Chapter VII.

From Vijayapala to Kirtivarman: Cedi-Candella Conflicts.

Vijayapala. - Vijayapala, the son of Vidyadhara, according to the Mānu Stone Inscription of the time of Madanavarman, succeeded him on the throne sometime after 1022 A.D., the last known date of Vidyadhara. In the absence of any record of his reign-period the length of time he occupied the throne can hardly be determined accurately. But as Nānyaura Plate of V.S. 1107 (1061 A.D.) was issued by his son, Devavarman, it may be presumed that Vijayapala must have ceased to reign before that date, i.e., 1061 A.D.

Epigraphic evidence that is available about him is derived from the records of his successors, viz., - (i) Mānu Stone Insc., (ii) Fragmentary Candella Insc. from Mahoba, (iii) Deogadh Rock Insce. of Kirtivarman dated V.S. 1154, and (iv) Nānyaura Plate 'B' of Devavarman dated V.S. 1107. Most of these records however make vague eulogistic references to the king (nrpo-nrpendrah) who is stated to have exterminated all the wicked and gladdened all good men and put an end to the Kali Age (ksapita nikhila duṣṭah pripiṭā-śeṣa-śiṣṭah kṛta Kaliyuga bhangah kṣoni- v. 6. Mānu Stone Insc.).

The only political incident of his reign however finds mention in the fragmentary Mahobā Inscription which refers to his conflict with Gāṅgeyadeva of the Kalacuri dynasty. V. 24 of the Inscription reads -

"Yahemagre bhīmaṃtupakṣeśāmānah/ āvahata jītavīḍvah so'pi
ḥṛt-pūndarikām mukulita rama garvagranthi Gāṅgeyadevah/"¹¹

(When Gāṅgeyadeva, who had conquered the world, perceived before him this terrible one, the lotus of his heart closed his knots of pride in battle).⁵

This statement no doubt looks like mere praśasti, but a closer examination would reveal that under Gāṅgeyadeva the Kalacuri power had not only recovered itself but was expanding on all directions.

A study of the Kalacuri records would also show that Gāṅgeyadeva affected extensive conquests and assumed the title, Vikramaśītiya. He is credited with achieving victory over the kings of Kīra, Āṅga, Kuntala and Uṭkaḷa.⁶ Even it is claimed in the Piwān Rock Inscription, issued during the time of Gāṅgeyadeva, and Jabalpur Copper Plate of Yasahkarna (v. 12)⁸ that he took up his residence at the feet of the holy fig tree at Prayāga. It may be remembered that the Doab region was under the influence of the Candellas till the time of Śīvaśāhara. So the expansion of the Kalacuris in that
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region could only be achieved at the cost of the Candellas. It is generally held that the successors of Vidyādhara lacked the ability of their illustrious predecessor. But an analysis of the situation would show that Vijeyapūla, the son of Vidyādhara, was only a child of the circumstances. The rot set in from the time of Vidyādhara himself. It has already been discussed how in spite of possessing undoubted military ability Vidyādhara failed to achieve any practical result in resisting the vandalism of the Turks. Though Kālāśa of course did not fall to the Sultan, still it cannot be denied that the invasions of the Turks seriously undermined the prestige and position of the Candellas and damaged the integrity of the Candella organisation. So long Vidyādhara was alive the outer structure of it was however maintained, but with his death it was no longer possible for his successor to stem the tide. To this may be added another menacing factor, the rise of an ambitious ruler, imbued with the vision of empire-building, among the Kalacuris, viz., Gāngeyadeva. These brought about an inevitable diminution of the Candella dominion. Even those states which during the heyday of the Candella power came within the orbit of its political influence, now felt the impact of the rising Cedis. This has further been confirmed by the statement of Baihaqui, who records that when Ahmad Niyaltigin, the general of the Yāminī King Masud I invaded Banaras in c. 1034 A.D., that city was included within the dominion of 'Gāṅ' (Gāngeya).

It may be noticed that even the Mahoba record admits Gāngayadeva to be 'jitavisva' (conqueror of the world)."

Therefore it appears that during the reign of Vijayapāla, the Candella dominion lost some territory in the eastern region. The western side was however not disturbed, as the Paramāras of Mālwa, their neighbour in the west, maintained status quo with them, and there is no evidence of any conflict between the two powers.

As regards the personal life of Candella Vijayapāla, it may be observed from the records that he has generally been praised for his virtuous conduct (Subhacarita pavitra) and that he has been endowed with such imperial titles as "Parama-bhattāraka Mahārājādhirāja and Paramesvara. The name of his queen, Bhuvanadevi, the mother of Devavarman, his son and successor, is found in Nāyaura Plate 'B' of the latter's reign. The illustrious Kṛttivarman was his another son, who also claim to be the successor of Vijayapāla in a number of Candella records viz., Māu Stone Inscription of Madanavarman, Fragmentary Candella Inscription from Mahoba and Deogadh Rock Insc., which make no mention of his brother, Devavarman. As there is no evidence of any dynastic conflict it has been held that Devavarman succeeded Vijayapāla but after a short spell of reign the throne passed to his brother, Kṛttivarman.

In the sphere of internal administration of the Candella state under Vijayapāla it is highly interesting to note that the office of the Chief Minister continued in the

same family and Mahipala, the son of Sivanaga the Mantrimukhya of Vidyadhara, now carried on the affairs of the state in a most efficient manner. It is claimed in V. 26 of the Mau Inscription that Mahipala became the standard of comparison among good ministers (susaciveamu babhuva nidarsanam).

Devavarman. - Devavarman is known to us only from two of his own records, one dated in V.S. 1107 (1061 A.D.) found at Nanyaura in the Hamirpur district of U.P. and the other dated in V.S. 1108 (1052 A.D.) found from the Charkhari Darbar in Central India. He claims in these records to be the son and successor of Vijayapala (Paramabhattaraka Maharahuladhira Paramesvara Vijayapaladeva-padamudhyata) and assumes the epithet of 'Kalañjaradhipati' (Lord of the Kalañjara fortress). In most other Candella records Devavarman is omitted and Kirttivarman is stated to have been 'meditating on the feet of Vijayapala'. Such an exclusion from the genealogy naturally arouses suspicion that there might have been dynastic quarrels, which resulted in the overthrow of one by the other prince. In the absence of any evidence it is however not possible to be definite about it.

A review of the political condition would show that already during the last lap of Vidyadhara's reign the Candellas were facing a critical position, which was further endangered by the rise of the Cedis, who for sometime even

suppressed the former. The literary work, Prabodhacandrodaya distinctly mentions that the race of the Moon (the Candellas) was dethroned by the lord of Cedi (Cedipatina samamūlitum Candrânvaya-pārthivānām ...). Another such work, Vikramāṅka-devacarita describes Lakaṇṇikarna of the Kalacuri family as "Kāleḥ Kālaṇjara-giripater-yaḥ ..." (death to the lord of the Kālanjara fortress), which appears to be corroborated by the evidence of the Candella records in which Kṛttivarman is credited with recreating Candella power like the Creator. Therefore the reign period of Devavarman particularly may be regarded to have proved to be a dark period for the Candellas. It was most probably due to this that the Candellas did not like to recount the condition obtaining during this period in the records of the later rulers. In the process the unfortunate prince Devavarman also stand excluded even from the genealogical accounts of later period.

He had practically nothing to his credit and that is why no political incident could be mentioned even in the inscriptions of his own time. But the fact that he uses the title of Kālaṇjara-śipati shows that though the Candella ruler might have suffered defeat at the hands of Kalacuri Karna, yet he retained his hold on the strategic fortress of Kālaṇjara. The mention of the Yamuna on the banks of which the village Bhūtapallika was situated, as mentioned in the Chūrkharī Plate (V.S. 1108), indicates that Candella
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Devavarman maintained his hold on the territory extending up to the Jumna (Yamuna) in the north east, though Banaras might have been under the Cedis. Thus the sovereignty of the Candella rulers was not suppressed nor were their kingdom wholly occupied by the Kalacuris as a result of their victory. The Chārkhari Plate alludes to the existence of feudatories of Devavarman while describing him as "Mahāsāmanta-rājaputra-vandita-pādān".\(^1\)

A description of the qualities of his head and heart is available in both the inscriptions mentioned above. But the statement in the Nānyaura Plate (Y.S. 1107) that ‘by the fire of his prowess he has 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’, (pratāpanala kavālīt-ākhila dīk-ekravalah/ Sāngramāmagām nihatārāti vanītā vaidhavyadāna-dīkṣā-guruḥ/\(^L.3\) ), is no doubt a conventional prāśasti of a court panegyric.

The use of the title ‘Parama-Maheśvara’ by the king is also not without any significance. It reflects to the fact that the King was a strong Saivite himself. His great regard for his mother, Bhuvanadevi, is evident from the Nānyaura Grant, which records the gift of the village of Kāthahau in the Ranemaua situated in Rajapura avastha to the Brahmin to mark the occasion of the death anniversary (samvatsarika).\(^2\)

---
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Kirttivarman.—By the middle of the 11th century A.D., Kalacuri Lakṣmi-Karna secured a predominant position in the political set-up of Northern India, mainly by virtue of his military achievements over the neighbouring states. It has already been mentioned that the Candellas suffered terribly at his hands, and the reign of the Candella prince, Devavarman, son of Vijayapāla, was most probably cut short during this Cedi-Candella encounter.

Devavarman, it appears, died without any lineal descendant, and the throne passed laterally to his younger brother Kirttivarman. It was indeed a happy augury for the Candella state which gained a fresh lease of glorious existence mainly through the efforts of the latter. Both literary and inscriptional evidence vie with each other in extolling the achievements of King Kirttivarman.

The available Candella records clearly indicate that their fortune was at a low ebb prior to the accession of Kirttivarman, and that Kalacuri Lakṣmi-Karna was mainly instrumental in effecting a temporary eclipse of the Candella power. Bilhana, the court poet of Calukya Somēvara I (1044-68 A.D.) seems to have referred to this event in his 'Vikramaṅkadeva-carita', wherein Karna has been described as 'Kālaḥ Kālāṇjara-giripateryah', death to the lords of the Kaliṇjara mountain. The eloquence of the Candella records in describing the glorious recovery of the Candella state by Kirttivarman, testifies to the importance attached to the victory of the Candella king over the Čedis.

It may however be construed to indicate an indirect admission of the defeat suffered by the Candellas at the hands of the Cedi prince previously.

Ajaygaadh Rock Inscription of Viravarman (V.S. 1317) refers to the victory of Kirttivarman over the forces of Karna in V. 3 as follows -

Kumbhodbhavah Karna payodhipane prajesvaro mütana-rājya-śrṣṭau/<
Tatrāṣa vidyādharā-gīta-kīrttah Śrī Kīrttivarmanā-kaśītīpo
gajātyma//

"In that race there was a ruler over the earth whose fame is sung by the vidyādharas, who was a pitcher-born (i.e., Agastya), in swallowing that ocean, Karna, and the lord of creatures in creating anew the kingdom, the illustrious Kīrttivarman".

The expression 'mūtana-rājya-śrṣṭau' is highly significant. It indicates that the kingdom which was engulfed in the surging tide of the Cedi invasion, has now been created anew, after the enemy had been completely defeated.

Another inscription from Mahoba also refers to the achievements of Kīrttivarman in the following words -

Gras tan oka kṣaṁbhṛta-muccakair-balabaribhir Lakṣmikarnam mahārṇavam-udhhatam/

"Just as Purusottama having produced the nectar by churning with the mountain (Mandara) the rolling milk-ocean, whose

high waves swallowed many mountains, obtained the Goddess of Lakṣmi, together with the elephants (of the 8 regions), he (Kīrttivarman) acquired fame by crushing with his strong arms the haughty Lakṣmi-Karna, whose army had destroyed many princes, obtained splendour in this world together with elephants.

This glorious episode in the history of the Candella dynasty has also been related in the prologue of the drama, Prabodhacandrādaya, an allegorical drama, written by Śri Kṛṣṇa Misra. It will be noticed that just as both the inscriptions mentioned above, compare the forces of Karna with the rolling waves of the sea (Karnapayodhi; Lakṣmi Karna mahānavaṇī), probably to indicate the magnitude of the invasion, so also in the drama we find the use of the expression 'Karnasaṅga-sāgara'. Then again in the Mahobā record, Kīrttivarman is compared with Purusottama (Viṣṇu) in recovering his Lakṣmi (the Goddess of Fortune, i.e., the kingdom or Rājya-Lakṣmi). In the drama also an almost similar expression has been used, where the army of Karna is compared to the Milk-Ocean, and Gopāla, who defeated the Cedi ruler on behalf of Kīrttivarman, is likened to Madhumathana, i.e., Viṣṇu. This coincidence, suggests Hultzsch, who edited the Mahobā Inscription, is probably

due to the fact that the composer of the Inscription knew the drama Prabodhacandrodaya and borrowed the description from it.

One cannot however fail to notice a serious discrepancy which exists between the account furnished by epigraphic sources and the one contained in the drama. In the former the credit for defeating the Cedi ruler Karna has been given to Kirttivaraman, but in the drama both the Sūtradhāra and the Naṭī state that it was Śri Gopāla who inflicted a crushing defeat on Lakṣmi Karna and re-installed the Candella prince on the throne. As the play was staged before Kirttivaraman, the reigning monarch, it may be presumed, as has been done by Dr. H.C. Ray, that the story given in the drama could not have offended the king as it was true.

The question therefore arises, who was this Gopāla, and what was his relationship with the Candella king? From the drama it appears that Śri Gopāla was held in high esteem at the court of Kirttivaraman, particularly by the feudatory princes. The Sūtradhāra says, "Adisto'smi sakala-samanata-cakra-marici-manjari-nirajita-araṇa-kamalena ... Śrimatā Gopālena". This means that he was ordered to stage the drama by Śri Gopāla on whose lotus-like feet were reflected the crest-jewels of the circle of the feudatory princes.

11. L. 6 "...Kṛnasemāsāgaram nimmahia Mahumahaneneva kīrasasmādhānādīta samaraviṇālaccāhī/". (Sanskrit rendering - Kṛnasemāsāgaram nimmathya Madhumathaneneva Kīrasesudramādīta samara vijayalakṣmiḥ/).
This passage is very important. But it is found that it has not been correctly interpreted by some scholars. They have relied upon this passage in inferring that Gopala served as the Chief Sāmanta or feudatory under Kṛttivarman. The relevant portion of the text which I have quoted does not lend any support to this view, which is based on 'sakalasāmanta-cakra-cudāmani' being taken as an epithet of Gopala. But it is not so, as it is a part of the compound, which includes 'maricī-maṇjarī-nirājita-caranā kamalena' to indicate the complete epithet of Gopala. There is no definite proof in support of this view afforded by the passage quoted. It would therefore be a mere guess if Gopala is taken as a chief sāmanta. It is noteworthy that the commentator Nāndillégopaprābhu in explaining 'Śrīmatā Gopālena' applies the designation 'rājā' to him, "Śrīmatā mahānuḥbhāvena Gopālena rājā". Hultzsch and following him V. Smith took Gopala to be a Brahman General of Kṛttivarman. It is not known why Hultzsch took him to belong to the Brahman caste.

We may next refer to the information supplied by the drama with regard to Gopala’s activities. He was the main architect of the 'digvijaya' of the ruler Kṛttivarman. With sword as his only friend (asilatāmātra-mitrā), Gopala extirpated the enemies not sparing even the women, the aged
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and the children (yasya stri-bala-vrddhavadhi nidhanavidhau viśruto'sau). With great passion he desired, as the Sūtradhāra says, to re-establish the sovereigns of the race of the Moon, dethroned by the lord of the Cedis, who has been compared to Rudra, the fire of destruction of all other royal families (yatah sakala-bhūpala-kūla pralaya-kālaṇi-rudrana Cēdipatina samūmūltam Candraṅvaya-pūrthivānān prthivyām-ādhipatyām sthīrīkārtum ayamasya saṁrāmbhah/). Gopāla having overcome Kāraṇa caused the rise of the illustrious Kṛttivārman, just as conscience overcoming delusion gives rise to knowledge (Vivekenaṝya nirjijita Kāraṇa-mohāvivijitam/ Śrī Kṛttivārmanapratapodhāv evaśvāyakṛtyah kṛtyah//9). Gopāla having acted as the saviour of the Candeśa sovereignty, and having re-installed Kṛttivārman there (saṁrajya Kṛttivārmanarapati-tilako yena bhuyoyo'bhvasoci//4), is regarded by the author to be as great as Viṣṇu, represented in the Man-Lion (Nṛsiṁha), the Primeval Boar (Mahā-Varāha) and Parasurāma incarnations.

These references taken together indicate that Gopāla must have shown exceptional skill as a military leader or a general in organising the campaigns of Kṛttivārman and winning victories for him. This is particularly supported by the passage in which Gopāla's part in Kṛttivārman's digvijaya is definitely mentioned (yathā khalvāya saṁhaja-suhrdo rājāh Śrī Kṛttivārma devāya digvijaya-vyāpar-āntarita para-brahmāṇanda-rasair-āhambhiḥ samūmūlita-vividha-vaśaya-rasāṅvāda-duṣita-iv-āśivahita divasāh/). As this natural

friend of king Kirttivarman was engaged in the 'digvijaya-vyāpāra' of the king, the enjoyment of the supreme bliss (witnessing the drama) was kept suspended, and the days were vitiated with various kinds of material pleasures. Thus his important role in the victorious expeditions of the king is clearly indicated in the passage.

Gopāla's services to the Candellas as Kirttivarman's 'Sahaja-suhrt' cannot be over-estimated. We do not gain very much by simply taking this expression to mean a natural friend. It may be pointed out that the term 'sahaja-suhrt' or 'sahaja-mitra' has some special significance in Hindu political philosophy. Kauṭilya applies the expression to denote the territory beyond that of the immediate neighbour, the latter being called an enemy (ari). "Pṛakṛti-mitra mātā-pitr-sambandhāṁ sahajam, dhanajyā-viśeṣā-adīrāṇavān kṛitrāma-mitrām" (Kauṭilya Arthaśāstra, Maṇḍala-yonih, sasthām-adhikaraṇaṁ, Samavayāmikāṁ prākaraṇaṁ). "He, whose friendship is derived from father to grand-father, and who is situated close to the territory of the immediate enemy of the conqueror, is a natural friend; while he, whose friendship is courted for self-maintenance is an acquired friend". (Shāmashāstry's Edn. P. 290). Mr. Ganapati Sāstri in commenting on this expression observes that one kind of Sahaja-mitra is, as already stated, the friendly state situated beyond the immediate neighbour-state ("svabhūmāyakā-vyavahitaṁ prakṛti-mitrāṁ ekam sahaja-mitrāṁ").23

22. The inference that Gopāla himself became 'viṣaya rasāsvadadusita' as found in D.H.N.I., II., P. 696., II. 14-15 is evidently unacceptable.

But there is apparent difficulty in accepting Gopāla as an ally of the Sahaja-mitra-type in the absence of any royal titles in the text, which neither assigns to him any specified territory.

The other type of sahaja-mitra, mentioned by Kautilya, as explained by Mr. Sastri, is represented by one’s cousins, sons of maternal uncles and paternal aunts ("Mātula-paitṛsvasayādirupam aparām sahaja-mitrām"). In the Śiśupāla-vaṣha kāvya also a similar expression is used to explain the relationship between Śrī Krṣṇa and Śiśupāla.

In the circumstances it may not be wrong to presume that the expression 'sahaja-suhrt', as used in the Prabodha-candrodaya nāṭaka, bears the meaning given to it by Kautilya, as commented on by Mr. G. Sastri. In that case Gopāla may be taken to have been a cousin of King Kirttivarman. It was Gopāla who organised the armies of the sāmanta chiefs and defeated the Cedi prince Karna, and it was he, who was mainly instrumental in reviving the Candella power. This was admitted by king Kirttivarman in permitting the drama to be staged in his own presence, and it is further proved by the interest he took in the performance of it, as mentioned by the Sūtradhāra in the passage:-

"Eajnah Śrī Kirttivarmanah purastād abhinotavyām bhavatā/ Asti-cūrṣya bhupataḥ sāpariṣica-śad-avalokena kutuhalām-iti//"

i.e., The drama is to be enacted before the king Kirttivarman.

who expressed particular curiosity to witness the show along with his courtiers.

There is therefore no real discrepancy between the literary and inscriptional accounts, as both mention the restoration of Candella power to have taken place during the time of Kṛttivarma. The 'digvijaya' referred to by Śrī Kṛṣṇa Misra is also attributed by him to Kṛttivarma. Kṛṣṇa Misra's drama only furnishes some necessary details about the leadership in the battle which resulted in the Candella victory. The leadership was in the hands of Gopāla, Kṛttivarma's 'sahaja-suhrt' or cousin, who must have also made himself conspicuous by organising a confederacy of the ṣāmentas of the Candella state.

As to the date of this glorious victory of the Candellas over Karna there is no definite evidence. The only dated records of Candella Kṛttivarma are Deogadh Bock Inscription of V.S. 1154 (1098 A.D.) and Kālanjar Inscription of V.S. 1147 (1090 A.D.). But as Karna abdicated his throne sometime before 1073 A.D., when Yasahkarna has already succeeded to him, it may be presumed that this incident happened in about 1070 A.D., i.e., at least 20 years earlier than the date of Kālanjar Inscription. Dr. D.C. Sircar has recently drawn our attention to an Image Inscription, which Dr. N.P. Chakravarti

28. Darbāt Śantinātha Image Ins. of V.S.1132(1075 A.D.). The name of the king, which was earlier read as Kṛttidhara by Dr. N.P. Chakravarti, has been recently read as Kṛttivarma by Dr. D.C. Sircar in I.H.Q., XXX., Pp. 183-85.
ascribed to the time of Kacchapaghāta Vijayapāla of the Dubkund branch. It has been re-edited by Dr. Sircar as belonging to the time of Candella Kīrttivarmāṇa, son of Vijayapāla, which goes in favour of the suggestion referred to above.

Besides this all-important Cedi-Candella encounter no other incident of political importance is indicated in the Candella records. The Deogadh record, dated in A.D. 1098 incised on a rock near the river-gate of the Deogadh fort, overlooking the Betwā. It records the construction of a flight of steps on the bank of the river by Vatsarāja, the Chief minister of Kīrttivarmāṇa, who is also credited with having constructed the Kīrtti-giri-dūrga (in honour of his master) defeating the enemies. Verse 6 of the record reads: "Khyāto babhūva kila mantripadaikamāтра Vācaspati tadiha mantra supunraḥbhūmā/

Yo yām samastām api maṇḍalām āṣau śatror āchīḍya Kīrtti-giri-dūrgam ādam vyādhatta//6". 29

The expression "samastām api maṇḍalām āṣau śatror āchīḍya" in the above verse has been translated by Kielhorn as 'having quickly wrested from the enemy the whole district (maṇḍala)'. Vincent Smith and Dr. Ray on the basis of this interpretation concluded that Vatsarāja appears to have conquered the Deogadh district in the Betwā valley for his
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master. But it may be pointed out that the inscription does not specify the name of the 'mandala' liberated by the minister, nor does it refer to any particular enemy of the Candellas defeated by him. Further there is no evidence to conclude that the Betwa valley was lost to the Candellas prior to the date of the record (1098 A.D.). It is quite possible therefore that the achievements of the minister appears to have been recorded in the inscription concerned in a figurative sense. The term 'mandala' in the particular context may mean the cardinal regions and not a particular district. It is not unlikely to presume that the minister by his wise policy stamped out some anti-social elements or internal enemies of the kingdom, who might have raised their heads during the weakness of the Candella power prior to the time of Kirttivarman.

In the administration of the kingdom it appears that Kirttivarman was aided by a group of very capable ministers and officials.

The services of Sri Gopala, the cousin of (sahajasuhrt) of the king, who was in charge of the feudatory chiefs and their forces, has already been mentioned. He directed the military operations of the king and achieved unique successes against the Cedi prince, Karna, the chief enemy of the Candellas.

Reference has also been made to Vatsaraja, who claims to have enjoyed the position of the Chief counsellor (amatya-Mantrindra) of the king. He has been compared to Vasaspati in counselling.32.

Another important minister was Ananta, belonging to the hereditary line of ministers mentioned in the Mau Record.\(^3^3\) His father, MahTpaLa, it may be remembered, served as the minister of Vijayapala, the father of Kṛttivaman. Ananta, during his service career earned the distinction of acting in different capacities, viz., hastyāśāvena (leader of horses and elephants) in leading successful expeditions against the enemy forces; Purabalādhyakṣa (Superintendent of the forces of towns, i.e., the pivot of organising the defence of the capital, and as such acting as an unrivalled protector of property (Ṛṣasvagopta), and 'ādhimata saciva' (the approved minister) of the king. With his mature knowledge and experiences in different branches of administration, both civil and military, he was later appointed by king Kṛttivaman to act as a Privy-Counsellor, counselling the king in confidential matters (Māntri mantreṣṭhikāre sumahati hṛdayam guṇha viśrāmbha kṛtye).\(^3^4\) It is claimed on his behalf in the Mau Cemella Inscription that, 'when a king has for his guide a minister of noble birth, endowed with understanding, uprightness and similar qualities, then there is nothing so high as it would be more difficult for him to attain. No wonder then that the lord Kṛttivaman by his fame, good acts, and prosperity surpassed the son of Dharma, even when that best of guides was governing the earth'.\(^3^5\)

\(^{33}\) I.I., I., Rp. 200, 205.

\(^{34}\) ibid., V. 30.

\(^{35}\) ibid., V. 31.
Besides those ministers there is mention in the Ajaygadh Rock Inscription of the time of Bhojarman of another officer of Kirttivarman, named Mahesvara, belonging to the Vastavya Kayastha family of Tarkarika, whose father, Thakkura Jajuka was granted the village of Dusada by the Cundella king Gandha. For his distinctive services to the king, Mahesvara was awarded the title of 'Visiya' of Kalañjar along with the grant of a village named Pipalāhika. Visiya is a new designation not met with in any other record, but in all probability it refers to an administrative post associated with the fort of Kalañjar. Alternatively the term 'Visiya' may indicate the introduction of a system of awarding honours and titles to officials in recognition of their meritorious services. It is no doubt a feature which indicates that the internal administration of the kingdom was in a well-ordered state under careful supervision of the monarch.

That works of public interest received close attention of King Kirttivarman is alluded to in local traditions. It had been observed by V. Smith that 'the Kirat Sagar Lake, 12 miles in circumference, to the west of Mahoba, was the work of Kirttivarman'. 'Another Kirat Sagar, no doubt contemporary, exists at Chanderi, in Lalitpur District'. A third tank, named 'Budhiyā-Tal, in Kalañjar fort, according to Cunningham, is associated by tradition with the name of

38. I.A., XXVII., P. 134.
Kirttivaman. The name of this ruler is also connected with some buildings at Ajaygadh and Kālañjar.

Kirttivaman was also a great patron of arts and letters. It has already been mentioned how under the patronage of Kirttivaman a highly philosophical drama like 'Prabodhacandrodayam' was composed and staged in his presence. It has expressly been mentioned in the preambles of the drama that the king evinced a keen interest in the drama by being present with all his court at its performance. This however reveals an aspect of king's life, who spent his leisure hours in intellectual and cultural entertainments in the company of his courtiers.

As for his religious inclination it may be stated that he was definitely a Saiva, as is evidenced from inscriptional references. Kirttivaman however following the tradition of his ancestors was not only tolerant to other sects but even patronised them occasionally. The Deogadh Inscription unhesitatingly describes him as 'agadam nutanai Viṣṇu' or a new Viṣṇu without his club (gadā). The expression 'agadam' has been interpreted by some to mean 'free from disease' which reminds us of the local tradition current in Kālañjar, which believes that King Kirttivaman was a leper, and is said to have recovered his health by bathing in the Budhiyā Tal within the fort. The Mahoba Inscription also in referring to the achievements of Kirttivaman against

40. ibid., XVIII., P. 238.
41. ibid., XXXVII., P. 135.
Kalacuri Laksmi-Karna calls him a 'Purusottama'. All these go to show that he had no bitterness against Vaishnavism.

The Darbat Sunitmath image inscription of V.S. 1132 (1075 A.D.), which has been ascribed by Dr. D. C. Sircar to the reign of Candella Kirttivarman reveals the patronage of the ruler to the followers of the Jaina faith. If the reading of 'Kulamatyavinda' (the group of hereditary ministers) is admitted, then firstly we get the names of two Jaina officers of Kirttivarman, Pahila and Jaju, and secondly we learn that a sresthin, a representative of the mercant community graced the court of the Candella ruler. Pahila of the Darbat record, according to Dr. Sircar is identical with Pahilla of the Grahapati family, mentioned in another Jain image inscription of Khajuraho of V.S. 1215 (1158 A.D.). So even adherence to a different religious community constituted no bar to administrative appointments under the Candella king.

42. 3.I., I., P. 219., V. 26.
44. ibid., P. 185.
45. 3.I., I., P. 151.