

CHAPTER-III

ANAᅅGABHIMADEVA III (1211-1238 A.D.)

Anaᅅgabhimadeva III, born of queen Malhanadevī, succeeded his father Rājarāja III in the Śaka year 1133 corresponding to 1211 A.D.¹ Although he inherited a large kingdom stretching from the river Gaᅅgā in the north to the river Godāvarī in the south, the happenings in the northern border made his task as a ruler quite challenging. With the foundation of the Delhi Sultanate in 1206 A.D. and the establishment of the Muslim power in Bengal, the threat of a Muslim invasion had become a constant menace to the Gaᅅga kingdom. In the West, Anaᅅgabhimadeva had to recover the Sonapur-Sambalpur tract which was still under Kalachuri occupation, and in the south he had to face the powerful Kākatiyas of Warrangal.

We have already stated that Anantavarman Codagaᅅgadeva² and his son Kāmārᅅava VII had made unsuccessful attempts to recover the Sonpur-Sambalpur region in the upper Mahānadī valley of western Orissa from the Kalachuris. While Codagaᅅgadeva's campaign against the Kalachuris was frustrated by Ratnadeva II,³ Kāmārᅅava VII was badly defeated by the Kalachuri king Prithvideva II.⁴ Dr. K.C. Panigrahi observes that the

1. Rajaguru, S.N., History of the Gaᅅgas, (Bhubaneswar, 1972), p.47.

2. See: above, pp. 4ff.

3. HCIP, V: The Struggle for Empire, p.206; Panigrahi, K.C., History of Orissa, p.156; Sharma, R.K., The Kalachuris and their times, (Delhi, 1980) p.50.

4. HCIP., V: The Struggle for Empire, p.65; Sharma, R.K., op.cit. p.52.

Gaṅga and Kālachuri armies perhaps fought at Seorinārāyan, situated at a distance of 38 miles south-east of Bilāspur (Madhya Pradesh) on the left bank of the river Mahānadi¹. Anāṅgabhimadeva III shortly after his accession, renewed the bid to recapture the Sonpur-Sambalpur tract from the Kālachuris. In the Chātesvara temple inscription² it is mentioned that Vishnu, the Brāhamin minister (Sachiva) and general of Anāṅgabhimadeva III frightened the king of Tummāna on the bank of the Bhima river near Vindhyas so much so that the latter perceived Vishnu every where through³ out his kingdom.

(Vindhyādreradhisiṃma-Bhīmatatīnī-kunje....visnu-visnu-rasāvasāviti-bhayādvai-tandisah-pasyatah.....visvam-visnumayam yathā parinatam Tummāna prithivipateh.⁴)

Thus it is clear that Vishnu led the Gaṅga army into the territory of the king of Tummāna, which was the old capital of the Kālachuris of Ratnapur. The campaign was obviously undertaken to take possession of the Sonpur-Sambalpur tract. The ruler of the Kālachuri kingdom who was defeated by Vishnu was Pratāpamalla, the

-
1. Panigrahi, K.G., op.cit., p. 161.
 2. JASM, LXVII, i, (1898) pp.317-327; E.I., XXIX, pp.121-133; I.O., V, i, pp. 52-63.
 3. I.O., V, i, pp. 54,60.
 4. Ibid; Basu, N.N., wrongly read Tummāna Prithivipati as Tughana Prithivipati and identified him with Malik Izzudin-Tughril-Tughankhan of Lakhnauti (JASB., LXV, pp.233-234); Chakravarti, M.M., correctly read it as Tummāna Prithivi Pati and identifies him with a king of Tummāna. (Chronology of The Eastern Gangakings of Orissa ch.VII, 1903); H.C.Ray also identified the ruler with a king of Haihaya family (H.C.Ray, DHNI, 1, pp. 469ff).

or Sonapur in the west during the time of Anāṅgabhimadeva who was the sixth ruler of the Gaṅga dynasty. Dr. K.C. Panigrahi has identified Anāṅgabhimadeva of the Mādalāpāñji with Anāṅgabhimadeva III as he happens to be the sixth ruler in order of succession from Coḍaṅga¹deva.

The conquest of the Sonpur-Sambalpur region by Anāṅgabhimadeva III is also suggested by the Anantāvāsu²deva temple inscription which mentions that Chandrikādevī, the daughter of Anāṅgabhimadeva III was married to Paramardideva or Pramardideva, a scion of the Haihaya³ dynasty.

(Mukhaṁ-chandramivai-tasyā-vilokya-duhituh-
kila | chandradevi-muvācainām-nāmnābhima-
mahīpatih || ...pitrā-haihaya-vaṁsa-jāya
sucoye-candrapahā-candrikā-putriyam-
paramadi-nāma-bhajate ksatrāya-ratnānyitā⁴).

The Kālachuris were variously called as cedis and Haihayas, and therefore, Paramardideva of the Anantāvāsudeva temple inscription should be considered to be a Kālachuri prince whom Chandrikādevī was married. It appears that after the occupation of the Sonpur-Sambalpur tract, Anāṅgabhimadeva III decided to bring an end to the hostilities between the Gaṅgas and Kālachuris by forming a matrimonial alliance in which his daughter Chandrikādevī was given in marriage to the Kālachuri prince

1. Panigrahi, K.C., op.cit., p.162.

2. E.I., XIII, pp.150-155; OHRJ, 1, iv, pp.274-88; I.O. v, i, pp. 211-220.

3. I.O., V, i, pp. 217, 220.

4. Ibid., p.214.

younger son of Ratnadeva III¹ (1178-1198 A.D.). This is evident from the fact that Pratāpamalla was a weak ruler and his reign marked the decline and downfall of the Kālachuris of Ratnapur.² Pratāpamalla was ruling sometime between 1200-1225 A.D., and hence, he was the ruler whom Anāṅgabhimadeva III³ defeated. It seems that Anāṅgabhimadeva III took the advantage of the weakness of Pratāpamalla and commissioned his army under the command of Vishnu for the recovery of the Sonpur-Sambalpur tract sometime before 1220 A.D. His campaign was well timed and it fetched him not only a victory over the Kālachuris but also the Sonpur-Sambalpur region in the upper Mahānadi valley. The Kālachuri inscriptions make no reference to the successful campaign of the Gaṅga army in the Kālachuri kingdom during the reign of Pratāpamalla. But such an omission seems to be deliberate as the Kālachuris were defeated and were forced to cede the Sonpur-Sambalpur tract.

The occupation of the Sonpur-Sambalpur tract by Anāṅgabhimadeva III is corroborated by the Mādalāpāñji,⁴ the chronicle of the Jagannātha temple at Puri. In the Pāñji it is stated that the income of the state was increased with the expansion of the kingdom upto Sonpur⁵

1. HCIP, V, The Struggle for Empire, pp. 65-66.

2. Panigrahi, K.C. op.cit., p.162; Sharma, R.K., op.cit., p.55.

3. HCIP, V: The Struggle for Empire, pp. 65-66; Panigrahi, K.C., op.cit., p.162.

4. Mohanty, A.B., (ed), Mādalāpāñji (Oriya), (Cuttack, 1969).

5. Ibid., p.29.

Paramadideva. It is, however, difficult to suggest that Paramadideva belonged to the main line of Kālachuris ruling from Ratnapura, although it is certain that he was a prince of a Kālachuri family. Dr. K.C.Panigrahi observes that "Paramardideva was in some way connected with the war that took place between the Kālachuris of Ratnapur and Gaᅅga king Anaᅅgabhimadeva III". Since we have no clear information about Paramardi's participation in the battle between Gaᅅgas and Kālachuris, it is difficult to offer any definite conclusion in this connection.

Paramadideva served Anaᅅgabhimadeva III as a general and continued as such during the reign of his brother-in-law Narasiᅅhadeva I. He was a great fighter and a brilliant general. The Anantavāsudeva temple inscription pays glowing tributes to him for the battles between the Gaᅅgas and the Muslim Nawabs of Bengal fought during the reigns of Anaᅅgabhimadeva III and Narasiᅅhadeva I.

The annexation of Western Orissa by Anaᅅgabhimadeva III has also been brought out by the Narla stone inscription. It is stated in this inscription that Madan Mahādeva was ruling over that area as a Governor in the Saka year 1153 corresponding to 1231 A.D. The Gaᅅgas continued their hold over western Orissa for quite a long time. This is evidenced by the Stambesvari temple inscription at Sonpur which mentions a Gaᅅga Governor

1. Panigrahi, K.C., op.cit., p.163.

2. I.O., V, i, p.220.

3. Orissa District Gazetteer, Kalahandi, p.49.

4. Ibid.

5. I.O., V, i, pp. 176-177.

named Vaidyanāthadeva during the time of Bhānudeva I (1264-1278 A.D. or 1279 A.D.).

As has been stated earlier,¹ Bakhtiyar Khālji sent the Sheran brothers to conquer Orissa in 1205 A.D., when the Gānga king Rajaraja III was the ruler.² The assassination of Bakhtiyar Khālji forced his lieutenants to abandon the plan of conquest. After Bakhtiyar Khālji's death, Bengal was under Ali Mardan Khālji for sometime. Sultan Shams-u-din Iltumish appointed Ghiyas-ud-din Iwaz as the Nawab of Bengal in A.H.612 corresponding to 1215 A.D. Thus Ghiyas-ud-din Iwaz was a contemporary of the Gānga monarch Anāngabhimadeva III.³ Iwaz consolidated his position in Bengal and proclaimed himself as an independent ruler. He shook off allegiance from the Sultanate at Delhi and even claimed the title of Sultan.⁴ He had to pay a heavy price for his recalcitrance as Sultan Iltutmish sent his troops to Bengal to chastise him.⁵ Iwaz was engaged in battles with Sultan Iltutmish and Nasir-ud-din Muhammad from 1225 A.D. He was finally defeated and killed in 1226 A.D. by the forces of Iltutmish.⁷

1. See; above, ch.I.

2. See; above, p.7

3. Riyaz-us-Salatin, p.71.

4. M.Haq, Some aspects of Muslim Administration in Orissa (Calcutta, 1980), p.3; HCIP, V, The Struggle for Empire, p. 133.

5. Ibid., p.133.

6. Haq, op.cit., p.3.

7. Ibid.

Minhaj-ud-din Siraj, the author to Tabaqat-i-Nasiri, mentions that Ghiyas-ud-din Iwaz invaded Jājnagara and collected tributes from the Rai of Jājnagara. Historians have identified Jājnagara with Orissa as the Muslim chronicles mostly refer to Jājnagara when they intend to refer to Orissa. Although it is claimed that Ghiyas-ud-din Iwaz invaded Orissa and collected tributes from its rulers, the details about the invasion are not mentioned. Ghulam Hussain Salim, the author of Riyaz-us-salatin, does not make any reference to Ghiyas-ud-din's expedition to Jājnagara (Orissa) let alone his collecting tributes from the Rai. This raises a doubt over the claim made by Iwaz that he invaded Orissa and collected tributes from its ruler. Historians have dismissed this claim as a distortion of truth.

On the other hand the Chātesvara temple inscription of Anāngabhīmadeva III makes an allusion to his conflict with the Yavanas, who were presumably the Muslim Nawabs of Bengal. The inscription refers to the defeat of Yavana king by Vishnu, the general of Anāngabhīma III

(Karnottam-sita-sāvakasya-subhatā-nekākīnā
nighnatah kimbrumā-yavanāvanindra-samare
tattasya-vārabratam).

The Yavana king of the inscription could very likely be

1. Tabaqat-i-Nasiri, V.I, p.587.

2. Panigrahi, K.C., History of Orissa, p.163; Banerji, R.D., HO.I, pp. 233; 240; JAHS, VII, p.234.

3. I.O., V, i, p.54, 60.

the Muslim Nawab of Bengal. Since Ghiyaz-ud-din Iwaz was the Nawab of Bengal from 1210-1227 A.D., he could be the Muslim ruler whom Vishnu defeated in a battle.¹ But the victory claimed by the Orissan monarch was of little consequence as it did not result in any annexation of territories. Since both Ghiyas-ud-din Iwaz and Anangabhimadeva III claimed victories over each other, it could be said that Iwaz invaded the Ganga kingdom and was driven out by the Ganga General Vishnu. The battle might have taken place before 1225 A.D. as Ghiyas-ud-din Iwaz was engaged in a struggle with Sultan Iltutmish and his son Nasir-ud-din in 1225 A.D. and was finally killed in 1226 or 1227 A.D.²

The defeat of the Muslim Nawab of Bengal by the Ganga general Vishnu, as suggested by the Chātesvara temple inscription, is corroborated by the Anantavāsudeva temple inscription³ which records that "In Codaganga's lineage was like a flag the heroic Anangabhima, whose profound strength was celebrated by the damsels of a multitude of hostile kings destroyed by his power, and who was exceedingly proud of his swift horses, the speed of which surpassed that of snakes' foes Garuda. He made an end of the war by defeating the Yavanas with impetuosity after entering into their territory beyond the frontier"⁴.

1. Haq, op.cit., pp. 3-5.

2. Haq, op.cit., p.3.

3. I.O., V, i, pp.211-220; E.I.X, xiii, pp.150 and OHRJ, I, No.4, pp. 274-288.

4. I.O., V, i, p.216.

(Yadvamse-vaijayanti-patamiva-subhato-
anaṅgabhimāḥ prabhāvah-pradhvastāratirāja
vraja-yuvati-yanodgita gambhirasārah i
Āsidāsivisāre-rādhikātaratarastā
drugarvorugarobah-svānte svāntapasarpata
yavamapi yavanam saṅgare sanjahāra.)

Anaṅgabhimadeva's military successes against the Kālachuris and the Muslim Nawab of Bengal emboldened him to turn towards the south. At this time in south India the chola empire, which had dominated the peninsula for about three centuries, was in a process of disintegration. The erstwhile feudatories of the cholas, the Hoysālas, Pāndyas, Yādavas and the Kākatiyas were engaged in a struggle for supremacy over the territory of the cholas. This protracted struggle afforded an opportunity to Anaṅgabhimadeva to occupy the veṅgi region comprising the fertile Godāvare¹ delta. The occupation of the veṅgi region was one of the grand designs of Anantavarman Coḍagaṅgadeva which could not, however, be materialised due to the chola supremacy over the veṅgi area. Anaṅgabhimadeva III temporarily succeeded in carrying his arms into the veṅgi territory, but his effort to occupy the veṅgi region was foiled by the Kākatiya ruler Gaṇapati (1198-1261), who, taking the advantage of the weakness

1. Ibid., p.212.

2. HCIP, V, Struggle for Empire, p.200.

3. Ibid., p.207.

of the chola king Rājarāja III (1215-1246 A.D.), occupied the Godāvarī Krishṇa delta¹. Gaṇapati even claims to have defeated the king of Kalinga in his Ganapeśvaram inscription² near Machhalipatanam. But such a tall claim does not seem to be probable as Anaṅgabhimadeva III continued his sway over the erstwhile Kalinga region upto the river Godāvarī. It could be that Gaṇapati frustrated the efforts of Anaṅgabhimadeva III to occupy the veṅgi region and established his supremacy over that area by putting an end to the rule of the velanatti chiefs. Some historians suggest that Gaṇapati forced Anaṅgabhimadeva III to cede the territory roughly denoting present East Godāvarī District³. Such an assumption does not seem to be correct as the Kākatiya supremacy was never extended over the territories to the north of Drākṣārama in the Godāvarī delta.

The discovery of two stone inscriptions⁴ of Anaṅgabhimadeva III on the south wall of the Arulāl perumal temple at Kānchipuram in Chingleput district of Tamil Nadu have led some historians to suggest that Anaṅgabhimadeva III extended his sway over Kānchipuram⁵. The first inscription records the grant

1. HCIP, V, Struggle for Empire, p.200; E.I., III, (1894-95)pp. 82ff.

2. Ibid; Srinivasachar, B.P., Corpus of Inscriptions in the Telingana district, (Hyderabad, 1940)

3. HCIP, V, Struggle for Empire, p.207.

4. I.O., V, i, pp. 79-83

5. E.I., XXXI, p.94

of the village by Samaladevi Mahādevi, the queen of Anāṅgabhimadeva III, for the worship and the offering to the God Allālnātha¹, while the second inscription records the gift of hundred twenty eight cows (sixty four milch cows and sixty four heifers and pregnant cows) and four bulls by Aniyāṅkbhimadeva for burning four perpetual lamps before God Perumā². The two inscriptions respectively dated in the regnal years 19 and 24 of Anāṅgabhimadeva III corresponding to 1230 and 1235 A.D.

T.V. Mahalingam has observed that Anāṅgabhimadeva III took the advantage of political turmoil in the chola kingdom during the reign of Rājarāja III and possibly occupied Kānchipuram³. He infers that Anāṅgabhimadeva might have been invited by a vassal of the chola ruler Koperunjiṅga⁴ who imprisoned Rājarāja III at Sandamaṅgalam in the south Arcot district. Koperunjiṅga was defeated by Vira Narasiṁha II of the Hoysāla dynasty who reinstated Rājarāja III on the chola throne⁵. The Hoysāla ruler also claims to have driven out the forces of Trikaṅga which obviously means the army of the Gaṅga monarch, Anāṅgabhimadeva III. In support of his contention Mahalingam points out that in the second Hoysāla

1. I.O., V, i, pp. 79-81.

2. Ibid., pp. 82-83.

3. E.I., XXI, p.95.

4. Ibid.

5. HCIP, V, The Struggle for Empire, p.247.

inscription there is a reference to ascertain 'dustha' element being uprooted by the Hoysāla king Vira Narasimha II from Kānchipuram. He believes that the 'dustha' element probably stands for the Gaṅga forces, who were driven out by the Hoysāla ruler. He further argues that the Allālnatha temple inscription is dated in the 19th regnal year of Anaṅgabhimadeva III corresponding to the 1230 A.D. and not in the regnal year of the cholas, a fact which justifies the occupation of Kānchipuram by Anaṅgabhimadeva III. Even after being repulsed by the Hoysāla ruler, Anaṅgabhimadeva's devotion to God Allālnatha was so intense that he donated perpetual lamps to the deity in his 24th regnal year corresponding to 1235 A.D.

The observations of Mahalingam were refuted by D.C.Sircar, who argues that the Gaṅga army under Anaṅgabhimadeva III could not have penetrated as far as Kānchipuram with out conquering the Kākatiya territories. Sircar observes that the Kākatiya ruler Ganapati, who was a contemporary of the chola ruler Rājarāja III and the three Gaṅga monarchs Rājarāja III, Anaṅgabhimadeva III and Narasimhadeva I held sway over the entire region to the south of river Godāvarī.

1. E.I., XXI, pp. 95ff.

2. E.I., XXXI, pp. 95ff.

3. Ibid.

4. Ibid.

5. E.I., XXXI, p.99; JIH., XXXV, pp. 75-89.

and extended his power of influence over Kānchipuram.¹ His supremacy over the area to the south of river Godāvārī is suggested by a large number of inscriptions discovered from Godāvārī, Krishna, Guntur, Kurnool and Cuddapa districts of Andhra Pradesh,² and his influence over Kānchipuram is brought out by two of his own inscriptions dated 1250 A.D. discovered in Kānchipuram itself.³ Sircar further observes that the Hoysāla ruler Narasiṃha II was dominant in the Kānchipuram area between 1229-1240 and, hence, it cannot be suggested that Anaṅgabhimadeva III held sway over Kānchipuram by 1230 A.D.⁴ Sircar's arguments are acceptable as there is no direct proof to suggest the occupation of Kānchipuram by Anaṅgabhimadeva III. It seems that Anaṅgabhimadeva III and his Queen probably made a pilgrimage to Kānchipuram and made donations to the deity Allālnātha Perumal. Such a type of donation is not uncommon in Indian history. In the 12th century the Kadamba chief Jayakesin II donated a village to God Somnātha in Kāthiawar of Gujarat.⁵ An inscription of Kākatīya ruler Pratāpruḍra I records a donation to the Vishnupada temple at Gayā.⁶ Therefore, it is difficult to suggest the occupation of Kānchipuram by Anaṅgabhimadeva III on the basis of two votive inscriptions found in the Allālnātha Perumal temple.

1. Ibid.

2. Ibid.

3. I.A., XXI, p.197.

4. E.I., XXXI, p.99.

5. E.I., XXXIII, p.103.

6. Ibid.

K.A. Nilakantha Sastri has suggested that Somaladevi Mahādevi, the queen of Anaṅgabhimadeva III was probably a sister or daughter of the chola king Rājarāja III. He draws his inference from the fact that the queen of Hoysāla king Narasiṃha II named Somaladevi was a chola princess. The observation of Sastri does not seem to be quite impossible although there is no direct evidence about Somaladevi Mahādevi being a chola princess and the daughter of Rājarāja III.

The Mādalāpāñji, the temple chronicle of Lord Jagannātha at Puri, mentions that Anaṅgabhimadeva III constructed a fort at Bārabāṭi village on the southern bank of river Mahānadi and named it Abhinava Vārānasi Kāṭaka. The fort town became the new capital of the Gaṅga kingdom. Anaṅgabhimadeva of the Pāñji has been identified by scholars with Anaṅgabhimadeva III and Abhinava Vārānasi Kāṭaka has been justifiably located in the Bārabāṭi fort area of the present city of Cuttack. The construction of Abhinava Vārānasi Kāṭaka by Anaṅgabhimadeva, as mentioned in the Mādalā Pāñji, has been supported by the Nāgari plates of Anaṅgabhimadeva III which mentions Abhinava Vārānasi Kāṭaka as the place of issue of the grant and quite likely the place of residence of the king. The Allālnātha temple inscription also mentions Abhinava

1. Sastri, K. A. N., The Cholas, p. 191.

2. Ibid.

3. Mohanthy (ed), The Mādalāpāñji, (Bhubaneswar, 1969), p. 27

4. Mahatab, H. K., History of Orissa, I, (Cuttack, 1959), p. 222

5. I. O., V, i, pp. 89-93; E. I., XXVIII, pp. 235-58ff.

6. Ibid., p. 89

7. Ibid, pp. 79-83

Vārānasi Kāṭaka as the place of residence of Somaladevi Mahādevī, the queen of Anāṅgabhimadeva III¹. Therefore, there should be no hesitation in accepting the Pāñji's information that Anāṅgabhimadeva III constructed a fort named Abhinava Vārānasi Kāṭaka, which served as the capital city of the Gaṅga rulers from his time. Anāṅgabhima also constructed a temple in honour of Jagannātha in the new capital. A discussion on the temple will be made later.

Anāṅgabhimadeva III called himself a Rāvuta or a deputy of Purushottama at Puri and dedicated his kingdom to the God². He acknowledged Purushottama-Jagannātha as the real ruler of his kingdom and dedicated every thing to the deity³. Purushottama-Jagannātha became the official state deity of the Gaṅga kingdom by substituting Gokarneśvara Śiva on the Mahendra mountain and Madhukeśvara Śiva at Mukhalingam. The persistent Śaiva tradition of the Imperial Gaṅga rulers was changed by Anāṅgabhimadeva III and a new tradition centring around Purushottama-Jagannātha had thus begun.

The Mādālāpāñji records that Anāṅgabhimadeva III made a detailed settlement of the variety of lands in the kingdom⁴. Since this piece of information is not supported by any epigraphic or other evidences it is difficult to accept the version of the Pāñji. It is further known from the Pāñji that Anāṅgabhimadeva III introduced the 'Chhatīsā-Niyoga' or thirty-six types of services in the

1. Ibid.

2. Eschmann, Kulke, Tripathi (ed), The Cult of Jagannatha and the Regional Tradition of Orissa (Delhi, 1986), pp. 150-155; E.I., XXX, (1954) p. 225; and I.O., V, i, pp. 79, 82, 87, 89, 94, 96, 108.

3. Ibid.

4. Mohanty (ed), The Mādālāpāñji, p. 31.

Jagannātha temple at Puri.¹

Anāᅅgabhimadeva III made donations to the Kurmeśvara temple at Srikurman, Laxmī-narasimha temple at Simhāchalam, Bhimeśvara temple at Drākᅅarama, Arulāl Perumal temple at Kānchipuram, Liᅅgarāja temple at Bhubaneśwar, Pātāleśvara temple at Puri and Batesvara temple at Pālur.² He is also said to have celebrated Hiranyagarbha-mahādāna and tulāpuruᅅa-mahādāna.³ He donated lands to god Purushottama and many brāhamāᅅas.⁴ Besides making donations to the learned pious brāhmaᅅas, he also carried out humanitarian works for his subjects. The Chāᅅeśvara inscription informs us that he constructed roads and dugout wells for the people.⁵

Anāᅅgabhimadeva III ruled for a period of 27 years i.e., from 1211 to 1238 A.D. His reign witnessed the political unification of the coastal tracts of Orissa with the western hinter-lands in the upper Mahānadī valley. Anāᅅgabhimadeva III could successfully ward off the Muslim attack in the north and made bold attempts to occupy the veᅅgi region in the south. He gifted his far-flung kingdom to god Purushottama and considered himself to be a ᅅauta or lieutenant of the deity. Ever since, such a theory of kingship became popular in Orissa.

1. See: Appendix.

2. I.O., VII, pp.43, 67, 69, 70, 77, 79, 80, 82, 84, 87, 88, 94, 95, 96, 97.

3. E.I., XXVIII, pp. 235-258, and I.O., V, i, pp. 61, 92; and OHRJ, Vol. XII, No. 4, (1964), p. 174.

4. Ibid.

5. E.I., XXIX, pp. 127ff.