gujarāt, 64 n
Abhī Rāhā, Muslim Chronicler., 84n
Ābhi Road, tn., 60
Achalanātha, s.är. Mā. Ābhi, do., 66 n, 164-165
Ācchutanya, Rāja, 201
Ācchuyaka, sär., 100, 201
Āchāra, s.är., Āhār, reg., 14
Ācārya, ep., 221
Ācārya, legendary account of the origin of the Paramārās, 3-4, 6
Āga, dr., 111
Āgraṇāra, rent free land given to brāhmaṇas, 151, 201
Āhār, vi., 130-11, 175
Āharavālā, alias Sōmāvāra I, Western Chaulukyā, k., 24, 27-28, 29 n
Aharichchhātra, tn., 16
Ahmadabad, du. 10
Ahmadabad, do., 1, 152
Ahlaki s.är., Kathi-ud-din, Tughluq k., 112 n, 113
Āvī-Abhari, wk., 3-4, 13, 16
Ājeda, au., 188 n
Ājehari, vi., 72, 157
Ājungadh, tn., 85

Ajiyadēva, off., 52
Ajiyadēva, min., 226
Ajiyapālla, Chaulukyā k., of Gujarāt, 44, 67
Ajiyapura, tn., 158 n
Ajiyārājā, Chāhārāmūa k., 33 and n
Ajiyavarman, Paramārā k., 38, 39 n, 40
Ajiyagadhi, fort., 107, 117-18, 131, 143
Ajiyagadhi, tn., 88, 111, 114-15, 118 n
Ajiyadēva, off., 120-21, 122 and n, 140, 167 and n, 209, 216, 228
Ajiyagadhi, s.är. stone ins., 122
Ajiyagadhi, s.är. stone ins., of the time of Bhājavarman, V.S. 1345, 96, 178, 199
Ajiyagadhi, s.är. stone ins., of the time of Bhājavarman (undated), 142, 225
Ajiyagadhi, stone ins., of the time of Viravarman, dated V.S. 1317, 118, 120, 136, 140
Ajiyagadhi, stone ins., of the time of Viravarman V.S. 1325, 105, 117
Āj Dev, min., 113
Ājmer, ca., 67, 94
Ājmer, ci., 22, 62, 95
Ājmer, dr., 130
Ākkalavarsa, Rādhakūṭā k., 5
Ākharāpāda, f., 95
Ālankāras:
Apahūnti, 199
Ālāsāyākā, 199
Rāptaka, 199
Śṛṇa, 193, 199
Upāma, 199
Upākṛtasthā, 199
Viyātīra, 199
Ālā-ud-dīn, Khiḍā k., 54, 122
Ālā-ud-dīn, Khiḍā k., and n, 133
Ālārā, s.är., Lahūr, vi., 116, 158, 202
Al-Bērūntī, Muslim Chronicler., 20, 26
Al-Bērūntī, Muslim Chronicler., 84e, 177, 185, 208, 220a, 222a, 224a, 224b, 227
Ālā, n., of a hero, 112
Ālā-ṇihāla, k., 110n
Ālā-ṇihāla, k., 112
Alāna, Chāhārāmūa k., of Nātāl, 75
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Aññadīvī, ruler of Chandraśāi, 70, 71n
Aññadīva, q.v., 30
Aññadīva, Abh, Paramārā k., 145
Ālīr, off., 142
Allahābād, ci., 84
Allahābād, du., 117, 154
Allahābād prāṣasti of Samudraśīva, 141n
Aličar, A.S., 2, 8, 19 and π, 26n
56n, 57, 99n, 91n
135n, 140, 178n, 208
and π, 213, 214 and π, 223n
Amāśāpadra, t.d., 152
Amurākha, w.k., 189
Amurāśīvarā, du., 133n
Amurāśīvarā-khētra, 155
Amurāśīvarā-śrīnāka, 158
Amurāśīvarā-śrīnāka, π of a holy place, 155
Amurāśīvarā-śrīnāka, π of a sacred tank, Amurāśīvarā-śrīnāka, w.k., 47, 194
Ānābha, min., 66-67
Ambāprāśūla, Guhīla k., 244
Ambākha, q., 16
Ambīrā, vi., 33, 35
Ambīrā ins., of the 174, 211
Ambīrā ins., of the time of Paramārā of V.S. 1151, 174, 211
Amrīt, s.a., Harivīra,
Chāndrānāka k., of Raṇāthāmbore, 94
Amoṣīgati, com., 16, 186, 195-96
Ammā, āsav, 174, 178, 202, 209
Amrīghavārtha, 5, 56, 87, 89
Rāiḍhākūla k., 63
Amīrapāla, ch., 129
Anūpūla, Chāndrānāka k., of Nāñdīlā, 24
Anūpūlapāla, ch., 39
Anūpūlā-patama, do., 25, 36, 68
Anāla, te., 163
Anānda, off., 143
Anānda, m., 117, 221
Anānapāla, k., of Kārunā, 22
Anānapāla, Śāhī ch., 95
Anānapāra, s.a., Vānagār, vi., 152n
Anānadāsana, au., 194
Anasā, off., 107
Ananta, ch., min., 105-108
Ananta, m., 103, 140, 222
Ananta-mahādāripāla, au., 166n
Ananta-pāla, off., 83
Ananta-pāla, min., 163
Ananta-pālā, k., of Tāyupālā (Drubkund) dy., 128-129
Ananyaśūtha, off., 145, 182, 203
Anannyaśītha, go., 223
Anannyaśītha, vi., 82
Anannyaśītha, pr., 83
Āṇāha, co., 25, 58, 93, 105
Āṇāha Prāsaḥ, state, 57
Āṇāha, co., 32, 93
Āṇāha-bhūtāntara, vi., 155
Āṇāha-vādi-vighaya, t.d., 105
āṇājjas, community, 224
Āṇāpāṇa, market, 207
Apaḍājita, Paramārā k., of Jālōr, 19n, 77, 78
Apaḍājita, Śīlāśīra k., of North Konkanā, 22
Apaḍājita, Śīlāśīra k., 19
Apaḍājita, ca., 17
Apaḍājita, reg., 18
Aparākara, commentator, 225n
Aparākara, śīvatarī, π of Sowth land, 202
Aparākara, śīvatarī, 195
Aparākara, śīvatarī, 15, 61, 175n
Aparāśīva, s.a., 78
Aṣṭiṇa, c.a., 78
Ārbarā, mo., 59, 62
Ārbarā, s.a., Mt. Abort, reg., 73
Ārbarā, place of pilgrimage, 182
Ārbarā, vās, 69, 73
Ārbarā, s.a., Mount Abū, mo., 69, 73
Ārbarā, molda, t.d., 63
Ārbarā, śīvatarī, holy place, 151
ārākāvya-padā, type of poetic composition, 192
Ārāvīthāpā, t.d., 152n
Ārāvīthāpā prāṣasti, 62, 65n
Ārāvīthāpā, Śīlāśīra k., of Northern Konkanā, 19
Arisāṅha, au., 22
Arisāṅha, epic hero, 66, 71, 86, 90
Ariyana, 197, 199
Ariyana, vi., 225, 238
Ariyana, Kachchhvpagāthā k., 96, 126
Ariyana, s.a., Ariyana-vanara
Paramārā k., of Chandraśāi, 47, 72
Ariyana-vanara II,
Imperial Paramārā k., 53 and π, 54
Ariyana-vanara I, do., 13, 30
45-48 and 58a, 49
52-53, 59, 141
144, 146, 162n, 179
184-85, 191n
192, 194, 194n, 195
197, 221-22
227, 229
Ariyana-vanara’s prāṣasti,
Arima, s.a., Arimā, Sākambhhrī
Chāndrānāka k., 38
Arimā, Vāhītha k., of Gujarāt, 65
Arimā, nīla of Bhīmāpālī, 67
Arimā, Chāndrānāka k., 33, 38, 65, 78
Ārīthā, ca., 11, 78-79 and 79n
81-82 and 82n
163, 174, 229
Ārśītha, vi., 11a, 129, 176n
207, 209, 227
Ārśītha ins., of Chāmuṇḍārājā, dated V.S. 1156
Ārśītha ins., of V.S.
1157 of Chāmuṇḍārājā, 83, 130
Ārśītha store ins., of the time of Chāmuṇḍārājā, dated V.S. 1159,
195n, 199
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Bhadra, ins., of the time of Vajrayāraja, dated V.S. 1166, 81-82, 141
Bhājana, vji., 50
Buddhakhand, regi., 115
Bhāja, vi., 130
Bājāra, s., Vāpada, neg., 78
Bāhāl (Khandesh) ins., of the time of Sihthana, dated Saka 1144, 47
Bui Kanpa, ch., 68
Bulbul, geni., 132
Bālābhattra, m., 119
Bālābhāttra, wki., 94
Baghāmune ins., 29
Bālamījan, commenator, 203
Bālaprāśāda, Chāhamāna k., of Nāthdī, 64
Bālarpur, lo., 134
Bālāsvarasvāt, s., Bālāsvarasvātikāyina, wki., 194
Bālavan ins., of Hamuntra dated V.S. 1345, 52
Bālavarman, k., 11
Bālādvēdīgha, k., 154
Bālīrāja, Chāhamāna k., of Nāthdī, 15
Bālīlīla, Paramārake, 36n, 39 and n, 41 and n, 65 and 66
Bālī, Harpatal k., 45, 59
Bālīlādēva, fez., 134
Bālīśa, au., 186
Bālīśvā, v., Karvā, n., 119
Bāṇihbanāv, vi., 157
Bāṇihbanādī, do., 158
Bāṇih, vi., 122 and n
Bāṇih Satt stone ins., dated V.S. 1363, 122
Bānja au., 187, 193 and n
Bāṇipatra, lo., 112
Bāṇid, dt., 84-85, 90, 107, 111, 135, 154, 216
Bāṇa, R.D., 131, 104, 167
Bānī, vi., 119, 33-34
Bānswādī, tr., 11n, 20
Bānswādī, dt., 26, 59, 78-79, 83, 129, 129
Bānswāda, regi., 135, 203 and n
Bānswāda grant of Bhājajīva dated V.S. 1076, 22 and n, 25, 220
Bāpapātikāja, Paramārake, 6, 9
Bāpārāp, geni., 15, 18
Bārhu, in., 116
Bāraloott, vi., 70
Bārloott ins., 71
Bārmād, dt., 60
Bārmat, L.D., 69, 79
Baroda, territory, 166
Baroda, erstwhile state, 152
Baroda, ci., 20, 164
Baroda plate of Kurkaṇja, 56
Bāsakī, R.G., au., 210
Bastar, :dt., 18, 58, 196
Bastar, in., 18
Bastar, regi., 19
Bhājāvara, vi., 110-111
Bātěsvās-circle (Babārī), stone ins., of the reign of Paramārake of V.S. 1252, 85, 109-10, 113-14
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Bāhada, vi., 160
Bāhārīja, fez., 21
Bādal pillar ins., 87n
Bādāmi, ca., 1
Bādali, ca., 157n
Bādmīr, dt., 72
Bādanvar, vi., 37
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Chandrälla, s.a., Chandrälla, d.y., 85
Chandrällas, d.y., 3n, 11, 22-23, 32-33.

Chandrini, m., 25n.
Chandrayati, ca., 60.
Chāpa, lo., 18n.

Characters-
Kannaḍa, 212.
Nāgarī, 211-13, 216, 218.
Chakhārī, vi., 111, 120.
Chakhārī, 1st white state, 118, 121.
Chakhārī, reg., 142.
Chakhārī grant of Dēvavarman dated V.S. 117, 122, 146.
Chakhārī grant of Praṇamardī dated V.S. 125, 161.
Chakhārī plate inscription of Viravarman dated V.S. 1311, 119.
Chasmāyati, n., 220n.
Chānchārtīya, v.k., 189 and n.
Chassautha, vi., 160n.
Chatturbujā, le., 91.
Chētuṟṟātukya, sur. n., 220.
Chatturvarya Chirūṭumāṇi, v.k., 171n.
Chatturvaryaṁśakā, do., 196.
Chatturvēndu, ep., 220.
Chenuḍa, reg., 74.
Chauṭhīnī, J.B., 74, 187n.
Chauṭhan, d.v., 111-12.
Chauṭikya-Chālamāṇa, d.y., 67.
Chastasyoginī, tc., 167n.
Chāvāyat s.a., Chāvāṭkaṭa, f., 10.
Chēṭa, d.o., 21, 33, 39, 91, 107, 213.
Chēṭi, co., 21, 25, 27n, 92-93.
Chēṭḷa, k., 90.
Chēḷa, peo., 100.
Chēḷiai ch. min., 133.
Chēṇārī, v., 157.
Chēṭapura, d.u., 111, 118, 133, 154.
Chēṭaspāṇḍa, t.n., 19.
Chīḍakā, Nāgā k., 58.
Chīḍaptā, a.u., 35, 142, 172, 192-193, and 196.
Chikilūkā, vi., 155.
Chī-ki-to, s.a., Jējaṃbukti, reg., 84.
Chīvākātha, do., 157.
Chīṭtā, d.o., 20.
Chīṭṭūl, d.n., 209.
Chittor, d.c., 180.
Chāḷāna, member of the vēmaka f., 174.
Chūrāvāṇi-gārvintā, v.k., 193.
Chintra prastāti, 53.

Chirihulla, v., 224n.
Chitor, s.a., Chitrakūṭa, t.n., 89.
Chitrakūṭa, s.a., Chitor, ci., 11.
Chitrakūṭa, reg., 89-90.
Chīṭi, is., 164n.
Chīṭor, d.o., 11n.
Chīṭtor, is., 38.
Chōḷa, co., 13, 25, 51.
Chōḷa, peo., 13.
Chōḷapikas, 145n.
Chōḷa s.a. Chōḷapika, 145.
Chūṭi, v., 159.
Chumberty, s.a., Chandāri, ci., 54.

Colonel Ellis, 118.

Cunningham, A., 7 and n. 84-86, 88, 98n, 100, 103, 110n, 116-17, 118, 119n, 122, 131, 167, 171, and n. 173, 213-14, and 214n, 215-18.
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Dabbe, ci., 45.
Dabbe ins. of Vāghēḷa, 51.
Vasaladēva of Gujārāt, 51.
Dabhiyāḥavārman, m., 119.
Dāḷāka, m., 36.
Dāḷārapohra, d.d., 151.
Dāḷārapohra, vi., 153.
Dāḷatra, d.o., 152.
Dāḷākīti, f., 120.
Dāḷā, lo., 118.
Dāḷada off., 145.
Dāḷand, m., 175, 208, 223.
Dāḷal, reg., 284n, 285.
Dāḷilā, co., 2, 122, 189.
Dāḷī, v., 142.
Dāḷī, t.d., 154.
Dāḷī, d.o., 119.

Dāḷī copper-plate ins. of Viravarman dated V.S. 1337, 119, 133.
Dāḷīma, f., 59.
Dāḷīyas, 'enemy of the gods,' 91.
Dāḷīyas, s.a. Veṇugūḍu, te., 91.
Dāḷikānā Kōsāla, co., 108.
Dāḷikānā-pathuḥkā, sur., 220.
Dāḷikānā-pathuḥkā, community, 194.
Dāḷikā wa Malāki, k., 117-18.
Dāḷanka, a kind of tree, 229.

Dāḷamāsimaṭṭha, s.a., Dāḷakā, Paramāra k, of Vāguḍa. 11, 79, and n. 99, 234n.

Dāḷādara, com., 145, 197.
Dāḷādara, m., 132.
Dāḷō, d., 84, 122 and n.
Dāḷamāsimaṭṭha, v.k., 195.
Dāḷas, 'charity,' 161, 176, 185n.
Dāḷipū, a.u., 187.
Dāḷānagāra, v.k., 185.
Dāḷaperuva, a kind of ear-ring, 228.
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Dantidurga, Rāshtrakūta k., 1-2, 55
Dantivardhan, Paramārtha k., of Chandravati, 64
Daru, mother of demons, 67
Dāpur, v., 155
Darbāt, s., Darbat, do., 102, 175
Darbāt Śāntinīmatā image ins., of the time of Kirtivarnman; dated V.S. 1132, 140
Daśabala, au., 204, 193
Daśbamudrabadrāma, w., 187
Daśapura, s., Māndasar, in., 2, 11
Daśapura, s., Māndasar, dr., 56
Daśi rāja, co., 113
Daśīrūna W., do., 113
Daśārūpa, w., 183
Daśāniḥgatvādikā, do., 186
Daśāvātra cave ins., at Ellīrā (undated), 1–2
Datū, dr., 119
Dāveṭa, v., 159 and n
Dāvabhāga, w., 189
Devachandra, s., Udayachandra, m., 175
Dayanam Saluva, 130
Days (lunar) (tithis): bright fortnight–
3 228
4 181
5 228
6 35
7 180, 290
8 195
11 68, 180
13 1130
14 181, 220
15 95, and 119, 131, 229, 178–179
and 179n
dark fortnight–
7 181
8 181
Days holy–
Amarāvati, 178, 181
Anantākṣara, 229
Akrūra-śrīśyana, 258
Chaitra-purva, 194
Desamakra-purva, 178–79, 229
Devāsayaṇi, 180, 228–29
Dipākali, 181
Dipākāyana, s., Dīpahālli, 229
Devīśhāla, ēkādaśi, 180, 228
Devīśhāla, s., ēkādaśi, 229
Ekādaśi, 180, 229
Ganapati-saptami, 180
Madana-śrayodāsi, 229
Māghī-pūrṇimā, 180
Mahāvaiśākha, 43, 179, 229
Makara-sankrāti, 180
Pārśvanātha-purva, 178
Rathanaptami, 229
Rāvan-puṣṭiṇa, 181
Sankrāti, 181
Udākaśya, 178–79
Vasanta pachman, 178, 228–29
Vishvavat sankrāti, 180
Days of the week–
Sunday, 119, 181
Saturday, 55
De., S.K., 189
Decem, rog., 4, 6, 16, 28, 135
Dedū, v., 110, 159
Dedū, off., 145n
Dējana, ni., 71, 177, 222
Delhi, c., 22, 54, 112, 213
Delhi, s., 94–95, 133
Delhi, dr., 130
Delāvāla, v., 159
Dējagādh, ṛa., 108, 134
Dējagādh, ins. of the time of Kirtivarnman; dated V.S. 1154, 98, 102, 104, 136, 139, 171
Dēkāṭhāra, v., 69
Dēkāṭhāra plates of Kṛṣṇa III, 50, 205n
Dēkāṭhāra, in., 50, 205n
Dēkāṭhāra copper-plate, of Bhūjādēva, Vikrama’s year 1079, 148, 204
dējā, territorial division, 78, 135 and n
Dēlāpāḷika, vi., 157
Dēvā, ep., 137
Dēvachandra, m., 148, 177
Dēvādhaṇa, c., m., 133
Dēvādhaṇa, off., 141n
Dēvagiri, ṛa., 45, 48n, 53, 122
Dēvakī, mother of Śrīkṛṣṇa, 81
Dēvakīthi, Chandrāvilā, k., 93
Dēvakīthi, rs., 135
Dēvakī, fe., 118
Dēvakī, m., 174
Dēvakī, Kacchhikapaghāṭa k., 125
Dēvakī, Pātra k., 87 and n, 89
Dēvakī, Pratīṣṭhāna k., 92 and n, n
Dēvakīlapuruṣa, in., 151, 155
Dēvakīpatama, dr., 46
Dēvakī, s., Mahāpāla, Paramārtha k. of Dharmadīvāla-ksatras branch, 61–63, 72–73, 75 and n, 77, 186, 202
Dēvakī, Paramārtha k., of Tālā branches, 77–78, 165
Dēvakī, Paramārtha k. of Tālā branches, 195
Dēvakī, Paramārtha, Chandellīa k., 99–101, 138, 198
Dēvakī, q., 125
Dēvī, ke., 171
Dēvī-Jagadamba, te., 171
Dēvīs, ṛa., 152, 163
Dēvās grant of Naravarman, dated V.S. 1152, 30–33, 38, 148
Dey, N.L., 203
Dīhakāja, s., Dīhakī, f., 223
Dīhāmadāva (or Vāṇamaṇḍāva), off., 150
Dīhāmadāva, dr., 145
Dīhanā (Dīhanājaya), k., 4
Dīhanājaya, au., 186 and n.
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Dhanapāla, con., 3, 10, 12, 57, 177, 183, 186, 193 and n.
Dhanapāla, Paramāra k., 55, 75.
Dhāpāla, 157.
Dhagūra, 159.
Dhanavāla, 159.
Dhanavāla-pattaikā, 159.
Dhundhukā, Paramāra k., of Bhīmālā, 25, 62, 63 and n., 64a, 73.
Dhundhapāla, vi., 63 and n. 72.
Dhundhukā, s.a., Dhundhukā, Paramāra k., of Bhīmālā, 63.
Dhanēkāra, te., 80, 164.
Dhanēkāra stūra,
Jaina stūra, 191.
Dhāniga, Chandañiga k., 11-12, 91-93, 94 and n., 95-96, 96-100, 137, 140, 143, 145, 147, 153, 150-153, 207, 222-23.
Dhanikā, s.a., Dhanbarasiñha, Paramāra k., of Vāgāna, 79-80, 163.
Dhanikā, au. and min., 196.
Dhāna-pratikā, 159.
Dhanātā, do., 166.
Dhāna stūra ins. of Somaśīhāla, Dhanyakumārapura, stūra, 199.
Dhār, du., 13, 145, 173.
Dhārā, ca., 159, 166 and n., 20, 24-25, 26 and n., 27, 30-31, 34, 36 and n., 37, 38 and n., 39-40, 51, 53, 56, 57, 80-81, 101, 151, 156, 163, 173, 185, 191-55, 207.
Dhariṇikāra, vi., 62.
Dhariṇkāra, m., 116.
Dharapāla, do., 13.
Dharampurī grant of Vik朴实ra, (Vikramā) year 1031, 6.
Dharamśīhāla, s.a., Dharamśīhāla, Paramāra k., of Bhīmālā, 72.
Dhārāshīhāla, do., 61-62, 72, 75 and n., 77 and n.
Dharammugyā, in., 54.
Dhār Sarpabandha ins., 193.
Dhārāvatika, Paramāra k., of Jālī, 77-78, 229.
Dhārāvatika, Paramāra k., of Sirśhi, 227n.
Dhārāvatika, of, 202.
Dhārāvatika, s.a., Dhārāvatika, do., 223-24.
Dharmapatsaha, s.w., 195-96.
Dhamānti, do., 197.
Dharmasthātu, do., 187, 189 and n., 273.
Dhavan, of valleys, 113.
Dhavala, Rākṣaśīhāla, k., of Hastikūla, 14 and n., 61.
Dhavāla, vi., 156.
dhānavāla, "fisherman", 207.
Dhavahāja-pattaikā, in., 139.
Dhavājā, Rākṣaśīhāla k., 1.
Dhruva, I, Maitraka k., 2a.
Dhūmaśīhāla, Paramāra k., 3 and n.
Dhundhukā, s.a., Dhundhukā, Paramāra k., of Bhīmālā, 73.
Dhūmadha, off., 62.
Dhūmadha, Paramāra k., of Abū, 82.
Dhūmapāla plate dated Kalachuri year 963, 116, 143, 149-50 and 150a, 165.
Dhūmapāla copper plate ins. of 1212 A.C., 141.
Dhūmapāla plate dated in K., 967, dvajārūpaya, 'raising banner', dvārya, 'one of the ashurāgas of being', dvijāyā, 166.
Dignātari-,
Adhikāri-mukhya, 140.
Adhikāra, 140.
Achāraudātikā, 146.
Achāraudātikā, 47, 139-40.
Achāraudātikā, Ayamāgā, 202.
Achāraudātikā, Avamāgā, 145.
Achāraudātikā, Bhāvāsūryapati, 143.
Achāraudātikā, Bhūtā-matra, 143.
Achāraudātikā, Bhūtā-patra, 143.
Achāraudātikā, Bhūtā-tāpaka, 146.
Achāraudātikā, Bhūta-bhāja, 146.
Achāraudātikā, Bhūta-bhāja, 146.
Achāraudātikā, Bhūta-bhāja, 139.
Achāraudātikā, Bhūta-bhāja, 145.
Achāraudātikā, Bhūta-bhāja, 146.
Achāraudātikā, Bhūta-bhāja, 146.
Achāraudātikā, Bhūta-bhāja, 146.
Achāraudātikā, Bhūta-bhāja, 146.
Achāraudātikā, Bhūta-bhāja, 146.
Achāraudātikā, Bhūta-bhāja, 146.
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Era-
A.H. years of,
631 115
645 117
711 54
Kalchuri years of,
944 116
963 116, 143
967 115
Saka years of:
919 16
964 20
977 17, 26
981 26
996 28
1033 39
1034 28, 57, 136
1108 44 and n
1186 51
1232 122
Vikrama years of:
744 61n
990 195
999 198
1003 200
1004 200
1005 200
1006 200
1007 200
1008 200
1009 200
1010 200
1011 200
1012 200
1013 200
1014 200
1015 200
1016 200
1017 200
1018 200
1019 200
1020 200
1021 200
1022 200
1023 200
1024 200
1025 200
1026 200
1027 200
1028 200
1029 200
1030 200
1031 200
1032 200
1033 200
1034 200
1035 200
1036 200
1037 200
1038 200
1039 200
1040 200
1041 200
1042 200
1043 200
1044 200
1045 200
1046 200
1047 200
1048 200
1049 200
1050 200
1051 200
1052 200
1053 200
1054 200
1055 200
1056 200
1057 200
1058 200
1059 200
1060 200
1061 200
1062 200
1063 200
1064 200
1065 200
1066 200
1067 200
1068 200
1069 200
1070 200
1071 200
1072 200
1073 200
1074 200
1075 200
1076 200
1077 200
1078 200
1079 200
1080 200
1081 200
1082 200
1083 200
1084 200
1085 200
1086 200
1087 200
1088 200
1089 200
1090 200
1091 200
1092 200
1093 200
1094 200
1095 200
1096 200
1097 200
1098 200
1099 200
1100 200
1101 200
1102 200
1103 200
1104 200
1105 200
1106 200
1107 200
1108 200
1109 200
1110 200
1111 200
1112 200
1113 200
1114 200
1115 200
1116 200
1117 200
1118 200
1119 200
1120 200
1121 200
1122 200
1123 200
1124 200
1125 200
1126 200
1127 200
1128 200
1129 200
1130 200
1131 200
1132 200
1133 200
1134 200
1135 200
1136 200
1137 200
1138 200
1139 200
1140 200
1141 200
1142 200
1143 200

126, 141, 175, 210
141, 162, 169, 206, 228
33, 211
30, 203
104
174
82, 174, 195n, 223
31, 33-34, 141, 145
162
83, 126
141, 174
33, 203
104, 163
76
127, 169, 181
104
34, 83, 107, 128
182, 201
33, 174
35, 107, 173, 221
36
34, 36
74
35, 37
35, 20, 44
65
175n
75
65, 66
175
83, 128
41
175
42n, 43, 170, 210
210
60, 72-73, 75
107n, 106, 110
30, 26
108, 110-11
30
41, 42n
75, 182
129
111, 175, 179
76, 78, 112, 210
116
44
42n
44, 194
45
109, 141, 169
43-44
111
114
115
165
46
30, 46, 144
46
166, 173
66
167
164
48
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1285  50, 197
1286  48
1287  145, 197
1287(9)  48
1290  69, 165
1297X  131
1297  49-50, 197
1299  69
1300  50, 70, 130, 197
1302  218
1303  28
1304  130, 218
1305  218
1306  218
1307  218
1308  218
1311  51, 117, 131, 208, 218
1312  51, 218
1314  218
1315  218
1315  218
1317  102, 104, 109, 118, 120, 136, 145n
1318  218
1319  130, 175, 218
1320  49
1322  218
1323  131
1325  218
1327  133, 218
1330  218
1331  47, 51, 145, 182
1333  218
1335  118n
1336  133, 223
1337  118-20
1338  134
1339  130, 133
1341  133
1344  53, 120, 136, 169, 210, 227
1345  2118, 120, 134, 169, 225
1346  120
1347  63, 72
1348  134n
1349  134
1350  134, 141
1351  134
1352  134
1353  134
1355  134, 141, 172
1356  72
1357  122
1358  54, 122
1359  122
1360  118
1466  122n
Erachcha, Jd., 194, 154
Eriyargha, Hoysala pr., 28, 39
Erich, n., 154
Eulogy of Sun-god composed by Chittapa, 199

F

Firishta, Muslim chronicler. 22, 54, 94, 95n, 97 and n, 113, and n, 117, 124n

Forbes,

Fragmentary Kalañjar stone inscription of the time of Viravarma, 109, 104
Fragmentary Khajurahó inscription of (Harshadéva), 88
Fragmentary Khajurahó inscription of Yasovarmman, 90
Fragmentary Mahóth inscription of the time of Kritivarman, 94
Fragmentary Mahóth inscription, dated V, 1240, 113
Fragmentary Mau stone inscription of the time of Madanavarman, 92
Fragmentary stone inscription at Vidisha, 11n

G

Gadadvarama, min, 140
Gadadvarama, ch. min, 110, 109
Gadadvarama, off., 105-07, 144a-146
Gadh, n., 142
Gadhaptgala, do, 62
Gadhul, n., 211
Gadhnavara, reg., 123
Gadre, M.B., 134n
Gaganamihira, Kachchhapagháti k., 127
Gahadavál, dy, 85, 107 and n, 109, 145n, 213
Gahulgád, n., 159
Gahoi, s.e., Gmahapati, f., 223
Gajamalla, Paramara pr. of Chandravatt, 62
Gajjó, n., 122
Gaj, editor, 190n
Galka grant of Jayasimha, dated V.S., 1153, 36-37
Ganakas, 'Khyathapa peca', 225n
Ganapati, Yajavalkya k., 133, 218
Ganapati-deva, do, 216-17, 134, 226
Ganapatirathnadhavali, dr., 188
Gajjó, Chandélíka k., 94d, 95-96, and 96n, 96m, 96g, 99, 103, 137, 140, 143, 225
Gatách, n., 94, 106-07, 184
Gatagas, dy, 21, 28
Gatágadéva, off., 152-43, 146, 222
Gatágadéva, m., 134-84, 194
Gastbidhara, off., 114
Gatú-Gandhavali, d. V., do, 92, 105
Gangara, n., 9, 90, 131, 161, 183
Ganapati, Kalachuri k., 21, 23, 25, 98-100
Ganapati-deva, s.e., Gangéya, do, 97n, 100-01, 211, 222n
Ganga, n., 214-15
Gautó, dr., 21
Ganapat, m., 168
Ganapatá Sástrí, 190n
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INDEX

Guhila, dy., 14, 17, 24a, 30
   54, 67, 71
   80, 129 and n
Gujarat, State,
   1, 10-11, 16, 24-25
   25n, 36 and n
   39, 45-47
   49, 56-60, 66-62
   and 67n, 68-69 and
   69n, 84, 101, 131
   151-52 and n, 185, 187
   194, 197, 211
Gujarat, reg.,
   6, 8-9, 14, 26
   39n, 54 and n
   80
Gujarat S., do.,
   51, 109
Guna, dt.
   103, 120, 134, 176n
Gunabhadra, au,
   199
Gunandhara, off.
   141
Gumpura, vi.
   156 and n
Gunarajya, in.
   59
Gunauri, vi.
   43, 156
Gunabhamaya, gen.
   24
Gupta, dy.
   5, 19, 129n, 161, 219
Gütrjaras, do.
   1, 24, 4, 14 and n
   15, 25, 44, 46, 55
   59, 67-68, 80, 89-50
Gütrjaras, pec.
   21, 25, 109
Gütrjaras, tribe.
   225
Gütrjaras, kingdom.
   2
Gütrjaras-Pratihāras, dy.
   1-2, 8-11,
   14 and n, 15, 55
   57, 84, 90-91, 96
   124n
Guvatsa, vi.
   156
Guzni, ca.
   68
Gwalior, cl.
   22-23, 49, 54, 93, 95
   98-99, 115, 124, 162, 171
   176n, 206, 209, 218-19
Gwalior, reg.
   119, 123, 124n, 126-28
   130-32, 135, 162, 168-69
   192, 204, 209-20, 225
Gwalior, fort.
   92, 123
Gwalior, s.a. Gopādri, dt.
   119, 207
Gwalior, erstwhile State.
   130, 217
Gwalior ins., of the time
   of the Kachchhaphātā k.,
   Mahipāla, dated V.S. 1161,
   135n, 145
Gwalior stone ins., of
   Mahipāla, dated V. 1150,
   181, 199
Gwalior-Shīvpūri, reg.
   384
Gyātī s.a., Jaist,
   Paramara k.
   30

H

Hadhālī (Saurīshira) copper plate
   ins., of Saka 836,
   10n
Haihaya, dy.,
   131
hatas, Lm.
   180, 161, 202
   and n, 204,

252
INDEX

Hālāyudha, au., 5, 203, 186
Hall, F.W., 7 and n, 8, 11x, 37n
Hall, F.E., 20n, 44x, 47, 57, 93x, 100n
Hamrapura, vi., 84, 92, 102
Hamirpur, dt., 111, 118, 133
Hannuma, Chālamāṇa k., 53 and n
Hamminamadamardana, wk., 49, 68, 69n
Hammin-Mahākāśya, do., 49, 53
Hamrāpur, in., 175
Hamirmāvarman, Chandēllā k., 120 and 151
121-22, 167
Hamirnatja, feu., 134
Hamvira, s.a., Hammira, Chālamāṇa k. of
Ramathambore, 94 and n
Hand, vi., 62
Har, m., 25n
Harānanda s.a., Kōkā, ruler
of Māvā, 54
Harigana, au., 189n
Haripāla, off., 69
Haripōla, m., 119
Harīrāj, ch., 65
Harīrāj, Prathāra, k., 90
Harīrāj, Ruler of Gwalior, 119
Harīrājan, m., 220
Harishandra, s.a.,
Harishandrādeva, Imperial Parumāra k.,
41, 42, 43, 48, 179, 182
Harishandrādeva s.a.,
Harishandra, do., 41
Harīshēṇa, com., 141n, 195
Harivaśu purāṇa, wk., 2, 55n
Harṣadā, s.a., Harṣdā, vi., 48
Harsha, alias, Syaka,
Imperial Parumāra k., 7, 9, 10, 16, 186n
Harshapura, s.a., Harshōla, vi., 88 and n, 89
Chandēllā, k., 88 and n, 89
and n, 162
Harsha, Guhila pr., 89
Harshadēva, s.a., Syaka,
Imperial Parumāra k., 10, 12
Harshādeva, Chandēllā k., 89
Harshapura, s.a., Harshōla, vi., 10, 43, 156, 162
Harshānisha (Harakshirgha ?)
s.a., Syaka, Imperial Parumāra k., 10
Harśōla, vi., 10
Harśōla grant of Syaka,
4-7 and 7a, 9-10, and 10n, 57, 195, 226
Harṣdā, s.a., Harshapura, do., 43, 164, 168, 173
Harṣdā ins. of the time
of Dēvāpāla, 42, 20, 167
Harśīka, m., 225
Hassan Artnal, governor,
Hassan, Lm., 205 and n
Hastikundu, s.a., Hāthiṇḍi, lo., 14
Hātyachālātanā, wk., 198
Hātya-18, ld., 155
Hājayēvara, vi., 186
Hāṭhadāli, do., 158
Hāṭhal copper-plate ins.,
of the time of Dēvāpāla dated
(Vikrama) year 1237, 66, 165, 179
Hāṭhēvdīk, vi., 156
Hāṭhīshāh, do., 159
Hāṭhīkāpā, do., 158
Hāṭhīnāvra, do., 156
Hāṭhīvāhā, do., 156
Hāyagirnavadana, wk.,
Hāzīahusūdīn Ḥasan
Āzal, 113
Hēmācandra, au., 35-36, 38n, 187-88, 202
Hēmādī do., 36n, 47, 51, 136n, 146n,
177, 179n, 185, 210, 220n
Ḥēmavati, q., 85
Ḥēmaṇ, priest, 85
Ḥēmamspūla, k., 92 and n
Hētāra, s.a., Vēuyas, 'prostitute', 228
Hieu-Tsang, Chinese traveller, 84, 152n
Hīmālayas, reg., 90-91
Hīmālayas, m., 91, 184
Hīmnātra, s.a., Hammin,
Chālamāṇa k. of
Ramathambore, 94
Hind., reg., 109
Hindu, community, 4, 55, 68, 131-32, 173, 219
Hindu, rel., 31, 84, 119, 173, 176
Hindu, society, 225
Hindūsam, rel., 161-62, 168, 185
Hindu Nāpūc (Kānja),
Kalaschūr, k., 101
Hindu Rājās, 22
Hindu, peo., 227
Hirlal, 119, 121-22 and 122n
Hiranā. a of a tax payable in
cash, 144, 200n
Hiranyagārabhā-dāna, ceremony,
1-2
Hoerman, 4, 88n, 215
Hōchangahālā, ch., 41
Hōchangahālā, ch., 152
Hōchangahālā, reg., 39
Hōysala, dy., 28, 36-39, 45, 58n, 59
Hultzsch, E., 47, 94, 103n, 194 and n
Huana, l.d., 147, 151
Huana—Gurara, a., of a tribe, 4
Huana—mānhdā, l.d., 11n, 15
Huanas, peo., 11n, 17
Huanas, tribe, 11, 15, 225

I

Ibn Badīta, Muslim chronicler, 84n
Ibn Azīr, 95n
Ibn-ul-Aldīr, Muslim Chronicon, 98
Ichchāhāvar, vi., 111
Ichchāhāvar copper plate inscription
of Parmardūn, 142
Iddar, entwistle state, 69
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDEX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ilutmish, Turkic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sultán of Delhi,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindi Images:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambiká</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achyuta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anuradha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ardhanárendravāra sa., Umá-Mahátvāra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashéśvākë</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bàhrūva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhatéëvārti-Dévi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chálmunëd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dugá</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guérō</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harasiddhi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanumát</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jivántapūrtikā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Káti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Káliká</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kánákñkhyá</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kádāra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krişñá</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kshétārajal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakútáa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahánásananddás</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naúdin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nálakñjñta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nánúntá</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Párvati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Váqēl-Vínñyakā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vámanu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śivā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śiva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śakú</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tríññtī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Umá-Mahátvāra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Váknñtha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Víshnú</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imagea:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jínàna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ańmáñita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kúmmáññita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahávñra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Némnáññita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sambhúvánnñtha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sáññánñtha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Várdhánñka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Víśuahánññtha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incarnations of Lord Víshnú-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balaráma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kátmávatátra,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kámaña</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mátayá</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nájánñtha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parabáñarna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ráma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vámána</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Váráhu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India, W., reg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India, c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Museum,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indica, w.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indore, c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indra, n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indra I, Ráhúpnásíkà, k.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indra III, d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indrañáltkàka, 'musician',</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indrañáj, Gáhádávàla k.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indumáñna s.a., Śiva, te.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indunáthá, Sómavánsí k.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indragádh stone ins.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingánáparśa s.a., Ríñgúdë, vi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingánáparśa, s.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingónoda, do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingónáparśa, t.d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingónádái stone ins., of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V., S. 1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron pillar at Dhar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ishábára-S., t.d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ísánanúmi, n. of a sage,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>Jáuna, image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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Jayasinha, 55n
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Kadamvapâdraka, vi. 156
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Kâilhâsa, mò. 20, 91
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Kâkâcâdâmâ. vi. 115, 159
Kâkâladvâra,
Paramûra k. of Bhumil-Kirgê branch Chandrêvâti, 65, 73-74, 225n

Kakandâbâ, vi. 139
Kakadêva, s.a. Kanka, s.a. Çâchhâ, Paramûra k. of Jalôr, 79
Kâlîja, 163
Kâlîchhuri, dyu. 13-14, 18, 23-25, 27-28 and 28n, 30, 32, 32, 81, 80, 91, 93, 97n, 98n, 100-01, 105, 107-09, 113, 116 and n. 122, 141 and n. 165-66, 171, 182, 198, 203, 211, 213
Kâlîchchurichanddâ, s.a.
Gâgêyâ, Kâlîchhuri k., 23
Kâlîgirâ, s.a. Kâlîâyâ, vi. 70
Kâlîjârâ, s.a. Kâlîgayâ do. 70
Kâlîkâlayâvâra-tirtha, n. of a sacred tank, 184

Kâlîmukhas, sect. 164, 166
Kâlînânâsa do. 166
Kâlînâjara, fort. 89-90, 92n
and n. 93, 98-101, 103-04, 106, 109
and n. 100-15, 117-18, 120, 131, 143, 159, 165-68, 182n, 184
Kâlînâjara, place of pilgrimage. 182, 183n
Kâlînâjara, ca. 94-95
Kâlînâjara, t. 22, 85, 117
Kâlînâjara ins., of the time of Kirtivarman dated V.S. 1147, 102, 146, 202
Kâlînâjara stone ins., of the time of Vitravâman, 106
Kâlînâjara stone ins., of Paramârîdêva dated V.S. 1258, 112-13
Kâlînâjara pillar ins., of the time of Madanavarman dated V.S. 1185, 146
Kâlînâjara stone ins., of the time of Paramârîdêva dated V.S. 1240, 199
Kâlînâjara ins., of the reign of Vitravâman dated V.S. 1332, 168
Kale, T.G. 189n
Kâlînâjârâvâla, vi. 158
Kalha plates of Sôkhadêva, 56
Kalîksâ, poet. 186, 195n
Kâlînti s.a. Yamunâ, rî. 92
Kâlînâ, rî. 1
Kâlînâ, ca. 21
Kâlînâ, ca. 32
Kâlînâûrâja, Kâlûchhuri k. 18
Kâlînâûrâja, k. of Kûtâla, 19
Kîlîyabâlîlîtâ, Yàtaka k. 106, 139n
Kâlûyâ, rî. of one of the four yugas, Kûlsâ-drâma, 'wish-fulfilling tree', 74
Kalâlatchî Munihi, 187n
Kûîpt, lo. 113n
Kalvân, vi. 142, 174
Kâlvan grant of Yâtjarman, 21, 25-26, 141
Kâlvan plate of the time of Bhôjâdeva, 145, 174, 209
Kâlûjâdevî , 4n.
Kâlûjâni, ca. 29
Kâlûjâpa, 'wine-dealers' 206
Kâmânâda, au., 142n
Kâmânâda, wish-fulfilling cow'. 3
Kâmbîgâ, ca. 25
Kamâd, ut. 29
Kâmâd inscription of V.S. 1140, 31-32, 34n
Kârra, demon, 109
Kanakhâl, vi. 165
Kanâres, co. 28
Kânnauj, t. 213
Kânchî, rî. 1
Kânchî, ca. 14
Kânchî, ut. 101
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Kane, P.V., 189n, 190n, 225n, 226n

Kanaew s.a. Kanyakubja, ca., 9, 15, 22, 56, 88-89, 91, 93, 94-95, 97, 105 and n, 109, 112, 185n

Kanaew reg., 123 and n, 126, 128

Kanduka-tridha, 230

Kanu, gen., 27, 81

Kanha-dadèva, s.a. Krushnadèva, III.

Kanàtdàraka w., of Abó, 70

Kanyakubja, s.a. Chachiha,

VIPAÇA Paramàra k., 17-18, 150n

Kanàta, s.a. Kakadèva, Paramàra k., of Jàlòr, 79

Kansa, N.M., 193n

Kànti, vi, 72

Kanyakubja, s.a. Kanaew c.a., 2, 23, 25, 92-93, 97, 105

Kanyakubja Bishnusnas, community, 3n

Kapadia, H.R., 196n

Kapalika, sect., 164, 166 and n

Kapalins, do., 166

Kapila s.a. Kuvilàra, ri.

Kara, lo., 117

Kara, ’as in general’, 144, 200

Karanka, ’Kanyakubja community’, 220n

Kardamara, m., 192

Karîhàj plates of Krushna III, 11, 90 and n

Karigav, t.d., 154

Karîka, ’Kalupakàra k., 56n

Karna, epic hero, 71, 90, 125

Karna, Katakharì k., 24-25, 27 and n, 28-29 and 29n, 30 and n, 34, 101-103, 130, 180, 188, 198

Karnadèva, s.a. Karna, do.

Karnapura, ’a kind of earring’, 228

Karnpà, co.

Karnàja, pests, 14, 21, 25, 74

Karnàj, pl., 13, 15, 21, 27-28

Karnpâra, ri.

Karpàta, reg., 80

Karpâlayà, m., 156

Karpâlayà, s.a. Karpâlayà, m., 156

Karpâlānti, w.k.

Karpâlayà, do., 198

Karpâlayà, w.k.

Karpâlayà, do., 194 and n

Karpâlayà, s.a. Karpâlayà, vi.

Karpâlayà, do., 164, 184

Kashmir, 187, 189, 213

Kashmir, reg., 90n, 91

Kashmirian, peö.

Katt, s.a. Vârâjip, ca., 100

Kâdi s.a. Vârâjip, ca.

Kâdi, do., 95, 107

Kâtaâhu, vi.

Kajak, dr.

Katac, S.L., 41, 48n

Kathàrâjûkara, w.k.

Kaurava, f., 209n

Kautheb grant of Vikramaditya V., 13

Kautheb grant of Vikramaditya VI., 15

Kautheb, au., 142n, 203

Kâvidà (or Kâvidà), eff., 68

Kavikangîdibharàna, w.k.

Kavindrabhâchâ-samuchchaya, w.k.

Kâvia, type of composition

Kâvîakâsha, w.k.

Kâvîakâsha, do.

Kâvîamârâbhâna, do.

Kâvâdârâ, s.a. Kâsâhrâda, vi.

Kâvâdârâ, do.

Kâvâsha, community, 206, 207, 208, 209

Kâvâsha, 125, 132, 141, 224-225 and 225n, 226 and n

Kâvâsha-khila-vidyâ, 225

Kâdâra, au., 156

Kâdâra, re., 163

Kâdâra, place of pilgrimage, 183

Kâdâra, a., of an ascetic, 165

Kêth, A.B., 186n, 198

Kêtha, Nâtyâ Chânâdârâ k., 66n, 67-68, 76

Kêthi, vi., 110, 159

Kêtha, m., 224, 218

Kêtha, te., 169

Kêtha, n., of a savant, 164

Kêthi-râj, alias Arêkâsini, Sîlâhrâ k., of Northern Kûkama, 19

Kêtha, co., 13, 18

Kêthâ, peö.

Kêthi, armlet.

Kêthi-patâkâ, w.k.

Kêthi, plates of Yaśâkârâ, K, year 925, 29n, 105, 182

Kâjurihâ, m., 107, 163, 167n, 171, 172n, 174n, 182 and n, 205n, 207, 215, 223

Kâjurihâ, ca.

Kâjurihâ, stone ins. of V.S., 1173 of the time of Dhaniga, 92, 104, 106, 199

Kâjurihâ inscription of Yaśôvarman of V.S. 1011, 11-12, 85-90, 95, 142, 146, 169, 172, 192, 205n, 207

Kâjurihâ ins. dated V.S. 1059, 85

Kâla, ’rending floor’, 205
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| Kuntulā, co. | 17, 48, 93, 112n, 227 |
| Kuntapāla, Paramāra ch., of Jālū. | 78 |
| Kuna, a tributary of the Chambal | 126 |
| Kura, peo. | 90 |
| Kūt-ud-dīn, k. | 113 |
| Kuvilātā, s.a., Kapilā, ni. | 183 |

**L**

| Laghu-Vaiṣṇavapaddhakā, vi. | 156 |
| Lāhāḍa, min. | 140 |
| Lāhāḍa, ch., min. | 110 |
| Lāhīnī, q. | 172, 211 |
| Lāhīnī dēvi, fe. | 43 |
| Lakhamā, s.a., Lakhamī-ḍeṅi, q. | 110 |
| Lakkhaṇāśīnha, off. | 146 |
| Lākel, vi. | 114 |
| Lakhāvarman, s.a. | 52n |
| Yēśvarman, Chuṇḍellā k. | 90 |
| Lakṣhmādevā, Imperial Paramāra k. | 31-32, 35 and n |
| Lakṣhmāṇa, Chākchhapagnāhā k. | 123 |
| Lakṣhmāṇa, te. | 171n |
| Lakṣhmānārāja II, Kalachuri k. | 13 |
| Lakṣhmānāśīnha, Gūḍhā k. | 54 |
| Lakṣhmānajāstrī, au. | 187 |
| Lakṣhī or Gajalakshmi, unāśa of the Chuṇḍellās, | 168 |
| Lakṣhī, fe. | 227 |
| Lakṣhmīdźeṅi, q. | 8 |
| Lakṣhmīkāra, off. | 103 |
| Lakṣhmīkāra, m. | 140, 211 |
| Lakṣhmīkāra Bhūṭa, min. | 185n |
| Lakṣhmīkārṇa s.a., Kuṇṭa, Kalachuri k. | 41n, 102 |
| Lakṣhmīvarman, Imperial Paramāra k. | 35, 37 and n, 39 and n |
| Lakṣhmī, ināśa of Śiva | 164, 166n |
| Lakṣhmī, Pāṭālo sēct | 189 |
| Lakṣhmīvarṇa, s.a. | 164 |
| Lakṣhmīvarṇa, ināśa of Śiva | 84 |
| Lalīṭpur, do. | 108, 176n |
| Lalīṭpur, reg. | 217 |
| Lalīṭpur, in. | 226 |
| Lalīṭpur, vir. | 223 |
| Lalīṭa Upādhyāya, do. | 116n |
| Lāl pāṇḍā, do. | 94 |
| Lāngātari, do. | 94 |

**Language**

| Arabic | 94 |
| Gujarāti | 10 |
| Hindi | 90n, 98 |
| Mahārāṣṭrī Prakrit | 191 |
| Marāṭhi | 193n |
| Persian | 54 |
| M | 259 |
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Mahāyāna, 11, 18, 26
29, 34, 58, 91m
108, 119, 126
128-31, 135, 131-32
154, 161, 167
172-175, 213
Magadha, co., 100
Magavādī, vi., 158
Māhāvīra, poet., 193m
Mahābhārata, epic., 189, 197
Mahāchakra., vi., 160
Mahādevīya, ep., 161
Mahādevas:
Gṛhastha, 182
Tulāpurusha, 181
Tulādāna, 95, 182n
Mahādeva, m., 33v
Mahādeva, governor, 36
Mahādeva, Yādeva k., 51-52, 140m
Mahādevaśāsaka-mandala, l.d., 40-43, 147
Mahākāla, vi., 49, 80, 163
Mahākavi-Chakravartin, ep., 35
Mahākāyya, 6, 18, 186
Mahākāyya, n., 18
Mahākumāra, 43
Mahārājkṛta, 148
Mahāśeṣa, na., 195
Mahāśāstra, ep., 195
Mahāśāstra, copper-plate ins., 148
of Bhājadeva, year 1074
Mahāśāstra, k., 196
Mahāśāstra, dā, 196
Mahāśāstra, Śāstra, 196t
Mahāśeṣa, n., 9, 88, 98
Mahēndu, m., 59
Mahēsvara, m., 120, 225
Māhī, n., 1, 5, 10 and n,
15, 78, 161
Māhī, reg., 12
Mahākurta, m., 102-103
Mahāpurūṣa, int., 150n
Mahāpāla, s.a., Kshirapadādeva
Imp., Prabhadra k., 9, 88, 56,
81-89
Mahāpāla, s.a., Dēvarajya,
Paramāra k., of Bhūmāl
Kīrata branch.
62-63, 72-73
Mahāpāla, Kācchhāpāgita k.,
100, 125-126
and 126n
128, 130, 142, 145,
162, 169 and
n. 182 and 7. 206, 226
Mahīpāla, m., 114
Mahīpāla, s., 114
Mahīpāla, Pāla k., 92v
Mahīrātātī, vi., 156
Mahīśavavuddhikā do., 156
Mahīśī, s.a., Mahīśdevi,
'chief queen', 227
Mahīśivingha, l.d., 154-55
Mahīśīvativāt, m., 156, 209
Mahīṣā, vi., 159
Mahīṭa, Lad., 148, 152
Mahūdāla, vi., 156
Mahārajadhana, t.d., 153
Mahāsāṃghikī, 22, 95-96 and 99n
Mahāvīra, 97-98 and 99m
Mahāvīra, 99m
Mahāvedīya, ep., 156
Mahāvīra, 94-95, 171, 125
Mahāvīravardhana, ca., 85, 88, 90, 100
102-03
Mahāvīravardhana, ca., of the time of Kirivarma, 96
Mahāvīravardhana, ca., of the time of Kirivarma, 97-98, 100
85-86
Mahāvīravardhana, ca., dated V.S. 1240,
116
Mahāvīravardhana, ca.,
204
Mahāvīravardhana, ca.,
111
Mahāvīravardhana, ca.,
85
Mahāvīravardhana, ca.,
grant of Bihāra, 26
Mahāvīravardhana, ca.,
14n, 39, 54n
Mahāvīravardhana, ca.,
2, 56, 87, 91
92v
Mahāvīravardhana, ca.,
66
Mahāvīravardhana, ca.,
167n
Mahāvīravardhana, ca.,
153
Mahāvīravardhana, ca.,
52, 141
Mahāvīravardhana, ca.,
170n
Mahāvīravardhana, ca.,
92
Mahāvīravardhana, ca.,
11
Mahāvīravardhana, ca.,
5, 27n, 78
38, 38 and n,
39, 44-47
49 and n, 50-52
53 and n, 60
65-66, 79
84, 102,
107-09
Mahāvīravardhana, ca.,
1, 2, 14, 19, 23,
27, 29, 45,
90-91, 124
129, 135n, 188
Mahāvīravardhana, ca.,
161
Mahāvīravardhana, Paramāra k.,
33n
Mahāvīravardhana, Paramāra k.,
59
Mahāvīravardhana, Paramāra k.,
33
INDEX

Malaya, n. of a hill, 20
Malaysia, s.a., 116
Malaysia, o.f., 149
Mahak Dava, Paramara k., 54n
Malik, m., 197
Malik Nusratuddin-
Till-i, gena, 115, 118, 131
Malikhi, s.a., 1, 196
Malikradi, q., 76, 163
Malay, gena, 142
Malikkarjuna, n. of a Pāñcāputa sage, 165
Malikkarjuna, Sūlāhāra k., 66-67
Malināth, a.m., 199n
Malāvī, co., 23-34, 36n, 54-55,
57-58 and
58q, 59, 74,
78, 101, 148,
151n, 173n, 188,
190n, 191,
193-94, 231n
Malāvī, reg.,
1, 2, and
2m, 4, 6, 8-9,
9a, 12-13, 15-16,
20-21, 25-26,
30-33 and 33p, 35
39m, 56 and
n, 41, 61n, 159,
151-52,
152-53, 161
163-65, 166n,
174, 177, 182
and n, 188-70, 172,
195, 199, 201,
203 and n, 204
and n, 205-07,
209n, 210-12,
215, 220n, 227, 234n
Manḍilāpur, v., 50
Manḍilāpur (Belgium Dist.)
ins., dated in Saka 1173,
47
Manmātā, a.m., 194n
Maṇḍi, n., 164
Maṇḍi, q., 22
Maṇḍā, r., 183n
Maṇḍagol, v., 46
Maṇḍāstrā, a.m., 209
Maṇḍāla, 'territorial division', 43, 60,
125 and n,
147-49, 151-54
Maṇḍāla, s.a., Maṇḍānādi, 26-27,
30, 87-82, and
82n, 136n, 163
Maṇḍānādi, a.m.,
Maṇḍānās, a.m.,
Maṇḍānā, s.a.,
Maṇḍālīka, s.a.,
Parāma k. of Jālōr,
26-27,
30, 87-82, and
82n, 136n, 163
Maṇḍānāda, s.a.,
Maṇḍānādi, s.a.,
Maṇḍānā, s.a.,
Maṇḍānādi, a.m.,
Maṇḍānā, s.a.,
Parāma k. of Jālōr,
26-27,
30, 87-82, and
82n, 136n, 163
Maṇḍānāda, s.a.,
Maṇḍānādi, s.a.,
Maṇḍānā, s.a.,
Maṇḍānādi, a.m.,
Maṇḍānā, s.a.,
Parāma k. of Jālōr,
26-27,
30, 87-82, and
82n, 136n, 163
Maṇḍāpa, s.a., Maṇḍā, for,
165, 202,
Maṇḍāpadurga, v.,
151, 156
Maṇḍāpīkā, s.a., Maṇḍā, doa,
2
Maṇḍāpōkt, u pavillon in the market;
114, 207
Maṇḍāraka, t.d.,
152
Maṇḍasaur, ci,
9
Maṇḍāsura, v.d.,
139
Maṇḍāvada, doa,
158
Maṇḍāhāta, tr., 26, 48, 51-52, 152,
166, 167n, 182 and n,
184
Maṇḍāhāta, place of pilgrimage,
182
Maṇḍāhāta grant of Jayavarman II dated
(Vikrama yea) 1331,
53
Maṇḍāhāta grant of Dēvapāla,
dated V.S. 1282,
44, 50, 148
Maṇḍāhāta grant of Jayavarman
dated V.S. 1317,
52, 148
Maṇḍāhāta grant of Jayasimha,
dated V.S. 1112,
20, 27, 114
Maṇḍāhāta grant of the time
of Jayasimha-Jayavarman II
dated V.S. 1331,
27, 47-49, 51-52,
145, 159, 180
Maṇḍāhātra-durgā, vi.,
131, 156
Maṇḍāhātra-dālātīrthakara, doa.,
156
Maṇḍālāpur, m.,
159
Maṇḍodgara, s.a., Maṇḍītī, vi.,
31
Maṇḍāmbara, doa.,
62
Maṇḍasaur, m.,
11, 51, 151-52,
163-64, 167n,
207
Maṇḍāṣura, n.,
9, 24, 31, 45, 52,
54, 55n, 56, 151, 166, 182
Maṇḍū fragmentary ins.,
194
Maṇḍagālā, Kacchhāpālākā, k.,
124
and n, 127
Maṇḍikānītha, com.,
141
Maṇḍrabha, off.,
125, 145
Maṇḍrad, P.A.,
192n
Maṇḍrañāhātya, v.ka.,
192
Maṇiri-parishad s.a. amātya-sahihā,
'council of ministers', 139
Maṇu, au.,
222
Maṇusmṛti, v.ka.,
306n
Maṇyakāhā, ca.,
12
Maṇṇānādi, s.a., Western Garāja k.,
12
Maru-maṇḍala, reg.,
60, 73
Maru-maṇḍala, t.d.,
63
Maṇīrā, s.a. Maṇīrāgā, 15,
59-60, 73, 77
Maṇīrā, s.a. Maṇīrāgā, 15,
59-60, 73, 77
Maṇīrāgā, v.,
93
Maṇer, ins.,
93n
Maṇuf III, k.,
109
Maṇuṣyā, ak.,
119
Maṇuvā, ci., 125, 226
Maṇuṣya kāyaśas, community,
226
Maṇuśayātra, ci.,
163
Maṇvāka, royal preceptor,
146
Maṇu, vi.,
107, 143
Maṇu, t.d.,
147, 152
Maṇuśaya Māṇjū-uṣ-din,
131
Maṇuśaya historian,
131
Maṇu, vi.,
158
Maṇu stone ins. of Dharāg, 93
Maṇu stone ins. of the
time of Māndana Varman
(fragmentary), 41n, 95-96, 99, 102-09
137, 139-40, 143n, 146
Maṇyāmādāka, vi.,
156
INDEX

Mēdāpārṇa, s.a., 14
Mēwād, reg., 67
Mēdāpārṇa, ca., 224
Mēdā, sub-caste, 208, 221 and n
Mēdhābhīthā, commentator, 123
Mērutungū, au., 2, 13, 16-17 and 17a, 24, 27a, 34, 36 and n, 46, 186

Mesures :

A ravindaṭṭha, 196
Dvipāṇa, 196
Nāraṇākara, 196
Paṭṭacapārṇa, 193
Rathādūhrā, 193
Prabhū, 193
Mēru, mo., 163
Mēwād, ca., 14-15
Mēwād, reg., 89, 131
Mēhāśā, vi., 136
Mēhāśā Bējō, 136
Ima., Prathāva k., 56
Minhāja-us-Sirāj, au., 94
Minhāja-ud-dīn, 132
Muslim historian, 132
Mērāda, plotted dated 1024 AC, 22
Mērāda V.V., 27a, 34, 18-19, and n, 21, 23, 28, 29a, 30
Mērāda, 93, 97a, 99b, 101a,
105, 148, 165,
203, 204, 204a, 204b, 211-12,
214a, 215, 218 and n
and 225a
Mērāda, 84
Mīrāda, k., 139 and n, 141a, 149
and n, 191a, 203
215a, 223
225a
Mīthilas, peo., 90
Mīthila, S.K., 12, 94, 98a,
103a, 111a
113, 124a, 225b
205a, 236
n and 237b
Mīthilchāh, peo., 49
Mōdāś, vi., 11 and n
Mōdāś grant, 25
Mōdī, vi., 51, 152, 163-64
Mōdī stone ins., dated V.S. 1311
(Tangential), 11, 52, 208
Mōdī fragmentary ins., dt. V.S. 1314.
11, 52, 208
Mōdī stone ins., of the time of Jayavarman, dated V.S. 1317.
182a
Mōdājaḍāśa, s.a. Mōdāś, vi., 10
Mōdājaḍāśa, v., 6, 152
Mōdājaḍāśa, v., 151, 156
Mōdājaḍāśa, s.a. Mōdāś, vi., 152a
Mōdājaḍāśa, ca., 120
Mōdājaḍāśa, v., 224
Mōdājaḍāśa, v., 85a
Mōdājaḍāśa, v., 35
Mōndol, race, 132-33

Mōhna:

Aśādī, 55, 180, 228
Aśī, 184
Chaitra, 11a, 228
Kārtika, 68, 95, 179 and n, 180-81, 228
Māgha, 22a, 181, 195
222
Pauša, 179a
Pāla, 181
Vaiśā, 119, 179 and n, 180,
228-29

Moon, mythological story relating to the origin of the Chandraśāla, 85
Mōra, s.a. Mōrandā a kind of grain, 205
Mōranā, dt., 123, 125
Mount Aṭā, reg., 68
Mount Aṭā, m., 3, and n, 4,
39, 66a, 67-69,
73, 79, 184
Mount Aṭā ins., 38a, 70
Mount Aṭā pursāit, 67, 197
Mrīja, adv., 186
Mrīja-purṣṭa, "maintenance of the family of a deceased warrior", 115
Mūchchhāka, f., 134
Mrīja, kidney bean", 205
Muhammad Gūlrā, k., 68
Muhammad b. Tughlāq k., of Tughlāq dynasty, 185a
Muhammad Gūlrā, k., 194
Muṣulā, R.K., 190a
Mukhtāpāl, vi., 148, 153a
Mukhtāpāl-a, s.d., 153
Mūlādāvā, Kauśikapagāthā k.,
99, 125
Mūlānā, reg., 95
Mūlēśā, Chauṭāya of Gujarāt k.,
14-15, 18,
24, 61
Mūlēśā II, d., 44-45
Mūlīyā, k., 117
Mūnīgāhā, of a sacred place, 184
Mūnīgāhā ins., of Dhārāvārsha, 143
Mūnī, ep., 209
Mūnī, s.a., Vākpatī-mūnī, "Imperial Paramāra k.,
of Malwa, 5, 12-13
and 13, n, 14-17,
and 17a, 48, 56,
136a
186, 191, 193a,
195a, 229
Mūnīsārādīśavantarā, w., 185
Mūnīpura, w., 16
Mūnīśa-gāna, of a tank, 16
Mūnīśa-Vākpatī, "Imperial Paramāra k.,
208
Mūnīsī, v., 30
Mūnīshā, K.M., 15, 16a
Mūrāla, m., 17
Mūrāla, peo., 18
Mūrdh, shrine, 168
Mūsīm, community, 1, 22-23, 49, 51, 53,
68, 94, 97, 100, 114-15,
119, 122 and n, 126,
131-33, 135, 218

262
INDEX

Mutgil, vi, 45
Mysore, cl, 189

N

Nāḍi, ca, 15, 24, 68
Nāḍula, m, 201
Nāga, dy, 18-19, 186
nāga-bandha, n, of type of composition 29
Nāgabhāsa, Imperial Pratihāra k, 1, 55-56
Nāgabhāsa II, do, 86
Nāgadāsa, vi, 151
Nāgadāsa, v, 152
Nāgadeva, off, 50
Nāgahāda, v, 151
Nāgahāda-pashchima pathaka, t.d, 153
Nāgara, f, 36
nāgara, town name ending in, 151
Nāgara, surname, 220
Nāgara Brāhmaṇa, community, 186
Nāgaramālīka, mercantile community, 223
Nāgara, off, 69, 159
Nāgendra, off, 145
Nagpur, st, 212
Nagpur Museum, 212
Nagpur Museum pravasi, 27
Nagpur Museum stone ins, of Naravarman dated V.S. 1161, 31, 33, 34 and n
Nāgara, n, of a clan, 226
Nāyās, M, chronicler, 72n, 76, 78
and n, 136, 142, 169, 193, 199, 201
Nājgara, 'corporation of guilds', 208
Naikama, f, 208
Naikama, 'a merchant', 226
Naikama, n, of a clan, 226
Nāilpā, M, chronicler, 72n, 76, 78
and n, 136, 142, 169, 193, 199, 201
Nātā, M, chronicler, 72n, 76, 78
and n, 136, 142, 169, 193, 199, 201
Nātēkhā, m, 194
Nātēkhā, vi, 145, 197
Nilachhā, v, 145, 197
Nilachchāpura, s,a, Nilachhā, do, 145
Nalagiri, s.a, Narwar, reg, 131
Nalagiri, v, 160
Nalakachchāpura, s,a, Nilachhā, m, 197
Nalapura, s,a, Narwar, hillfort, 130
Nalapura, v, 160
Nala-lātāga, do, 156
Nalapura, s,a, Narwar, ca, 160, 218
Nālāmpitaka, v, 189
Nānā, v, 69, 165, 184
Nānā, m, 120-21
and n, 140, 164, 169
Nānā, m, 70
Nānā, n, of a fort, 75
Navavarman, s,a, 151, 158
Navavarman, n, of a fort, 75
Navavarman, vi, 151, 158
Nāyak, M, chronicler, 72n, 76, 78
and n, 136, 142, 169, 193, 199, 201
Nāyaka grant of the Chalukya Alha, 34
Nāyakamattode, s,a, 193
Nanda, (mistake for Bidh), t,a, Vidyādhara, Chandāla k, 97
Nandavāna, t,d, 148, 154-55
Nandul, v, 159
Nandipura, lo, 120, 159
Nānākha, Chandāla k, 84-86
Nānyaya, vi, 92
Nānyaya grant of Dēvavarman, 99-101, 140
Nānyaya plate of Dēvga, 89-92
Nānyaya, North, reg, nāpā, 'barber', 207
Narapāla, m, 69
Narasimha, Hara, v, 38
Narasimha, member of the Sūki, 93
Narasimha, offic, 32
Narasimha, Kula, member of Tripuri k, 108n, 115f
Narasimha, m, 221
Naravarman, Parānākha k, 31-33 and 33a, 34 and n
Nārāyaṇa, ca, 35, 36, 37 and n
Nārāyaṇa, min, 47
Nārāyaṇa, te, 169
Nārāyaṇasvāmī, m, 200
Naraimāli, r, 130, 133-35
Narimāli, s,a, Nalapura, reg, 123 and n, 127
Nārāyana, s,a, Narwar, 193 and n, 199
Narimāli, s,a, Nalapura, reg, 123 and n, 127
Nārāyaṇa, s,a, Narwar, 193 and n, 199
Nārāyaṇa, s,a, Narwar, 193 and n, 199
Nāscott, 25, 203 and n, 204
Naik, M, chronicler, 119
Nāshuddhī, Sultan of Delhi, 195n, 196n
Nātā, type of composition, 194
Nātā, vi, 136
Nātā, q, 89
Nātā, v, 158
Nātā, s,a, Narwar, 186, 194
Nātā, s,a, Narwar, 186, 194
Nātā, s,a, Narwar, 57
Nātā, s,a, Narwar, 149, 154
Nātā, s,a, Narwar, 149, 154
Nātā, s,a, Narwar, 3, 6-9, 11, 17-18
and n, 20, 186, 209
Nātā, s,a, Narwar, 75
Nātā, s,a, Narwar, 3, 6-9, 11, 17-18
and n, 20, 186, 209
Nātā, s,a, Narwar, 20, 186, 209
Nātā, s,a, Narwar, 75
Nātā, s,a, Narwar, 3, 6-9, 11, 17-18
and n, 20, 186, 209
Nātā, s,a, Narwar, 75
Nātā, s,a, Narwar, 3, 6-9, 11, 17-18
and n, 20, 186, 209
Nātā, s,a, Narwar, 75
Nātā, s,a, Narwar, 3, 6-9, 11, 17-18
and n, 20, 186, 209
Nātā, s,a, Narwar, 75
Nātā, s,a, Narwar, 3, 6-9, 11, 17-18
and n, 20, 186, 209
Nātā, s,a, Narwar, 75
Nātā, s,a, Narwar, 3, 6-9, 11, 17-18
and n, 20, 186, 209
Nātā, s,a, Narwar, 75
Nātā, s,a, Narwar, 3, 6-9, 11, 17-18
and n, 20, 186, 209
Nātā, s,a, Narwar, 75
Nātā, s,a, Narwar, 3, 6-9, 11, 17-18
and n, 20, 186, 209
Nātā, s,a, Narwar, 75
Nātā, s,a, Narwar, 3, 6-9, 11, 17-18
and n, 20, 186, 209
Nātā, s,a, Narwar, 75
Nātā, s,a, Narwar, 3, 6-9, 11, 17-18
and n, 20, 186, 209
Nātā, s,a, Narwar, 75
Nātā, s,a, Narwar, 3, 6-9, 11, 17-18
and n, 20, 186, 209
Nātā, s,a, Narwar, 75
Nātā, s,a, Narwar, 3, 6-9, 11, 17-18
and n, 20, 186, 209
Nātā, s,a, Narwar, 75
Nātā, s,a, Narwar, 3, 6-9, 11, 17-18
and n, 20, 186, 209
Nātā, s,a, Narwar, 75
Nātā, s,a, Narwar, 3, 6-9, 11, 17-18
and n, 20, 186, 209
Nātā, s,a, Narwar, 75
Nātā, s,a, Narwar, 3, 6-9, 11, 17-18
and n, 20, 186, 209
Nātā, s,a, Narwar, 75
Nātā, s,a, Narwar, 3, 6-9, 11, 17-18
and n, 20, 186, 209
INDEX

Paramāras, dy., 1-2 and 2a, 3, 146, 194, 229
and n., 4-6, 8, 11-13, 15, 16a,
17-19, 22-24
and 24a, 25-30
32-34, 36-37
and 57a, 39-40
41a, 44-47
49-57, 59-60,
61a, 63-66, and 66a, 67, 70-71
and 71a, 75, 78-80, 91,
93, 97a, 99, 101,
104-15, 108,
114, 121a, 122, 124,
128-29, 132-33,
135-36,
138-39, 141-42 and
142a, 143, 145 and
n., 146-52, 150a,
161-65, 167
and n., 166, 171-73,
178 and n.,
179, 182 and n.,
183-87, 188a,
190-1, 193-95,
197, 200-01,
204, 207-09,
212a, 215, 220-22, 225a,
226-27, 229, 234a
Paramāras of Ābō, do., 38, 64, 70, 72,
76, 145a, 149a,
130, 162a,
163, 165,
184, 222, 235a
Paramāras of Bhūmāla-
Kīrdā, do.,
72-73 and 73a,
146
Paramāras of Jālōr do.,
76, 78, 162a,
163
Paramāras of Mālāvā, do.,
72-73, 77, 83,
104, 149, 173
Paramāras of Sirohā, do.,
177, 184
Paramāras of Vāgāda, do.,
78, 83-84,
109, 130 and n.,
163, 222-23,
226
Paramārdin, Chandellā k.,
102, 110-12
and 112a,
134-15, and
135a,
116, 122a, 140,
141n, 143,
164, 169, 175,
180-81, 198-99,
215-16, 225, 229
Paramārdin,
K. of Kurkula,
58
Param Deo., s.a.
Paramāradē, s.a.
Bhōjādeva, Imperial Paramāra k.,
22
Pāna-nārī-sahādara, it.,
35
Pīryāt, in.
148
Purānīka, it.,
Purīk, 4
Pārijitāmālājī, it.,
21, 46-48,
Parīmal, s.a.,
Paramārdin, Chandellā k.,
112
Parītal, in.,
117
Pāthapukāramā-Vyākṣaya, do.,
67, 197, 229
Pāva, it.,
193
Pārvān, n.,
151, 169
Pāsuni, it.,
154
Pāsmtpā, sect.,
164-65,
166a
Pāsūpatāchārya, Pontiff
of the Pāsmtpā sect.,
165
Pātaka, territorial division,
151
Pātāla, s.a., Pratipāsinīha,
Paramāra, k., of Ābō,
72 and n.
Pātāsprāyana, it.,
71
Pātāphali, it.,
189
Pātāsavāñja, it.,
156 and n.
Pātākha, territorial division,
2, 147-48,
149n, 153
Pātākha, ep.,
220
Pātīla, it.,
158
Pātīlā, territorial division,
149 and n.
Pātīlana, town,
131
Pātīlanā, n.,
183-84
Pātīla-Vishnu, it.,
160
Pātīlā, it.,
51, 56
Pātīkha, s.a., Pratipāsinīha,
Paramāra k., of Ābō,
72n
Pāvākīma, s.a., Paramāra, dy.,
1n
Pāurānīc dharma,
177
Pṛastha, ins. from Mahāō dé,
dated 1165A.C. of
Maddavanārman,
110n
Pericles, Greek historian,
228
Peters, 192n
Phailini, it.,
158
Phiplin, do.,
131, 158
Pīrāvan rock ins. of
Gānēkha,
100n
Pīrvān, it.,
156
Pīlākhā, it.,
159
Pīlākhā, do.,
155
Pīlpāsāri, it.,
61n
Pīlpāsāri, it.,
Pīlpāsāri, it.,
5
Pīlpāsāri, it.,
159
Pīlpāsāri, it.,
41-42
Pīlpānagār, it.,
3
Pīlpānagār grant of
Arunavārman dated V.S. 1267,
3, 44
Pīlpānagār grant of the
Mahākumāra Harishchanda
dated V.S. 1235-36,
38, 41, 43, 47, 182
Pīrparak-jañāna, it.,
156
Pīrāna, 'evil spirit',
184
Pīrānadhā, holy place,
151
Pīrānadhā-liñgha, it.,
Pīrīch, 187n
Pūrāvās, in.,
102
Pīra, it.,
154
Pīkaraṇa, s.a., Pūkaraṇa, it.,
35, 75
and n.
Pīrāvandhā, it.,
Pīrāvandhā-vānīmanitī, do.,
38, 112,
186, 191-92
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Rājābhāśya 'royal dues',
Rajāskrāmbha, vi,
Rājāsīhāsana, da,
Rājāmūliśa, lk, 172, 176, 188–90
Rājāmūliśiśa da,
Rājāmūliśiśakāvarama, da,
Rājāsāla, m,
Rājāpūtṛā, S, reg,
Rājāsyaana, t.d.,
Rājāsikha,
Rājasthān, 25–26, 29,
31, 33, 35, 55,
60–61, 62n, 68, 75,
78, 83, 124n, 127–29,
31, 33, 35, 55,
131, 135, 151, 182,
203, 207, 210–11
Rājasthān–Gujarāt, reg,
Rajāsthan S, reg,
Rājāvārīka, wk,
Rājendra I, Chāla k,
Rājendra II, Eastern Chāla k,
Rājā stone ins. of
Mathonāvā of V.S. 1016,
Rājpur copper–plate ins.,
Rājput, pe,
Rājput, dy,
Rājput clan,
Rājputāni, state
Rājputbhākā-sūhāna, wk,
Rājput, community
Rājya–lakshmi, s.a. Lakshmi, goddess,
Rājyāpāla, k, of Karnāu,
Rājyāpāla, off,
Rājyāpāla, Pāla k,
Rājyāpāla, Pratīṣṭhāna k,
Rākṣaṇa stone ins., of
Vijayapāladēvi dated in V.S.
995–1000,
Rālāgrāma, vi,
Rāma, Ṛkīdāvā k,
Rāma te,
Rāmachandra, Yādava k,
Rāmādēva, Paramāra k, of
Chandavādi,
Rāmāsvara, place of pilgrimage,
Rambhārāmarjuri, wk,
Rāmāsvara, te,
Ramprasad Santri
Ram Valla, Somani,
Rāṇa, ti,
Rāṇāchā, Paramāra k, of
Ābhī
t
Rāṇāchāmpuru, s.a,
Rāṇāchāmpuru, vi,
Rāṇa, au,
Rāṇādēvi, q,
Rāṇā–Kaliśā, reg,
Rāṇābhārābhōr, fort,
and 132a
Rāṇāmālī, wk,
4n, 31,
36, 38–39,
and 59
Rāṇāmālī, da,
188a
Rāṇāmālībhāṣa, da,
20
Rāṇāmālībhāṣa, ay,
1–2 and 2n, 4–6, 8–11
and 11n, 12–14 and
14n, 16, 18–19,
24, 55–57, 61, 80,
86–91, 93n, 147, 150a, 202
Rāṇāsāhāvān, wk,
48, 59,
191n, 194 and n
Rāṇā s.a. Phipāvīrāja Rāṇā, do,
Rātanpur ins. of Rājaśāla,
9, 19
Rātanpur ins. of Rāmatēva II,
106n
Rātā, vi,
130
Rātā tank, n, of a tank,
85
Rātāli, da,
34, 128, 182
Rāmatēva II,
Dukhiṇā Rājāla k,
108
Rātāngā, vi,
160
Rātāpāla, Kachchhipāghūla k,
126 and n
Rātāvāni k, of Lakā, 184
Raverty, 109n
Ray, H.C., 2n, 4–5, 7n, 9, 13,
15, 17n, 18n, 22–23 and
23n, 25, 26n, 27n, 28, 30–32,
34, 37n, 93n, 47–48,
49n, 51n, 53, 85–86 and
98n, 87, 90, 93n, 94–95, 97,
100n, 110, 112–13 and 113n,
114, 118, 124n, 127, 198
Rāziyā, ruler of Delhi,
132
Rēva, vi,
1
Rēva, erstwhile state,
108
Rēva stone ins. of Karna
dated K. Year 800,
21, 101
Rēva, do,
215
Rēva, reg,
116 and n
Rēva stone ins., dated
Kalachuri year 944,
116
Rēva stone ins.,
dated Kachhuri year 96X,
116
Rēva stone ins.,
dated Kachhuri year 96X,
116n
Rēva stone ins,
192n
Rēva, conservant with
the Rēveda,
220, 225n
Rīdhvīvā s.a., Rāparadhī, Puluhāvā,
Parāndu, pr,
31
Rīrāgōd, tv,
129
Rīrāgōd, s.a. Inugōdā, vi,
84, 182
Rīrāgōd ins.,
164n
Rīshabhāpačālīkā, wk,
196
Rīshi, m,
175, 208, 223
Rīshi, eff.
145
Rūkapāli, co,
11
Rūkapāli, co,
93n
Rūka, V.P.,
212 and n
Rodger, 216n
Rōhēdu, vi,
82n, 128
Rōhēdu plate of
the Paramāras of Ābhī,
62–66, 72–73
Rōhēkā, vi,
158
Rōpā, q.a., Rōpā, da,
62, 72
Rōpā plate of Dēvanāka
V. 1099 (or 1097),
62, 179, 202
Rudrā, te,
163
Ruddkālīya, min,
16, 33n, 139, 226
Rudrapād, co,
11
Rudrapād, do,
11n
Rudrās, au,
194
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Adivirāja, 113, 127
Avasahā, 221
Avasadhik, 221
Chātra-āvahā, 220-21
Dikshita, 220
Dvīdā, 220
Dvīdā, 221
Hākim, 124n
Mahākavi-chakravartin, 33, 172
Mahākumāra, 40-44, 83 and n, 128-29, 134, 168, 182
Mahāmahattama, 116
Mahāmicasūrvarṇa, 60, 66, 136n
Mahāmāndala-āśrama, 10
Mahārāja, 80
Mahāpandita, 47
Mahāraja, 37, 60, 64, 74n
Mahā-rajarājaśāstra, 121, 175, 201, 207
Mahājñānaśūla, 10, 13, 40, 42, 60, 62, 64, 66 and n, 70, 73, 74n, 83, 89, 92, 100, 103, 114, 120n, 127-29, 136, 145, 189, 191, 201
Mahājadīprakāsa, 228n
Mahājānaputra, 75, 120, 122
Mahājñāna, 138
Mahārāja, 150
Mahārājak, 116
Mahāsāmanī, 62
Mahāśāstra, 138
Mandala-āśrama, 135n
Mandala, 74n, 116, 136n
Mandala-āśrama-Śambhu, 66
Nāyaka, 220
Pandita, 139, 143, 172, 191, 194, 196, 220-21, 225
Paramahāttāraka, 13, 40, 42, 92, 100, 103, 114, 121, 138
Paramahāttāraka-āśrama, 42, 101, 113, 162
Parama-vaśṣṭhavā, 169
Parama-vaśṣṭhavā, 13, 40, 92, 100, 103, 114, 128, 136, 174
Patarānī, 138
Pratāparājyā, 138
Rāja, 65, 124n
Rājaśāstra, 174
Rājaśāstra, 66
Rājputra, 138 and n
Rāja, 138
Rājā, 117
Rāmak, 116, 138, 174, 202, 209
Rāmak, 114, 119, 130, 142, 145, 220
Sālá, 124n
Śāmanī, 136n, 138-39
Śāvabhūma, 57
Śrīkṣetram, 175, 223
Śūt, 180n
Thakura, 53, 96, 114, 121, 138, 201-02, 220-21
Trīvēla, 220
Yuvārāja, 17n, 67, 69
Tirumala prāṣāti, 19
Tod, Col., 3n, 39n, 123n, 130
Tōmarā, dy., 223
Trailokya-amalaka, s.a.
Trailokya-varaman, Chandella k., 114, 116, 125
Trailokya-varamadāva, s.a., Tīlakī wasa Deo,
Sā. Dalīkī va Malīkī, do., 117
Trailokya-varaman, Paramāra k., 26, 40, 42
and n, 43
Trailokya-varaman, Chandella k., 114-18, 121,
131, 140, 160, 168, 171, 199, 202, 216, 225, 229
Trīti, of a, 228
Ṭribhubanapāla of Vījāyapāla
(of Ringsūdā) dy., 83
Trīka, 'group of three temples', 174
Trīlokaṇaṇapāla, Kauai ruler, 22
Trīlokaṇaṇapāla, Liṅga nīlṛ, 22
Trīlokaṇaṇapāla, Śāhi k., 96
Tīrathī, R.S., 2, 89m, 89-90, 92 and n, 95n
Ṭrigūrādāna, w.k., 198
Ṭripūrāsura, k., of the demons, 198
Ṭripūr, ca., 13, 32, 105, 108, 116
Ṭripūr, s.v., 131, 216
Ṭriśahākṣitārati, w.k., 49
Ṭriśahākṣitārati, s.v., 197
Ṭumūtūnma, v.t., 160
Ṭurks peo., 45, 84, 93, 95
99-100, 113-115
Ṭurahkas, peo., 14, 21-22, 32, 114-15

U

Udayādhyāya, s.v., Udayādhyāya, Śāstra, Paramāra k., 212n
Udayādhyāya, s.a., Udayavāman, do., 26-28 and 28n, 29
and n, 30-32, 34, 42, 44
and n, 38 and n, 82, 104n
137-38, 149, 162-63, 171-72
178, 203n, 211-12, 227
Udayādhyāya, Giga ch., 28
Udayādhyāya, Hoysala k., 59
Udayādhyāya, Chandella k., 183n
Udayāgiri ins., of Chandragupta II, 139n
Udayaprabha s.v., of a, receptacle, 14
Udayapura, s.v., 151, 157
Udayaraśi, Paramāra k., of Kīrtaru, 74
INDEX

Udayarāja, com.
Udayaśīnha, Chālamāṇa k., of Jādir, 70-71
Udayasāraṃ Imperial
Paramāṇa k., 41, 43-44 and 44n, 48, 179
Udayāśeva, te.
Udvītita-lāhū-
prastaran-puṣpa,
‘expert in pacifying the
enemy who has gone astray’, epithet, 190
Ujjain, ci., 1-2, 9, 13, 22, 24,
26, 29, 31-32, 34-36,
41n, 49, 53-55 and 55n,
56-57, 80, 95, 163, 165
and n, 106-67, 182a
185, 188, 193, 209
Ujjain, territory,
Ujjain, dt.
29, 131, 152, 167n
Ujjain, place of pilgrimage,
182, 183n
Ujjain copper-plate ins., of
Bhāsaḷeṇa V.S. 1078,
148
Ujjain stone ins., of Jayasimha,
dated V.S. 1153,
36
Ujjayal, e., Ujjain, ci.,
151
Ujjyāl, dt.
151
Ujjvāl, ci.,
152
Pacchimapaphaka, do.
133
Ujjyālī-viśhaya do.,
148
Ukhā Mandaś stone ins., at
Bayanāl, 124a, 127
Ukālana, vi.
160
Upanikas, ‘grace brought from
the royal grazing ground’
and to be used as fodder,
143n
Ullagh khāna, gen.,
117
U, vi.,
29, 31, 163, 193
Undated fragmentary
cooper plate from Rāhāda,
61
Undapura, n.,
157
United Province, s.a.,
Uttar Pradesh, state,
84
Uphālāya, m.,
221, 226
Uparikara, ‘additional Tax’;
144
Uphāsakāra, w.,
196
Uparikara, t.d.,
152
Uparāja, observing rel., fasts,
177
Upādanda, Imperiāl Paramāṇa k.,
2, 5-7, 8,
37, 152, 180
Upādandrapuṣa, s.
165
Upādandrapuṣa, t.d.,
147, 152
Upādandraḷā, Imperiāl Paramāṇa k.,
7
Usala s.a., Dīśala, k. of
Paramāṇa of Bhirālā-Kīrāṇī branch,
61
Ushāna, ‘barren land’,
202
Uṭī, s.
95n, 97
Utpala, s.a., Vākrapūla-Muṣāja,
Imperiāl Paramāṇa k.,
13 and n, 15,
17, 60n
Utpalārāja, Paramāṇa k., of
Kīrāṇī,
13, 61 and n.
189n
Uttarakaṇḍa, reg.,
223n
Uttarānanda, vi.,
157
Uttar Pradesh, State,
85, 92, 121,

INDEX

Utakṣapana, s.a., Arthāśastra
col.,
135, 193
Utātānaka, s.a., Arthāśastra, do.,
78, 158
Uvāja, m.,
192

V

Vāchaspati, ch. min.,
93
Vāchaspati, k.,
93n
Vāchaspati Miśra, au.,
189
Vālaji, q.,
12
Vājayī, vi.,
69
Vālāṇḍa, do.,
157
Vālāṇḍa, do.,
115, 160
Vālāṇḍa, s.a., Vālāṇḍa, do.,
154
Vālāṇḍa, t.d.
108, 154
Vālāṇḍa-pattana, in.
157
Vālāṇḍa prastāti of Kumārpāla,
18, 20
25-26, 36, 39
Vālāṇḍa s.a., Vālāṇḍa-rāda, s.a., Vālāṇḍa-rāda, in.,
12, 17, 78n
Vālāṇḍa s.a., Bīrālā-āda,
Dūṇīgarpur area, co.,
11, 25, 27, 31,
59-60, 109, 129
Vālāṇḍa, reg.,
17, 78, 80 and n,
83 and n, 84, 129,
135, 141, 152, 162,
207, 209-210, 223, 227
Vālāṇḍa, s.
136
Vālāṇḍa, Chālamāṇa k.,
49 and n
Vālāṇḍa-saṁhitā, w.,
194
Vālāṇḍa, feu.,
120, 122
Vālāṇḍa, vi.,
157
Vālē̄, dh.,
51, 53, 71
Vālē̄, clap.,
31, 227
Vaidarbhī, n. of a style
of the composition,
185
Vaidya, ‘medicine-man’;
207, 224
Vaidya, C.V.,
4-5, 7,
39, 98
Vaidyaśastra, te.,
69
Vaiṣṇava, do.,
169
Vaiṣṇavāśastra I, Imperiāl
Paramāṇa k.,
6, 9 and 56-57
and 57n, 79 and n, 182n
Vaiṣṇavīi II, do.,
73n
Vaiṣṇavīi-Vaiṣṇava, do.,
Vasāṇa, sect.,
162, 169-69,
172, 185
Vaiṣṇavavī, do.,
124, 163
Vaiṣṇava, ‘community’,
219, 221-24, 227
Vaiṣīṣṭya Samhitā, w.,
192
Vaiṣṇava, alias Vaiṣṇavā, n. of a ch. of the aborigines,
18
Vaiṣṇavadīna, Kachchhagātiṣṭha k.,
93, 123 and
124, 182, 237n
Vaiṣṇavā, n. of a demon,
18
Vaiṣṇava, m.,
192
Vaiṣṇavāvāmi, s.a.,
Vaiṣṇavīi, Imperiāl Paramāṇa k.,
9
Vaiṣṇavīiśa, vi.,
157
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Vijā, s.a., Vijayaśakti, 87
Chandella k., 87
Vijayāla, ch. min., 183-94
Vijayakunti, Jaina pontiff, 175
Vijayananda, Imperial Paramāra k., 13r
Vijayapāla, dy., 128
Vijayapāla, feu. k., 34, 83-84
Vijayapāla, Kachchhapaghāṭha k., 126-27
Vijayapāla, k. of Vijayapāla dy., 129, 202
Vijayapāla, Gaurjara-Prathishtā k., 15, 92, 124
Vijayapāladeva s.a., Vijayapāla, Kachchhapaghattha k., 127
Vijayapāladeva s.a., Vijayapāla, k. of Vijayapāla dy., 128, 201
Vijayavājra, Imperial Paramāra k. of Vāgāla, 83, 174, 222
Vijayagāna, n. of a lake, 100
Vijayāskari, Chandellā fe., k., 87 and n. 100
Vijayasimha, Kalachuri k., 52, 116
Vijayasimha, Gudula pr., 30
Vijayasimha, member of the Adhivirāchārya f., 41
Vijayabhi, wk., 194
Vijālika, s.a., Vijayaśakti, Chandella k., 87
Vijāla, Paramāra k. of Jālāra, 77-78
Vijālaśvara, au., 189, 221
Vikara, t.d., 108, 154
Vikhila-pādra, vi., 148
Vikhila-pādra 12, t.d., 153
Vikrama, m., 211
Vikrama, k., 2
Vikrama, gen., 35, 222
Vikrama, Chōla k., 33
Vikrama -Chola Vilakwk., 33
Vikramaditya, gen., 27-28
Vikramaditya, W. Chatukya k., 59
Vikramaditya, V. do., 21
Vikramaditya VI, do., 193a, 212, 221
Vikramaditya, legendary k., 185
Vikramadityaścharitra, wk., 101
Vikramasimha, Kachchhapaghāṭha k., 123v, 126–27, 145, 173, 195,
XII, 204, 207-08, 210, 223
Vikramasimha, Paramāra k., of Abū, 65-66, 136
Vikramasimha, ch., 72
Vikramāsi, t.d., 114, 154
Vilāpadraka, vi., 31, 157
Vilākapura, do., 151, 160, 199
Vilāhauga, ch. min., 67
Vimalā, governor, 63
Vimalabodha, wk., 189
Vimalāśiva, n. of a Salva saint, 146, 165-66, 202
Vindōpaka, 'denomination of coin', 210 and n
Vindōpaka, Lm., 281
Vineshachandra, m., 197
Vineshakalaha, Imperial Prathishtā k., 87
Vindhyā, m., 52, 86, 130
Vindhyā, reg., 135, 165, 167-69,
173a, 182, 199, 202, 206,
208v, 227-28
Vindhyā, t.d., 43, 152

Vindhya Pradeśa, s.a., 84
Buddhā khand, reg.,
Vindhyavaran, Imperial
Paramāra k., 44 and n. 45,
141, 193-94, 222
Vīra, cor., 196
Vītrahvāla, 49, 68, 69n
Vītāraṇā, vi., 157
Vītarākṣya, Chālamāṇa k., 49
Vāravarūpa copper-plate dated V.S. 1242, 129
Vira Rājendra, Chōla k., 10
Viraṃthīka, Kachchhapaghattha k.,
137, 162, 199, 218
Virasimhadeva, s.a., Virasimha, do., 219
Virāja, co.,
Viravarman, Chandella k.,
105, 117-18 and
118v, 119-20 and
120v, 121-22, 135,
136, 140, 167-68,
171, 181, 216
Viravarman II, do., 122
Vīryarāma, Chālamāṇa k., 23-24
Visa, k., 53n
Visa, Paramāra k. of Jālāra,
76-78, 163
Visa, governor,
71
Visalādeva, Vāgāla k., of
Gujarat, 51
Visāla-kirti, m., 197
Visa Udayagradamaka, n. of
a Salavāchakya, 165
Vishālaya, 'territorial division',
6, 78, 108, 114,
130, 135, 147,
149, 151, 152n
Visaṇu, offic., 105
Vishṇu, tc., 1634, 164,
168-70, 176-77
Visāya, offic.,
114, 210
Vishvavardhaka, Hoysala ch.,
38, 59
Vidvāna, offic., 102
Vidvāna, m., 221
Vīva-bhūti, 'creator of the universe', god, 85
Virāja, m., 156n
Vivinātharhakalpa, wk.,
185
Vidāna, vi., 146n
Vidānaśīrī, t.d., 153
Vrīhāmani, do., 160
Vrata, 'observing religious fasts',
161, 176-77,
185n
Vratavikrīna, wk.,
138v, 210
Vratavikrīna, do.,
177n
Vratasūtra, do.,
177n
Vratasūtra, t.d.,
185n
Vṛṣi, 'paddy', 205
Vṛtahbha, 'coin', 211
Vṛtakṣa, t.d., 174
Vṛtakṣa, bh., 211
Vṛtakṣa, s. a., Vṛtakṣa, t.d.,
152
Vṛtakṣa, au.,
Vṛtakṣa, m.,
122
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W

Wasif, an, 54, 151
Watson, 4
Wilkinson, 153n
William Crooke, 4

Y

Yaadava, dy., 45-47, 48r, 49-53,
106, 122, 132, 138r,
145n, 177, 180, 210
Yadav, G.S., 216
Yajnapurusha, 174
Yajnavalkya-sruti, wk., 114n, 189, 203, 230,
and n, 225n
Yajurveda wk., 192n
Yajurvedin, conservant with Yajurveda, 220, 225n
Yajnapala, dy., 26, 119, 129, 132-36,
139-41, 145, 162, 164,
167, 174-75, 181, 184,
198, 216, 226-27
Yaksha, Jaina semi-supernatural
being, 196
Yarna, one of the
ashvitas of Yaga, 166
Yamini Sutrams, dy., 93-94 and n
Yamuna, s.a. Kalindi, ri., 90, 92, 94, 106, 154,
183-84, 199
Yamunadeva, m., 183-84
Yantra, 'War-machine', 143
Yantra-ghatana, the art of mechanical construction, 190
Yajjapamadrajja, an ancestor of Chahada,
Kachchhapsahutta
k. of Narwar, 130 and n, 131
Yashkarna, Chedi k., 32-33, 105, 108-09, 182
Yashapala, off., 105

Yasoderva, comp., 95, 143 and n, 222
Yasodhara, off., 95
Yasodhara, Chandella k., 147
Yasodhavala, Chaulukya ch., 65
Yasodhavala, Paramatra k., of Chandravati, 66
Yasodari, k., 33
Yasodvarman, fea., 141-42, 178, 184
Yasodvarman, Imperial
Paramatra k., 11, 33 and n, 35
and n, 36 and n, 37
and n, 38-39 and 39a,
40-42, 179
Yasodvarman, Chandella k.,
11, 33, 87 and 88a,
89-92 and 92a, 93,
108-09, 111, 114, 138,
142, 149, 162, 169,
173-74, 179
Yasvati Mahasogavagupta, Somanavati rulers, 19
Yacmis, ds., 166, 169
Yoga, n. of a śakti, 64
Yogaraja, Paramatra k.,
of Abi, 10, 161
Yogaraja, k. of Saurashtra, 189
Yogasutra, wk., 193n
Yoginamitra, alias
Nichala, an., 36
Yoginipa, 90, 125, 136
Yudhishthira s.a., 142n, 150, 192n
Dharmaraja, epic hero,
Yuktikapatanu, wk., 91
Yuvavati, s.a., Yuvavati II
Kalachuri k., 13, 91n
Yuvavati, I, ds., 126
Yuvavati, Kachchhapsahutta k.,
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