CHAPTER-III

The Ideological and Institutional Background-II: Kingship and Religion in early Medieval North India

Kingship, which was considered a divine function in ancient India, became more functional and less divine in the early medieval period. The King's divinity originated in his sacred ancestry, but he had to prove his authenticity as a king through the quality of his rule. The political and religious writers of the time defined the true king as the one who performs rightly the duties proper to a king. The Dharmasāstras made these tasks unambiguously clear - procurement of the success of dharma, through the protection of the brāhmaṇas and temples, care of the tīrthas and holy places, reverence of and homage to the holy ascetics and help to their maṭhas and āśramas; accomplishment of the caturvāraṇāśramadharma; and the general welfare of people through the creation of an atmosphere of purity and rightness which attracted to the kingdom divine blessings and prosperity. Different dynasties of the period took these objectives seriously. They strove to realize as many pious works as they could, the result of which was great support to the development of the Brahmanical religion during the period.

A novelty also arose during the period, in the closed association between the kings and the ascetics. The context for it was a more syncretic conception of kingship and the admission
of ascetic knowledge into the previous Brahmanical background. The king was considered as a sacred administrator who could manage the secret power of the kingdom and produce victory over all kinds of evil, and generate wealth and prosperity. The ascetics were the principal agents for harnessing the magic power (śakti) and they accelerated its general manifestation in the kingdom. In view of such a vital role of the ascetics they attained in the early medieval kingdoms a position close to the kings and an authority without precedent. It became also the means by which Brahmanical monasticism gained ascendancy in northern India.

III.1 Some major early medieval dynasties of north India, their religious affiliations and patronage.

III.1.1 Harṣa

Harṣavardhana was the son of Prabhākaravardhan and Yaśōmatī, scion of Puṣpabuti, the founder of the royal house of Thānēśvar (Kurukshetra, Haryana), one of the small kingdoms which conserved its autonomy and traditions after the collapse of the Gupta Empire and the Hūṇas' invasion. Harṣa was born in A.D. 593 bearing signs of a future cakravartin, a universal ruler. Through sheer determination and military success Harṣa became the king of kings and achieved and the unification of a large part of India. He also controlled the territory of Kanauj at its moment of supremacy. Harṣa's military genius, magnificence, magnanimity and fame have ensured for him a place of honour among the
greatest rulers of India.

Harṣa was the prototype of the early medieval monarch. His government followed the ancestral style of absolute sovereignty centred in his person as king. He was the supreme administrator and the first person of the state. Hailing from a devoted Śaiva family, Harṣa probably maintained his Śaivite faith till his death, but he was a protector of dharma as was Aśoka the Great centuries before. As a zealous accomplisher of dharma and danda, He patronized brāhmaṇas and non brāhmaṇas and was a friend of the Buddhists and the Jainas.

Harṣa’s government functioned on the three traditional power (śakti) or capacities for action in the service of dharma: prabhu śakti (sovereign power) was incarnated in the person of the king; mantra śakti (advisory power) vested in the Council of Ministers consisting of wise, learned and senior officers with the king as the head; utsaha śakti, the strength and force of the state was embodied in the army, of which the king was the supreme commander, Harṣa personified these three powers in combination (śaktitrayasaya) and these three emanated from him as the priyadarśika (the beloved, the preferred, the anointed), because he occupied that position by and for dharma.

Harṣa’s administration is a classic example of the early medieval style of central control combined with local autonomies represented by different tiers of sāmantas who acknowledged his
suzerainty. The structure of Harṣa's court would thus offer a sharp contrast to political organization of early historical times. Harṣa vindicated constantly his supreme sovereignty touring around the kingdom in a triumphal manner, periodically shifting his capital.12 The movement of the king with his ministers, high officers and army through the territory was intended to impress the people and the feudatories with the pre-eminence and incomparability of his power. The unity of the country was maintained and tax payments were secured through diplomacy, largesse or use of force. These also ensured the loyalty and subjection of the people and of the feudatories. Coming up against such phenomenon of an itinerant government, one is immediately reminded of the wandering spirit that was the universal stamp of the ascetic principles discussed in Chapter I.13 Even more striking in this context is the fact that Harṣa had wished to take on the ascetic robes but "Mahālakṣmī took him in her arms and impressing all the royal marks on all his limbs forced him, however reluctant, to mount the throne, and since he had taken a vow of austerity he did not swerve from his vow".14 Fortune touched Harṣa and indicated to him a mārga equivalent to asceticism. A just government with a just king as the head possessed the power (śakti) at the universal level equivalent to the tremendous mystic power the ascetic accumulated at the personal level by tapas. Harṣa's itinerant government, while at the practical level it obtained the objective of
exhorting the people to subjection and payment of tributes, was at the philosophical level the symbol of devotion to rule: the action of dharma - political asceticism. Denying himself the repose of the apolitical life Harṣa sacrificed most of his daily time to royal duties (political-cum-religious) and an important part of his life going from place to place. He was a cakravartin, one who is moved by and for dharma; and dharma is put in action by power. Universal dharma required action by the universal ruler.

Harṣa as an itinerant ruler was not an exception. Rulers used to go around time to time. They did this not only to parade their armed power or splendour but often for religious purposes, including in their tours visits to holy tīrthas where they performed sacrifices, had purificatory and symbolic baths on special occasions and gifted largesse as a way of expressing their magnificence and in a very practical way to support religious institutions, as we explained in Chapter-II. Pious works were the karma of the rulers, the means to purify their government, maintain unity, peace and justice and secure affluence and the success of dharma.

Harṣa’s state apparatus was large and well planned and the division of the territory continued the partition into bhuktis, viṣayas, pāṭakas and grāmas traditionally handed down by the Guptas. So also the complicated network of feudal hierarchies, which Bāṇa describes when visiting the Camp of Manitara, where he
saw "three courts full of subject kings" who accompanied the great king. Titles and posts also continued from the Gupta times.

Faced with the necessity of subjecting some rebel local power or counterbalancing his arch-enemy Pulikēsin II (608-642), the great Cālukya King on the one hand, as also the ideal of emulating King Aśoka’s ahiṃsā doctrine on the other, Harṣa had to find a way of expiation, which he did by patronizing two magnificent religious events. One was the great Buddhist convention at Kanauj of the Mahāyāna Masters to meet the distinguished visitor Yuan Chwang to which kings, theologians, brāhmaṇas and Jainas were also invited. The other was the Mahāmokṣa Pariṣad at Prayāga where half a million persons attended the celebrations for two and a half months. These two actions plus his undisputed position in north India and his embassies to China reflected his standing in his own eyes as universal Lord, patron of all religions, and conserver of dharma. In the south, Pulikēsin II claimed the similar position. Both rulers set a precedent and defined a model of kingship. In north India the path of dharma set down by Harṣa was used as a model by almost all succeeding rulers (for instance, the use of the Harṣa era) who saw themselves as pre-eminent protectors of dharma.

III.1.2 The Pratihāras

The Pratihāra dynasty was founded by the brāhmaṇa Haricandra. The inscription of Mihira-Bhūhja discovered near
Gwalior,\textsuperscript{20} which delineates the genealogy of the family, speak of Nāgabhāṭa I who frustrated an intended Arab invasion in western Indian c. A.D. 756. Nāgabhāṭa earned immense prestige with his victory which helped him to build up a solid kingdom and start alliances with other branches of the family.\textsuperscript{21} Vatsarāja was the next Pratihāra monarch who reigned from Jāvālipura and was a patron of Jainism. He expanded his dominion over the whole Rajputana and important areas of north India, and in the process clashed with the other two powers of the time and was embroiled in the "battle for Kanauj" or the triple war among Pālas, Raśtrakūṭas\textsuperscript{22} and Gurjara-Pratihāras. The struggle was for supremacy over north India and for the former imperial capital, Kanauj, a real symbol of paramountcy. Desirous of building a sacred genealogy and respectability to their regal power the Gurjara-Pratihāras claimed to be descendents of Rāma's brother Lakṣmaṇa who performed a sacred work named pratiharaṇa, conferring that appellation on the family.\textsuperscript{23} They were no fanatics in orthodoxy, and permitted the free movement of all sects. Under their rule the Pāśupata and Mattamayūra line of Śaivism became strong and influential in Rajasthan, Gujarat and west Madhya Pradesh. Gwalior, the seat of one of the Gurjara branches, was the centre of the Mattamayūras and Sirohi, Marwar, and other areas of Rajputana became the nuclei for the irradiation of Pāśupata activities. Śaktism, which as we shall see in the next chapters, was one of the most important religious
innovations in the early medieval times and was taking shape in this region against the backdrop of a benign Pratihāra disposition. Śaivism and Jainism, the most popular religious in Rajasthan, Gujarāt and western Madhya Pradesh were strongly influenced by the Śākta tendencies. The cult of the Great Mother or the Great Goddess, a very primitive manifestation of cosmological and theological ideas, asserted itself forcefully in these regions where again a mixing of cultures was taking place. Brahmanical orthodoxy, after a protracted fight against the Buddhist, Jaina and other sects became more tolerant and even suffered itself to be penetrated by Tantric ideas which affected all religions in the early medieval times. The religious process must certainly have affected the political process, though it is not easy to prove its ramifications. The king are represented in various forms of association with worldly śakti. And pure śakti was produced in the religious centres, or more precisely, in ascetic places. The secular order and the religious order were mutually supportive. The king provided to the temples and maṭhas material support; the latter, in turn, performed internal purificatory works. The entire kingdom was the beneficiary of this arrangement.

There is adequate inscripitional evidence of this interaction (a) The inscription of A.D. 736 of the Gurjara king Jayabhata III of the Gurjara-Broach branch (the list of Gurjaras of Nandīpurī is given in the Appendix of Epigraphia Indica
(APP. EP. IND.), Vol. XIX-XXIII, p. 391), presents the genealogy of the family from Kariga, the founder of the branch, "who supported families of brahmañas". It records the grant by Jayabhata III to a brahmaña, a student of the Yajur Veda.²⁵ (b) A fragmentary Pratihāra inscription of the ninth century, praising Śiva in his Ardhanārīśvarā form (man-woman, the emblem of Śaktism), refers to "the sacred duty of distributing wealth among the brahmañas". There is also mention of the construction of a temple to Viṣṇu, which was richly endowed.²⁶ (c) The inscription on the wall surrounding the city of Jodhpur, dated c. 840, proclaims the military exploits of a Pratihāra chief called Bauka whose ancestor was brahmaña (probably Hariśchandra). The brahmaña ancestor married two wives, a brahmaña woman and the other of a lower caste. The sons of the brahmaña wife became Pratihāra brahmañas and kings; the other wife only had sons who were "wine bibbers".²⁷ (d) The inscriptions of Kakkuka, the son of Kakka, belonging to one of the feudatory branches of the Pratihāra family,²⁸ on a column in Ghatiyālā, a village 22 miles away from Jodhpur, speaks of the visit of Kakkuka to the place where he had meetings with brahmañas, kṣatriyas and vaiśyas of the locality promising them enough means of livelihood. He also established there a hatta and mahājanas or merchants.²⁹ (e) Even as late as A.D. 1221 were registered two grants of the Pratihāras of Śivapurī, Gwalior. One is the grant of a village by Malayavarman to a brahmaña by name Bhēraṅga. Malayavarman exhibits proudly his
genealogy coming from the first Pratihāras and declares himself "a worshipper of gods and protector of the brāhmaṇas".

III.1.3 The Pālas

Gōpāla (A.D. 650-770), the founder of the Pāla dynasty, assumed the leadership of an area that was in need of a central direction. Dharmapāla (A.D. 770-810), his successor, was forced to meet the challenge of his two powerful contemporaries, the Pratihāras and Raṣṭrakūṭas. His initial success in the "triple war" mentioned earlier made him the biggest authority in the region, receiving the fealty of many chieftains of eastern India. The Pālas assistance and devotion to Buddhism, is well known. Dharmapāla was the founder of the Vikramaśīla monastery at Magadha and gave many donations to Buddhist institutions. Devapāla (A.D. 810-850), his successor, continued expanding his territory. A great patron of Buddhism, Devapāla elevated the Nālandā University to the highest academic glory not only in India but perhaps in the whole Eastern world. He gave scholarships to students, financed travels of monks and maintained relations with other Buddhist rulers of distinct countries as the Śaṅkīndras of Śrīvijaya.

Though unambiguously favouring Buddhism, the Pālas continued carefully the tradition of the protection of Brahmanism. The Brahmanical culture was widespread in eastern India since the times of the Guptas. Land grants were given by kings, princes,
royal officials, noblemen and civilians to brāhmaṇas and Brahma-
nical temples, to śramaṇas, religious organizations and monastic
establishments.35 That tradition of protection to brāhmaṇas and
Brahmanical institutions continued in Pāla, and more vigorously,
in the post-Pāla or Sāna period, as epigraphical records bear
witness.34

Vedic sacrifices were performed during the Gupta times and
probably continued centuries thereafter. The Damodarpur Copper
Plate Inscriptions of the time of Budha Gupta (A.D.482)36 provide
details to this effect. Also the Kalaikuri Inscription36 of A.D.
441 speaks of a grant to maintain "the five daily sacrifices"; so
does the Mallāsarul Copper Plate Inscription of Vijayasēna.37 All
these grants were made to brāhmaṇas or to Brahanical temples to
perform rites, maintenance, repairing and defraying the daily
expenses of the religious routines. The abundant references to
sacred fires, Purānic deities, and brāhamāṇas learned in the four
Vedas through the several inscriptions of the fifth, sixth and
seventh centuries bear witness to the prevalence of Brahmanism in
Bengal and eastern India, and its cultural influence was greater
than that of other religions, being itself the great backdrop
against which other religious branches made their appearances.

The Pālas continued donating generously to the brāhmaṇas,
as examples may be cited the Monghyr Copper Plate Inscription of
Dēvapāladēva38 or the Badal Pillar Inscription of Nārāyanapāla,39
which mentions the brāhmaṇa Garga, Minister of the great Dharmapāla, one of the most distinguished brāhmaṇas of the history of Bengal. The Bādāl record makes clear the close association between the Pālas and the brāhmaṇas. Another interesting document comes from Gayā in Bihar, and it is the Gayā Stone Inscription of the time of Nayapaladēva (A.D. 1038-1053), one of the later Pālas. It describes the Brahmanical ambience where "the loud voices of the brāhmaṇas, the smoke of the sacrificial fires and holy smells filled the place".

Tripathi hypothesizes that the revival of Brahmanism under the patronage of the Imperial Guptas brought about the spread of the Vedic culture in Bengal and Assam. The post-Gupta kings followed that tradition of protection to Brahmanism. The early medieval Brahmanism which flourished in Bengal, however, was penetrated by many Purānic conceptions and ideas. Vaiṣṇavism and Śaivism were the two main forms of expression of that Brahmanical stream.

Vaiṣṇavism was oriented to the worship of Kṛṣṇa under various names such as Gopāla, Śrīpati, Murari or others. Its cult of the avatāras (the successive incarnations of Viṣṇu) had an affinity to Buddhism and accepted the Buddha as an embodiment of Viṣṇu. Śaivism was equally popular and it is probable that after the Pālas and under the Sēna kings the cult of Śiva became popular and privileged. Perhaps during the tenth, eleventh and
twelfth centuries the regression of Buddhism was balanced with
the quick growth of Śaivism and Śaiva sects. The inscription of
Dharmapāla of Prāgijyōtisa, four who ruled over an area of Assam c.
A.D. 1120, starts with laudatory verses in honour of Ardhayuvatī-
śvara (Ardhanārīśvara Śiva), and records a grant of land made by
this king to a brāhmaṇa "who came from Madhyadeśa". The charter
has a seal that is possibly the Tantric symbol of a yoni, with an
elephant in the vertex.

And this brings us to one of the most important point for
discussion: Tantrism and kingship. N.N. Bhattacharya, quoting
Tāranātha, the Buddhist historian, says that during the Pāla,
period the siddhācāryas or Tantric gurus taught their knowledge
and made it popular. He calls Tantrism "a religion of the
masses", because it combined a series of non-orthodox elements,
such as magic, exorcism, divination, secretiveness, witchcraft,
all involved in an esoteric yogic system. The sources of Tantrism
are diverse (āryan and non-āryan) and it has its roots in
aboriginal traditions and magic beliefs. Besides, Tantrism has a
non-caste base.

Amidst the social turmoil that accompanied the
transformation discussed in Chapter II, and in a time of frequent
wars and disputes for supremacy, the secret doctrines — which
offered a possible superior status to everybody became extremely
attractive to people who were segregated from other more elitist
schemes of spiritual life. With time, Buddhism and Jainism which charmed people by their novel doctrines became excessively organized institutions: they suffered a process of "aristocrati-
ization" and with their properties and high centres of learning became distant and strange for the simple folk.

History was repeated when the siddhācāryas moved from place to place teaching their esoteric doctrines about the development of supranatural power. People with a poor cultural or ancestral background were drawn to them as a means of making a leap beyond their caste and cultural barriers. In itself Tantrism is a deviation of traditional Yoga system. It consists in achieving control of the body through the manipulation of the breath, the concentration in the power centres (or cakras) and the activation of the superior nervous system (the susuma artery and its net). The goal is to consummate the ultimate capacity of a human being (be a siddha) and experience the Inner Light through the use of the Supreme Power attained by the siddha (the śakti of nature or the Great Goddess). The control of the sexual energy is a key to this attainment. Its elevation to feed the superior nervous system produces a sublimated stage of mind and body.48

Both the people and the king felt attracted by the promise of Tantra. A doctrine that proclaimed that perfection could be attained through the personal endeavour for concentration was any time preferable to doctrines that taught a central programme of
moralization and ethical and political consciousness to promote adherence to a central rule. Tantrism often descended to excess and objectionable rituals but the leniency of the Pāla kings and the better communication network in the wide empire disseminated the Tantric ideas throughout the whole Pāla empire rapidly. Early medieval Hinduism was a veritable cauldron of ideas and theories originating from different provinces and people. The conquest of Nepal by the Pālas was a watershed in its history. Tantrism arrived in Nepal mixed with Śaivism, Vaiṣṇavism and Buddhism. The many manifestations of Tantric art are evident in the Bhaktapur Temple Complex (Bhadgaon), in Patan (Lalitpur), and other sites in the Valley. Brahmanical Hinduism had a peripheral influence on Tantric Buddhism in the formation of the kingdom of Nepal. The institution of kingship as one responsible for the fecundity of the world, which is manifested in many aspects of the Nepali civilization — for example, the festival where the participation of the king and the royal family is mandatory, is probably the main function of kingship in the Nepali social structure.

Nepal is a well documented case of early medieval Tantric influence. The influence of Tantrism on Tibet would make an interesting study in itself. Other places where similar influences were at work with similar results were Assam and the hilly north Bihar and Uttar Pradesh.
III.1.4 The Sēnas

The Sēnas\(^{52}\) came from south India. Ānanda Bhatta's Ballāla-carita (composed circa A.D. 1500) says that the Sēnas were scions from Kārṇa's great grand son Vīrasēna, besides that their status was brāhmakṣatriya, like that of the Paṇḍavas.\(^{53}\) The first historical Sēna ruler was Sāmantasēna, the kulaśīrodāma of the brāhma-kṣatriyas, "who slaughtered the wicked robbers of the wealth of Kārṇāṭa" (Kārṇāṭa-lakṣmī-luṇṭhakāṇām).\(^{54}\) This Sāmantasēna is described as born in the family of the rājaputras of the lunar family who were ornaments of the Rādhā country.\(^{55}\) Also Sāmantasēna is praised as the head-garland (kula-śīrodāma) of the Kārṇāṭa-kṣatriyas.\(^{56}\) Therefore, it would be inferred that the Sēnas came from Kārṇāṭa (Karnataka) and settled in the Rādhā country (possibly this is the northern part of West Bengal to the south and west of the Hooghli. The movement of different groups from Karnataka is very important because it permits to appreciate the circulation not only of religious factions from northern India towards the Deccan but also movements of political and military groups. Besides, the Sēnas coming from Kārṇāṭa, around the eleventh to twelfth century A.D., had already experienced the impact of Śaivism which was the strongest religious movement in the Deccan. The Sēnas carried to Bengala a new Śaiva fervour and contributed decisively to the dominance of Brahmanism in the region. Sāmantasēna, in the Deopara Inscription,\(^{57}\) is called brahmavādī and it is also known that he retired himself to a
hermitage on the Ganges when he was in old age. These points indicate that the Sēnas descended (or were strongly connected) from a line of Śaivācāryas. In the same Deopara Inscription, which is one of the earliest of the dynasty, still is remembered their brāhmaṇa ancestry which then was slowly forgotten.

Vijayasēna, the third ruler of the family, built the Sēna power taking advantage of the internal dissensions in the Pāla Empire and of the weakness of its king Madanapāla. The Deopara Inscription praises the foundation by Vijayasēna of the temple of Pradyumnaēvara (Śiva) in the village of Dēvapāra or Deopara, where this inscription was discovered. Vijayasēna used the biruda of arivṛṣabhaśāṅkara and the title of paramamāheśvara, which suggest his deep Śaiva devotion. Hence, it is important to underline the Śaiva character and affiliation of the Sēnas, their pious foundations favouring Śaiva institutions and their protection to brāhmaṇas. The new political order created by the Sēna rulers facilitated the wide diffusion of the Śaiva faith towards the north and east of Bengal and with that, the establishment of ascetic institutions. There are few documents about foundation of Śaiva monasteries in the area during the period but because of the strong Śaiva activities supported by the Sēnas it is possible to conjecture the presence of Śaiva monks wherever Śaiva temples existed. Vijayasēna’s inscriptions which demonstrate the Śaiva affiliation of the family are:
- Paikor Pillar Inscription,60 incised on a pillar at Paikor, Birbhum district, Bengal.
- Deopara Stone Inscription,61 discovered at Deopara, Godagari Thana, Rajshahi district, Bengal.
- Barrackpur Grant,62

Vijayasena's son, Ballala Sena, also used śaiva titles as niṣāṇka-Śaṅkara and arirāja. In the Madanapara Grant,63 he is called Gauḍēśvara. His deeds and pious facts are recorded in the Ballāla-carīta. This king was also a very learned scholar as he wrote several books. Ballala Sena's son, Laksmana Sena also was a great patron of intellectuals and himself was a very wise man. However, all that scholastic activity very probably was encouraged by the rājagurus of the Sēnas. The court of the Sēnas was frequented by several contemporary luminaries such as Umāpati (the author of the Deopara praśasti), the great Jayadeva, Dhoiyi, Halāyudha and Śrīdharadāsa. The Sēnas, however, were catholic Brahmanical rulers and they protected all sects, as it is proved by the Vaiṣṇava title used by Laksmana Sena — parama-Saura — in the Madanapara Inscription of Visvarūpa.64

III.1.5 The Candras

In the area of west Bengal existed several kings who formed part of the coalition which accepted the Pāla power. Some of them, as the Sūras,65 unfortunately have left very little information about their existence. However, there are a number of
inscriptions related to a family of princes of eastern Bengal whose names end in Candra. Their records reveal the continuation in that region of a line of Candra kings of Vikramapura — their possible capital — during the period between circa A.D. 950-1050.

The Rampal grant of Śrīcandra, discovered at Rampal, has a Buddhist emblem (the cakra) and the head-legend Śrī-Śrī-Candra-devaḥ. Besides, it gives information about this king and his genealogy, which is as follows:

... in the Candravaṃśa -- --, who ruled over Rohitaga(ri)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fūnacandra</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baudha Suvarṇacandra</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Trailōkyacandra 67 ... "The support of the royal majesty smiling in the royal umbrella of the king of Harikela (=Vanga, or eastern Bengal), who became king of the dvipa which had the word Candra prefixed to it (Candra-dvipa=some parts of the modern districts of Bakergunj, Khulna and Faridpur).

Śrīcandra 68

In the introduction of this Rampal grant, which would be dated in the second half of the tenth century A.D., there is clear indication of royal support to Buddhism. Nevertheless, Candradèva was also a magnanimous protector of the brāhmaṇas. In
the present grant this king gives a pāṭaka of land to a brāhmaṇa named Pitavasagupta Śarman.

On the other hand, the Tippera Inscription, which is incised on the pedestal of a huge image of Naṭeṣa Śiva dug out at Bharella village, Tippera district, Bengal, would demonstrate Śaiva affiliation of some members of the family. This inscription mentions king Layahacandra, and it would be dated circa A.D. 975. The support extended by the Candras to the brāhmaṇas in general and to monastic institution specifically is however most overwhelmingly evident from the Paschimbhag Plates of Śrīcandra. The details of the plates will be analyzed in an appropriate context later on.

III.1.6 The Gaṅgas

An earlier branch of the Gaṅga stock appear to have ruled on the territories round about the Mahēndragiri (Ganjam district, southern Orissa), since the end of sixth century A.D. From that time these kings claimed to be lords of Sakala-Kaliṅga and devout worshippers of Gōkarṇēśvara, the family deity who — it was said — resided on the top of mountain Mahēndra. Most of their grants were issued from Kaliṅganagara (which could be the actual Mukhaliṅga, twenty miles from Parlakimedi, Ganjam district) or from Śvētaka, both being their principal cities, and from where they ruled as independent sovereigns. There is no definitive proof that the Gaṅgas were the only family which ruled through
branches over the Kaliṅga country. Could be they were the only dynasty with itinerant government and various capitals such as Kaliṅganagara, Kōlhapura, Śvētaka, Sīnhapura, and Serapalli. The names of the kings of Gaṅgas of Śvētaka and Kaliṅganagar are given by the epigraphical evidence, however the ruling period for each one would not be defined.

The Gaṅgas were one of the most constant dynasties in religious matters. They maintained select groups of very learned brāhmaṇas whom they consulted in specific matters. The influence of orthodoxy is clear in several details in the large quantity of Gaṅgas records. The concept of sacred kingships is very clear in the Gaṅgas proclamations. The considered themselves the central symbol of the triśakti (the king and the magic circle of feudatories around him).

In the first half of the 11th century we find another series of kings claiming descent from the same line as the above. They also worshipped Gōkarṇēśvara on Mount Mahēndra and had Kaliṅganagara as their main capital. It is probable that if it was several Gaṅga branches, perhaps all of them belonged to the same stock and were descending from the Gaṅgas of Mysore nevertheless, each one had its proper political development. In any case, the later Gaṅgas of Kaliṅga was also a very pious Śaiva family, devoted to lord Gokarnēśvara, in spite of the "conversion" of Anantavarman Cōḍagaṅga (or Anantaabhīma I), which
would be considered a political move because his interest in achieving the full dominion over Utkala. The later Gaṅgas made many endowments, and many of the religious constructions of early medieval times were made with their support.

III.1.7 The Candellas

The Candellas were among the dynasties which enlarged their power after the break-up of the Pratihāra empire. One of the thirty-six royal clans claiming to be Rajput, they claimed to be descendant from the sage Candrāṭreyā and therefore, the Lunar race. In the genealogical list of Prof. Bhandarkar appear twenty-two Candella kings, starting with the historical founder, Nunnuka, who probably was a chief in the area around Khajuraho and ruled at the beginning of eighth century A.D. and ending with Hammīravarman, of who we have an inscription and who ruled c. A.D. 1289. The most notable among the Candellas was Yaśāvarman or Lakṣavarman (A.D. 925-954), who celebrated his military victories with the construction of magnificent religious foundations at Khajuraho, where he erected a temple to Viṣṇu. The laudatory verses on this king succinctly express the Purānic principles of royalty that the Candellas followed: they were "protectors of the land and people, of gods and brāhmaṇas."

Several inscriptions speak of the Candella's protection to religious institutions. Sallakṣaṇa Varman (A.D. 1100-1110) and his successors up to the last great Candella, Paramaridēva (c. A.D.
1165-1203), were conspicuously devout kings. They declared themselves to be protectors of the holy tirthas. Gajalakṣmī was their emblem, because they felt touched by Fortune, and professed devotion to Mahāśivarā, the Divine Lord of Kalañjara. Madanavarman, who was praised as "Indra on earth" granted lands generously to learned brāhmaṇas and built temples to Viṣṇu and Śiva. The Mau inscription associates him with an ascetic by name Rāghava- Caitanya, a Vedantist, and speaks of the king as gifting the treasures he conquered "to those who know the meaning of the Vedas and the Śāstras". This king rewarded "the virtuous" and wise men "who see the supreme light called majesty", and from that cooperation obtained power to perform his great deeds.

The best inscription that clearly lays down a king’s role in his own eyes as the protector of dharma is the Mahoba plate of Paramardidēva, the last great Candella (c. A.D. 1165-1203). It is the record of a grant of land given by Paramardidēva to a brāhmaṇa named Ratanaśarman, in A.D. 1173. The introduction or the prasasti of the plates which calls the king a dīkṣita (the anointed), is a clear profession of faith to Brahmanical orthodoxy and the doctrinal aspect of kingship. In it:

- The king confirms his divine ancestry of belonging to the Lunar race.
- He declares his mission of protecting the earth "as if she were a noble lady".
- He claims to possess the characteristic of pure nobility. He is destroyer of enemies and the purger of whatever must be purified on earth.

- He gives lands to brāhmaṇas and orders that they must be obeyed, respected, and non-alienated from their rights.

Also Paramardidēva and Sallakṣaṇa had a brāhmaṇa as first minister.⁷⁷

This pattern of patronage prevailed also among those who were situated below the king. The Minister of the penultimate king, Bhōjavarman (A.D. 1285-1288), the kayastha Nāna (descending from a hereditary family of ministers), donated a temple of Viṣṇu and enshrined there an image of Murari (Viṣṇu). In the laudatory verses which appear in the inscription engraved on that occasion,⁷⁸ he synthetized the high goals existing among the nobility under the Candellas: knowledge, intelligence, fame; to the brāhmaṇas riches; glory to the kingdom and salvation for those who donated generously.

During the seven centuries of their reign over Bundelkhand, the Candellas administered a kingdom where temples were built, brāhmaṇas honoured and deep religious life was lived. These kings patronized culture and spirituality and with time they acquired a style befitting the great kings of north India.⁷¹

III.1.8 The Kalacūris or Haihayas of Tripūrī, Ratnapura and Sarayūpāra

The Cedi country was the first home of the Kalacūris, where
they were the southern neighbours of the Candellas. Bhandarkar suggests a list of the earlier Kalacūris, before the rule of Kökkalla I, considered the first Kalacūri of Tripurī, who reigned form c. A.D.840 in the Dahala mandala. This Kökkalla who married a Candella princess named Naṭṭā was an aggressive warrior and put to trouble all his neighbours who caused concern to Pratihāra Bhūja I. Kökkalla came to be considered one of the greatest kings in power and authority in his time. Later inscriptions of the family mention his eighteen sons. The eldest among them, Śaṅkaragana, was his successor. All the other received mandalas and were governors in the already expanded kingdom. Yuvarāja I, the fourth Kalacūri king, was pious man and had a great sympathy for Śaivism. The famous Gōjakhi-maṭha, situated in the Dāhala mandala and founded by the Mattamayūra master Sadbhāvaśambhu, was generously endowed with several villages by Yuvarāja so that the residents of the maṭha could continue with their disciplines.

Yuvarāja had married Nohalā, daughter of the Cālukya feudatory Avanivarman who resided in the city of Mattamayūra. In that city also was a powerful ascetic institution of the same Mattamayūra line which the Kalacūris held in great reverence. Yuvarāja invited the head of that monastery, the acārya Prabhāvāśiva, to his kingdom and built for him a huge monastery and Śiva temple which was richly endowed so that he could continue the work of teaching the Śaiva-Mattamayūra philosophy. The remains of that monastery are at Candrehi, twenty miles from
Rewa in Baghelkhand. Probably, the mutual understanding of the two families of the Cālukyas and Kalacūris was helped by their devotion to Śiva and the influence of the pontiffs of the Mattamayūra sect who had great authority and regard in both courts and countries.⁷⁰

The Bilhari Inscription⁷¹ is rich in information about the religious affiliation of the Kalacūri family and the activities of the Mattamayūras in their country. The record says that the queen Nōhalā, wife of Yuvarāja-Kēyūravarśa, erected a temple to Śiva and endowed it with the revenues coming from seven villages; besides, she gifted two villages to the sage Īśvarasīva, disciple of Sabdaśīva, disciple of Pavanaśīva, all of them of Mattamayūra formation. The temple was located at Bilhari (Jubbulpore, M.P.).

The record open with praises to Śiva followed by laudatory verses to the Kalacūri Kings — great warriors, the son of Yuvarāja and Nōhalā, the devoted king Lakṣmaṇarāja who continued the legacy of his father and mother of doing pious works and great conquests. It also records an important grant made by him to the Mattamayūra sect. First is given the spiritual lineage of these "Mādhumateyas" (referring to that specific line of Mattamayūra gurus), in which the great master and initial light was Rudraśambhu. From him Kadambaguhā obtained knowledge, from him Mattamayūranātha, from him Dharmaśambhu, from him Sadaśīva, from him Mādhumateya, from him Īśvarasīva, and from him Hṛdayasīva to whom the king, showing his devotion, gave the monastery of the
Holy Vaidyanātha. All these gurus are described as rich in austerities, princes of heaven. Ṣrdayaśāvīva was the earlier head of the holy monastery of Nauhalesvara, where he deputed his favourite disciple, Aghoraśāvīva.

The king, after making these holy donations went to wage wars. His campaigns in East Bengal gave him fame in that part of India. There he received a present from the king of Odra (Orissa) consisting of an effigy of the serpent Kāliya, wrought in jewels and gold. Lakṣmaṇarāja defeated also the king of Kōśala, Mahābhāvagupta. He returned from the east with tremendous power going on to conquer the Lāṭa country and continuing towards the west, with nobody capable of stopping him, Lakṣmaṇarāja reached Sōmanāthapattana (Gujarat) were he offered to the god Sōmanātha the effigy of Kāliya that he carried from Orissa. The devotion of the Kalacūris and their collaborators was deep. In their kingdom Śaivism and Vaiṣṇavism, as also Jainism and other minor sects were accepted and protected. The Karitalai Inscription records that the brāhmaṇa Bhāṭṭa Somēśvara, a minister of Lakṣmaṇarāja, who was the son of Bhākamiśra — the chief Minister of Yuvarāja — built a temple to Viṣṇu. The temple was located at Kārītalāī (Mudwara division, Jabalpur, M.P.) and near the temple was a brahmāpura, a town where lived eight learned brāhmaṇas. The temple was endowed by the king with a village, and to these brāhmaṇas the sovereign also gave a village named Dirghaśākhīka. Śaṅkaragaṇa, son and successor of Lakṣmana, was himself a great
devotees of Viṣṇu and he used the title of paramavaiṣṇava.

An inscription from the time of Karṇa, the tenth of the line of Kalaciśris of Tripuri (c. A.D. 1048) gives valuable information about the government of the Kalaciśris and their concept of royalty, royal power, procedure and division of power. The Rewah Inscription, which was engraved in a Śiva temple probably located in the same Rewah area, offers information, apart from that of the Kalaciśri Lunar ancestry, about the kayastha caste of officials working for the Kalaciśri kings. In the Inscription these kayasthas are declared as twice born (or high caste, touched by dharma to accomplish a sacred mission). They took up the sacred ministerial task to augment mantra sakti (the power of good counsel) for the Kalaciśri kings who were already in possession of the other two powers: utsaha sakti (personal energy) and prabhu sakti (power derived from royal status). The legendary origin of the kayastha caste is also set forth in the inscription: the holy sage Kacara, who was born of Śiva and lived, while on earth, in the Kūlānca town (where traditionally had lived distinguished brāhamaṇas). He had a loyal and excellent śūdra servant, a man full of virtue. Kacara blessed him and dictated that all his descendants could be known as "kayasthas", for they would always have many merits in their person (kaya = body, matter; "they are made with excellent matter"). From that race were born many diplomats, statesmen, and civil servants of the Kalaciśri kings.
The origin of the Kalacūris is not clear and their kṣatriya ancestry was indeed in doubt. To overcome this handicap, they surrounded themselves with brāhmaṇas. This mission of their family was to transmit all members of the society the sacred power they possessed as sovereigns, which in turn was a derivative of social śakti. This must be understood not as a democratic institution in which the king was the depositary of the suzerainty coming from the people,¹⁰⁰ but as a public acknowledgment of king’s superior power (śakti) among other rājas of the same area. That is why the different segments of the society accepted the śakti of the king to be able to feel possessed of their own portion of the universal śakti and make effective use of it. A good example of such social segment was the kayasthas, a caste which was consolidating its position in early medieval society and through official association with royalty was interacting directly with supreme śakti represented by the royalty.

The Kalacūri royalty, like that of many other kingly dynasties of the era, came from the coalescence of military strength and religious works. They performed both duties rightly. The other branches of the Kalacūri family, too, were guided by the same principles. While they did not acquire power equivalent to that of the central line of Tripūrī, in their own inscriptions they celebrated the victories and fame of their predecessors and felt a commitment to the same mission of protecting religion,
giving donations and founding temples and maṭhas. This was true of the Kalacūris of Sarayūpāra, a collateral branch ruling Sarayūpāra, located on the banks of the Sarayū (or Gogra river in U.P.).\textsuperscript{101} The Kalacūris of Ratnapura (Ratanpur) were also all Śaivites and sensible devotees.\textsuperscript{102} The Kharod Inscription (A.D. 1181) praises the initiatives taken by Ratnadēva-III’s minister, the brāhmaṇa Gaṅgādhara, "who gave peace and prosperity to the kingdom". He built in Ratnapura a temple of Śiva, near which he ordered the construction of a maṭha for Śaiva ascetics and in the same compound also a maṇḍapa for Saurī (Viṣṇu). In a hill to the west of the city, he ordered the construction of a temple of Ėkavīra (Viṣṇu) and in the forest named Vadada he built a maṇḍapa for Śiva and Gaṇeśa. He also built various other Śiva and Gaṇeśa temples. In the same fort of Ratnapura he built a temple of Durgā (apparently the protector goddess of the city) and a shrine for Sūrya. To the north of Ratnapura he ordered to be built a temple to Tuṅḍa (Gaṇeśa) besides many other public works such as tanks, orchards, public dining houses, etc.

Satiated and intoxicated with Śaiva spirituality, the Kalacūris still had that ample tolerance proper to Purānic Brahmanism. Their government was entirely based on Brahmanical principles, was religious-oriented and guided under Brahmanical criteria as the ministers themselves were brāhmaṇas. The Koni Inscription (A.D. 1148) speaks about the works undertaken by the Minister Pleni potency (sarvādhikārin) of Prthvidēva II of
Ratnapura, the brāhmaṇa Puruṣottama.103 This minister took up the building of a magnificent five-shrined temple of Śambhu (Śiva) "with a view to dispel the mass of darkness (ignorance) of the three worlds". He endowed the temple with land for its maintenance and graciously gifted land also to a brāhmaṇa named Vasudēva. Puruṣottama was rewarded by the king Prthvidēva with land for his great dynamism and enterprise. Following Puruṣottama’s example he gave a part of the land to the learned brāhmaṇa Vāsudēva. Puruṣottama performed many other pious works such as erection of temples, construction and provision of mathas and a lake for the city of Ratnapura.

The sense of divine kingship was not restricted to the royal personages of the Kalacūris; it was shared by the feudatories, who formed with the king a mystic body of government of the earth. The Ratnapur Inscription (A.D. 1163-64),104 which belongs to a brāhmaṇa feudatory of Prthvidēva, refers to a certain Brahmadēva, who undertook several charitable works in various places. The benefactions of Brahmadēva were: the construction of a temple of Dhurjātī (Durgā) at Mallalala, the building of ten shrines of Tryambaka (Śiva), the construction of a big temple of Śrīkantha at Varelapura; the construction of nine shrines of Pārvatī at Ratnapura, a temple of Dhurjātī at Nārāyanapura, a temple of Śiva at Kumarākūta; an endowment of a village named Lonakara to the god Sōmanātha; and construction of many tanks and other minor charitable works.
III.1.9 The Paramāras

The Paramāras of the Mālava (Malwa) country probably originally came from a humble stock. To cover this low origin, the Paramāra inscriptions from the eleventh century onwards make it a point to include, as a preamble, the legendary history of the origin of the dynasty. Or this could be a device to legitimize their rule over disperate clans and groups, by giving it an apparent divine sanction. The legend attributes one of the most holy tīrthas of the region, Mount Abu (Sirohi district, Rajasthan; see Map section), as their place of origin. Viśvāmitra, it says, stole the wish-granting cow of the great sage Vasiṣṭha. Vasiṣṭha did a special sacrifice for recovering the divine animal. From the sacrificial fire, and out of the powerful magical incantations of the sage, sprang a hero who took the cow away from Viśvāmitra and restored it to the rightful owner. Vasiṣṭha named this warrior "Paramāra" (slayer of the enemy), and blessing him, declared him to be a king.

The Paramāras, apparently, were chieftains of the Raṣṭrakūṭas. When the Raṣṭrakūṭa Gōvinda III seized Mālava after defeating the Pratihāra Nāgabhaṭa, he gave this new possession in administration to one of his feudatory followers, Upendra, the first historical ruler of the dynasty. From Upendra descended the two primeval branches of the family, the Mālava branch and the Vāgāḍa branch. Upendra's son Vairisimha inherited Mālava; ṇambarasisimha, the other son, received Vāgāḍa (Bāṇswara and
Dungarpur) which Upendra had acquired by force of arms. The Vāgāda branch continued subject to the main line of Mālava.

Among the Pāramāra kings, Śiyaka III\(^{110}\) perhaps best represents how a combination of royal and ascetic qualities was idealised and how the complementary of the two was considered to be the essence of the monarchic ideology conceived along Brahmanical lines. After the glorious years of his reign he retired to the ascetic life.\(^{110}\) This was a royal action, of the same value as any of his military victories. As a warrior, he had defeated other potentates; as an ascetic, he overcame his own self. The king, the symbol of the correlation of social forces, transformed himself into a meek and humble sannyasi, following the dictate of varṇāśramadharma. It was a public declaration, having the power of law, that both levels of action — the active and the contemplative — are important.

In statescraft too, religion has its place. To keep a kingdom together, organised and welfare-oriented, military might alone is not enough. There is also the cultural and religious aspect. The Pāramāra kings were well aware of the possibilities that religion provides for royal propaganda and knitting together a coherent kingdom, and placed great dependence on the promotion of religious culture. Just as the capital was the seat of the throne and the axis of the kingdom, so were religious centres the springs of ideology, which helped to keep the people subject and
to generate a centripetal force to keep the kingdom strong and united.

The Paramāra kingdom reached its zenith under Sindhurāja's son, Bhōjadēva (A.D.1011-1055). The greatest of the Paramāra rulers of Mālava and the ninth in the dynastic succession. Bhōja was an excellent warrior and a magnificent king; a great protector of arts and letters, he himself was an illustrious scholar; but Bhōja's most important feature was his religiosity, piety and respect for traditional institutions.

The Betma Plates of Bhōjadēva, as also his Banswara Inscription both issued in A.D.1020, confirm the Śaivite affiliation of the family and its resolve to govern according to the Brahmanical tradition. These inscriptions are about donations to brāhmaṇas. For the execution of the orders the king commanded the obedience of "the inhabitants headed by the brāhmaṇas, the patels, the townsmen and others assembled at the town" near by the villages granted. The Mahākālēśvara Temple Inscription at Ujjain, relating to the restoration of that famous Śiva temple which contains one of the holiest Jyōtirliṅgas of India, after long praise to Śiva, eulogizes the Paramāra family and mentions the reigning pious king Naravarman (A.D.1094-1133), the thirteenth Paramāra king of Mālava. The Inscription of Jayasiṃha, the fifteenth ruler of the family Mālava, records a donation, given by Jayasiṃha, after he worshipped piously Lord Śiva, to a group of sixteen brāhmaṇas. The same inscription speaks of the
realization of several religious works, such as the construction of a temple to Śiva, excavation of a tank, and the erection of a temple of Jambūśārava Śiva in Oṁkāra (Oṁkāresvara).

The different branches of the Paramāra family showed equally keen devotion and concern for pious works. The Chirava Inscription (A.D. 1273) of Sōmasimha, the fifteenth ruler of the Narwar branch, gives the genealogy of the family, all supporters of religion and devotees of Śiva. Its prasasti eulogizes the many foundations made by the princes of this family to the Śaiva cause. The Arthuna Inscription of Cāmūṇḍarāja, the seventh king of the Vāgaḍa branch, speaks about the foundation and endowment of the temple of Mandalēśa (Śiva) at Arthuna (see Map section). Cāmūṇḍarāja, it says, "established religion in an unprecedented degree and dispensed rich bounties to brāhmaṇas and others (religious persons)".

The Garuḍa emblem of the Paramāras makes it clear that, besides being devotees of Śiva, they were also devotees of Viṣṇu. Their religious benefactions must have been on a large scale, considering that their territorial control extended on the most holy places of India, such as Ujjain, Mount Abu, Oṁkāresvara and so on.

III.1.10 The Cāhamānas or Cauhāns

The Cāhanānas were one of the largest and expansive royal families of northern India. Its several branches reigned for
several centuries. In the religious perspective, they were very important as protectors of the various holy tirthas of their domain and because of their foundations, endowments and cooperation with the ascetic life.

The discussion about the original home of the Cāhamānas and the approximate dimensions of their dominions is made by R.B. Singh, who thinks that the original land of the Cāhamānas perhaps was Ahicchatrapura from where they shifted their capital to Sākambhari and finally to Ajmer. They ruled over a country known as Jāṅgaladesa and Sapādalakṣa, both in Rajasthan.

Some authorities like Bhandarkar postulate that the Cāhamānas were a priestly clan of the Khazars from Central Asia. There are, nevertheless, good reasons to think that the Cāhamānas were an old family of brāhmaṇas absorbed in military activities, who adopted a kṣatriya way of life.

Some of the earlier branches of the family ruled in Bhṛgukaccha (Broach) for at least one or two generations before A.D. 756 and continued for long, perhaps as vassals of the regional potentates. We learn of the Cāhamānas of Dholpur for the first time thanks to the inscription of the third ruler of that branch, Caṇḍamahāśena, issued in A.D. 842. This branch was particularly generous to and protective of brāhmaṇas and religious institutions.
One of the main lines of the Cāhamānas was that settled in Śākambhari Pradeśa, where they ruled from their capital Śākambhari (Sambhar, Jaipur). This branch, founded by Vasudēva, is also known as the Imperial Cāhamāna dynasty of Sambhar and Ajmer. For several generations they continued as feudatories of the Pratihāras, cooperating in the campaigns of their overlords and visiting the court of Kanauj. Gōvindarāja I or Guvāka, the eighth king of the line, is famous for his victory repulsing the attack of Sultan Vega Varissa, son of Da'ud, the governor of Sindh under Caliph Al-Ma'mūn (A.D.813-833).

Gōvindarāja I’s great-grandson Candana was a pious man who with his queen laid many religious foundations at Puṣkara. His son Vākpatirāja felt himself strong enough to challenge the Pratihāra authority, and he proclaimed his power with generous foundations at their favourite tīrtha, Puṣkara, where he built a temple to Śiva.

Vākpatirāja had two sons, Laksmana who inaugurated the Nāḍgula branch and kingdom, subject to the paternal house, and Sīmharāja, the fourteenth king of Śākambhari, a great warrior who defeated the Tōmaras of Dillī and other feudatories of the Pratihāras. He gave himself the title of mahārājadhirāja and lived up to it, waging wars and displaying great magnanimity. Sīmharāja richly endowed the Hariṣanātha temple lying seven miles south of Śikar (Shaikhawāti, Jaipur). His son Vigrharāja, even mightier, performed many pious works such as the construction of
a temple to the goddess Asapuri at Brugakaccha.

The Rayapurambore branch of the Cāhamāna family appears to have been specially devoted to Śiva. Hammīra (A.D.1283-1301), the mighty warrior, was a zealous guardian of customs and traditions, a generous protector of brāhmaṇas and Jainas. Even in the middle of Ala-ud-din Khilji's attack on Rayapurambore, Hammīra and his officials had time for ceremonies. The Arabic chronicler of Khilji's exploits mentions in superlative terms the splendour of the Bahar Deo (Śiva) temple within the citadel, which was razed to the ground by the invaders. An inscription of Hammīra's time, engraved on a slab, part of a tank in front of the Kavaljīt (Kāpaliśvara) temple in Balvan, Kotah, Rajasthan, opens with an invocation to Gaṇeśa and Kāpaliśvara-Śiva, indicating the acceptance in the kingdom of even this extreme sect of Śaivism.

The Naddol branch of the Cāhamāna family reigned in the area around Mount Abu till they were subdued by Muṇja. Then they turned against the central branch of Sakambhari. This family also were orthodox brāhmaṇas and protectors of brāhmaṇas. The Sevadi Plates (c. A.D.1150) of Ratnapāla the fourteenth of the line of Naddol (Jodhpur), after praising Brahma, cites the sacred descent of Cāhamāna Ratnapāladēva. It says that mahārājadhirāja Ratnapāladēva gathered all his civil and military officers, the eminent persons among his subjects and the resident brāhmaṇas of the Satpāsata Viṣaya (the High Council of brāhmaṇas of the 700
villages). After bathing and worshipping Śiva and staying in a pure state of mind, the king gave the rights of the village Gumdakurcca to the brāhmaṇas who lived in it.

A similar religious zeal is seen in the three inscriptions of King Kālhaṇa found at Bamnera,130 of c. A.D.1165. The three plates record grants to brāhmaṇas as reward for their mastery of the Vedas and orthodox disciplines.

Another Cāhamāna inscription of the Naddol family, which confirms the magnanimity also of this line in granting gifts to different religious groups, is that of Alhanadēva,131 the father of Kālhaṇa. The inscription, which is of A.D.1161, informs the reader that the king after worshipping the Sun and Isāna (Śiva) gave gifts to brāhmaṇas and gurus, and he made a grant to the (Jaina) temple of Mahāvīradēva located in the Sanderaka Gaccha, at the holy place (mahāsthāna) of Naddula.

An inscription on a wall of the Acalēśvara temple of Mount Abu, which belongs to Luṇṭigadēva, the fifth king of the Marwar-Dēvā branch,132 celebrates the repairs made at the Acalēśvara temple by this king. He endowed the temple with a village "for the perpetual worship of God". This branch descended from the family of Sōngirā, descendants of the branch of Naddol. Luṇṭigadēva reigned c. A.D.1321.

The Sundha Inscription (A.D.1261)133 of the fourth king of
the Śōngirā branch, Cācigadēva is very informative about the religious affairs of the family. It was composed by a Jaina scholar, which in itself indicates a degree of liberality in the king. It prays to Śambhu (Śiva) and Pārvatī, the divine couple. It cites the descent of king Cācigadēva from legendary origins, naming the most distinguished members of the Cāhamāna clan. It celebrates the scholarship of Cācigadēva, who was learned in the Śāstras. It also speaks of the foundation by this king's father of two Śiva temples at Javalipura. Cācigadēva's exploits and his religious works, which were many, are also cited, the most significant among them being an award for the god Vigrahāditya; a golden cupola and a flagstaff to the god Aparajiteśa and a silver girdle also for this god; a hall and a car (ratha) richly decorated. Cācigadēva worshipped the goddess Cāmunḍā (Aghāṭesvari) for whom he established a maṇḍapa.

The Cāhamāna branch of Partabgarh also started as feudatories of the Pratihāras. They were three kings; Gōvindarāja, who was a great ally of Pratihāra Bhōja I, Durlabhharāja and the mahāsāmanta Indraja, who built a Surya temple in Ghontavarsika (Ghotarsir, seven miles from Partabgarh) in the west pāṭaka of Dasapura.

It is clear from the above, that the Cāhamānas maintained a close relation with the Brahmanical orthodoxy, supporting it directly or giving it the wherewithal for self-sufficiency.
Their Śaiva affiliation is confirmed by most of the epigraphical references and archeological remains in their domains. Yet, like other dynasties of the early medieval times, they exhibited tolerance and liberality. Vaiṣṇavism, Sūrya worship and Śaktism were aspects of early medieval Brahmanism that were widely spread and practised in the Rajputana of the Cāhamānas. Jainism also flourished and maintained its pre-eminence in several areas. The favour these king showed to religious organisations also encouraged the growth of ascetic institutions. In Jodhpur area functioned many temples-cum-maṭhas of Śaiva institutions. In the Sirohi and Jelóor areas the Pāṣupatas, Śāktas and several other Śaiva groups besides the Jainas made their presence felt. In Jaipur and Ajmer the Mattamayūra sect set up its western headquarters near the Śākambharī capital of the imperial Cāhamānas. The Śwai Madhopur area (Raṃathambore) was a great Śaiva and Jaina centre. The congruence of the spread of ascetic institutions with the rise in power of the Cāhamānas and other feudatories indicates a possible necessary relation between the two phenomena.

III.1.11 The Guhilas of Mewar and Dhoḍ

The Guhilas of Mēdāpāṭa or Mewar were the southern neighbours of the Cāhamānas of Naddol. The first ruler of this family was Bāppā, or Bhōja, or Kalabhōja, \(^{134}\) who gave up the throne to Mahīndra I in A.D. 783. \(^{135}\) Bhartripāṭṭa II or Bhartribhāṭa, the fifteenth ruler of the line titled himself
mahārājadhīrāja, indicating his independence from the Pratihāras of whom his predecessors were feudatories. This Bharripataṭṭa II, son of Khommanā III, appears in the Partabgarh Inscription as donor of a field to one of the shrines attached to the monastery of Guru Rūṣīṣvara, a citizen of Daśapura. Under the management of this master of ascetics were the shrines of Vaṭa-Yakṣinīdevī, Indrādityadēva and Trailokya Mohanadēva. This complex of maṭhas and shrines was situated in village Ghontavarṣīka (see Map section) where also was a temple of Nityapramuditadēva. The main deity of this religious complex was Indrādityadēva (the Sun god) to whom Bharripataṭṭa in A.D.942 donated "the field named Vavvuliśa by the side of the river Nandya in the village of Palāsa-Kūpikā" (present-day Parasia, fifteen miles south of Mandasor). This monastery, which was erected in the area of Mandasor, apparently was a very famous and important ascetic centre as it received gifts from three different kings: Mahēndra Pāla II, the Pratihāra sovereign of Kanauj; Bharripataṭṭa, lord of Mēdapāṭṭa; and the Cāhamāna Dēvarāja, son of Cāmūndārāja, the builder of the Sun shrine. These three grants are collectively cited in the Partabgarh Inscription.

In another inscription of Bharripataṭṭa dated A.D.943 is mentioned Āghāṭa (Ahar, north of Udaipur, see Map section) as the capital of Mēdapāṭṭa country.

Bharripataṭṭa's son Āllāṭa, the sixteenth Guhila ruler of
Mēdapāṭa, married Hariyadēvi, a Hūṇa. The Guhilas, possibly, were a brāhmaṇa family forced by circumstances to adopt a kṣatriya code and discipline, as happened also with the Cālamānas. But their style of command and government showed their compromise with both high missions: the brāhmaṇa duty of maintaining the purity of the world and the kṣatriya responsibility of protecting the temporal world. This is seen in the foundations and donations made by the family to the religious institutions in or nearby his dominions. Ālāṭa's marriage with a Hūṇa princess demonstrates the openness and liberal attitude of these rulers who had before them the task of unifying and integrating a diverse society (in the ethnic and religious sense).

Āghāṭa was then a great centre of trade, frequented by merchants coming from countries north, south and east of Mēdapāṭa. The munificent disposition of the rulers of Āghāṭa and the riches of the kingdom plus the existence of old holy tīrthas in the area, such as the famous Ekaliṅga temple, were an ideal ambience for attracting ascetic groups from neighbouring monasteries. Quite likely, the region corresponding to the present-day Udaipur-Chittorgarh districts was an active centre of Śaiva sects, Jaina activities, or other ascetic groups like the monastery of Hari Riṣiśvara who, going by his name, appears to have been a certain type of Śiva guru with special devotion to Śūrya.
Āghāṭa, "the jewel of the Mēdapāṭa country" was attacked and destroyed by the Paramāra king Muṇja in A.D. 977. But the Guhilas of Mēdapāṭa recovered and continued displaying their generosity. Āghāṭa was a perfect symbol of sacred suzerainty for the Guhilas. Their consecration of the kingdom of Mewar to Ekaliṅgeśvara was perfectly in accordance with the early medieval doctrine of sacred kingship. The Guhilas claimed to be administrators (mantrins) of god Ekaliṅgeśvara. Āghāṭa was the political centre in the midst of the many Liṅgas of Mewar. The popular tradition said that the whole Mewar was the abode of Ekaliṅgeśvara who emerged at several spots. So, it was the duty of kings the discover, installation, support and homage payment to such Liṅgas. The Ahar fragmentary Inscription mentions Sucivarma (or Rāhila), the twenty-first king of Āghāṭa who perhaps was the one attacked by Muṇja. He was succeeded by his brother Naravarman who built the Rahilēśvara temple and married the Cālukya princess Sodguka.

In spite of their political success and independence, the Guhilas did not always use high sounding titles. For example, Samarasiṃha (c.A.D. 1260) called himself only mahārāja in the Chittorgarh Inscription. Perhaps such modesty has relation with the very complex process of ascension of those rajputs clans to the status of kṣatriyas and even more — as happened with the Guhilas — because the feeling of being responsible of large areas and very holy places as real universal lords. This problem
has been studied well by B.D. Chattopadhyaya who considered the Guhilas one of the specific cases of ascension of a rajput clan.146 And probably for the same reason they endeavoured in proving their mobility through the pious foundations in favour of all sects. Samarasiṃha donated land to a Jaina temple of the Bharthripuriya Gaccha.

Probably between the tenth and eleventh centuries the Meḍapāṭa country still comprised the area of Udaipur (Samoli–Ahar–Ekaliṅga). During that time the centre of power was transferred to Chittorgarh, where the Guhila family had its next glorious chapter.

The inscription at the fort of Kumbhalgarh on a wall of the Kumbhasvāmin temple (the present-day Mamadeva temple) dated A.D. 1146, gives considerable information about the old Mewar country and the Guhila family.147 The first slab contains a description of Mewar, its lakes, hills, sacred places, and people. It opens with the propitiation of Gaṅga, Sarasvatī and Ekaliṅga, and continues with praises to Lambōdara, Gajamukha, Vindhyaṇāsinī, Ekaliṅga, Pinākin, Ina and other deities. It depicts the Trikuta-varṇana range where the Ekaliṅga temple is situated (see Map section). The shrine of the Vindhyaṇāsinī goddess is situated on the slope of one of these hills. The Ekaliṅga temple, which was built by Bāpā Rāval (the same Bāppā or Bhōja, founder of the Guhila family of Mewar ?), is described. The Indra Sagara (artificial lake) built near the Ekaliṅga temple, is described as
Indratīrtha Bhūjasara, a tank which is supposed to have existed since the Krīla Yuga, when Indra used to meditate at the feet of Ekaliṅga. Bhūjābhupa's merit (again, Bhūja, the first king of the Guhila lines) gave the place is distinction. Nāgdā (Udaipur, Sirohi, Rajasthan), an ancient capital of Mewar, and its legendary founders, Kamadhenu and Takṣaka, are also mentioned. The Dharāśvara temple, near the Ekaliṅga temple, built by Rāval Samarasimha, is described. Also described is the Vaidyanātha temple, which existed near the compound of Ekaliṅgaji and which probably succumbed to the Muslim depredations and was not rebuilt. The Samadhiśvara temple in the Chittorgarh fort (erected to the south-west of Khumba's Tower of Victory), which was built by Paramāra Bhūjarāja in the eleventh century, when Chittorgarh and other areas of Mewar were under Paramāra rule (that is after the Muṅja conquest of Mewar), is also depicted. Also illustrated are other important buildings of Chittorgarh. Life of Mēdapāṭa country — its main cities, rivers, hills, lakes, gardens, about its people — is also described. In the second slab, the description of other places of Mewar catches one's attention.

The third slab gives information about the genealogy of the Guhila family which has given rise to controversy. It mentions the elder ancestors of the line: Hārtarāsi and Śrī Bāppā (verses 121-122), the first celebrated as a dvijēndra (the best of the dvijas), i.e., a brāhmaṇa. Pandit Keerty Vyas, who published this
Inscripticn, thought that at the time of the composition of the inscription it was common — in this bardic style of chronicle — to attribute to founders of dynasties the brāhmaṇa ancestry. He based his surmise on the Atapura Inscription where the Guhila family appears as "kṣatra-kṣetra", i.e., kṣatriya.147

Rai Bahadur Ojha,150 on the other hand, opined that this Haritarāśi was an ascetic brāhmaṇa of the Nātha sect. Bhandarkar believed that the founders of the Guhila family were Nagar brāhmaṇas from Vadnagar in Gujarat.152 In verse 123, it is said that "Bāpā, a vipra, who meditated at the feet of Hāritarāśi who bestowed upon him the kingdom of Mewar ... " In the other inscriptions cited in this controversy, both Bāppā and Hāritarāśi are referred to as vipras or mahidēvas, i.e. brāhmaṇas.

Be that as it may: it is still remarkable that the Guhilas were either brāhmaṇas transformed into kṣatriyas (which is our perception) or kṣatriyas giving Brahmānical ancestry. Evidently, they intended to involve themselves in the religious past of Mewar.

E.D. Chattopadhyaya, in his article about the origin of the rajputs,153 has clearly expounded the phenomenon about the elevation of the new rajputs families in early medieval Rajasthan. He opines that the real ancestry of the rajputs clans is a difficult matter to resolve, because like other families there is not only the problem of dynastic ascension or the tendency to
"dynasticize" their own genealogies, but the origin of the rajputs was a complex process which involved the process of change during the early medieval period in Rajasthan and also in the context of the entire early medieval northern India. The elevation of the rajputs clans to kṣatriya status was a widespread phenomenon which in some cases at least involved passage from tribal organization to the state polity. Besides, the problem is connected with the expansion of these groups and the colonization of new areas, the introduction of more advanced agricultural techniques and domination in the form of surplus appropriation, over irrigational networks. The expansion of several rajputs clans was detrimental to local tribes which became clientele of the new lords. The consolidation of rajput hegemony was linked with new forms of land distribution, division, protection (and probably taxation) and a new relation between landed property and the military organization centred in hill-fortress from where the rajputs clans dominated the valleys.

Chattopadhyaya argues in favour of linkages between different Gurjara-Pratihāra groups. All were involved in a similar process of transformation, incorporating all varieties of high varṇas into their social structure. However, the preference of the ruling families was for the kṣatriya status. That social effort can be appreciated though analyzing the genealogies which show certain common stages in the process of being standardized as royal genealogies. Guhilsas, Cāhamānas, Gurjara-Pratihāras have
various common elements in process of their social elevation; for example, at some stages of their mobility towards political ascendancy they claimed brāhmaṇa ancestry. But in all cases they finally opted for kṣatriya status and demonstrated their quality as rulers by extending patronage and protection to religious institutions.

Mēdapāṭa probably had its importance before the Guhilas came on the scene, and its history is closely related with the holy tīrthas of the area. Quite likely, there was an association between the Guhila rule and the prestige of the holy complexes in the vicinity of their capital. The Guhilas reigned from a holy city and their radius of power coincided with the religious links between the holiest tīrthas and minor ones. The political kingdom was a super-imposition on the religious map of Mēdapāṭa.

In the Guhila branch of Dhavagartā (Dhod, Gahazpur district, Udaipur), Balāditya, the twelfth, and the last in the line, built a temple of Viśṇu in Chatsu, Jaipur.154

III.1.12 In extension of the above data about early medieval dynasties, the other royal families of that time considered are:

(i) Maitrakas of Valabhi
(ii) Vākāṭakas
(iii) Śailōdbhavas of Kōngoda and Śrivardhana
(iv) Maukharis of Kōśala
(v) Kakairas of Bastar
(vi) Śulkis of Kōḍālōka
(vii) Bhaumakaras
(viii) Bhañjas of Khiñjali
(ix) Bhañjas of Baudh
(x) Bhañjas, later, of Khiñjali
(xi) Bhañjas of Mayūrbhañj
(xii) Gaṅgas of Kaliṅga
(xiii) Gaṅgas of Śvētaka
(xiv) Gaṅgas, later, of Kaliṅga
(xv) Caulukyas of Mattamayūra and Aṇahilapāṭaka
(xvi) Saindhavas or Jayadrathas
(xvii) Yādavas
(xviii) Śilahāras of Kōṅkaṇ

To each dynasty is given its ancestry (if known), religious affiliation, capitals, territory over which it reigned, approximate dates from beginning to collapse, and some of the epigraphical evidence and the subjects in these. The purpose is to underline the general tendency in the dynasties of this period in matters such as religion, support to religion, and the relationship between kingship and religious activities.
(i) Maitrakas of Valabhi:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DYNASTY</th>
<th>ANCESTRY</th>
<th>RELIGIOUS AFFILIATION</th>
<th>CAPITAL</th>
<th>PERIOD</th>
<th>TERRITORY</th>
<th>EPIGRAPHICAL EVIDENCE</th>
<th>MAIN CONTENTS OF THE INSCRIPTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Dharasena I</td>
<td>Kṣatriyas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dhruvasena, devout worshipper of Mahēśvara; Dharasena, devout worshipper of Viṣṇu.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Brāṇasiṃha</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The genealogy of Dhruvasena is given. It is the same as in the Palitana, Baneshgadh, Bhavnagar Inscl.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Dhruvasena</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A niece of Dhruvasena, Dudda, founded a convent at Valabhi. This Dudda appears in several inscriptions. She must have been an influential person and very devoted woman.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Dharapāṭha</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Guhasena, devout worshipper of Mahēśvara; Dharasena, devout worshipper of Mahēśvara. Grant to Buddhist monastery of Vamsakara.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Guhasena</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Grant of land in the village of Kukkopādra (Saurashtra) to the brāhmaṇa Dikshita Saggala.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Dharasena II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dhruvasena II, fervent worshipper of Mahēśvara, donated certain land to two brāhmaṇas resident at Agastikragraha and Ayanaka-grahara.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Śilādiṭya</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Kharagara I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Dharasena</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Dhruvasena</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Dharasena IV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Dhruvasena III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Kharagara II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Śilādiṭya III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Śilādiṭya IV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Śilādiṭya V</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Śilādiṭya VI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Śilādiṭya VII</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

General features of the Maitrakas:

They continued (and imitated) the style of government of the Guptas. In general their inscriptions follow the same pattern and deal mostly with pious donations to Brāhmaṇas.
(iii) Vākāṭakas:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DYNASTY</th>
<th>ANCESTRY</th>
<th>RELIGIOUS AFFILIATION</th>
<th>CAPITAL</th>
<th>PERIOD</th>
<th>TERRITORY</th>
<th>EPIGRAPHICAL EVIDENCE</th>
<th>MAIN CONTENTS OF THE INSCRIPTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Vindhyasakti (dviśa)</td>
<td>brāhmaṇas, Vāchchhomi or Vatsaguṇa</td>
<td>Brahmical Orthodoxy or Śaivas</td>
<td>Vāchchhomi or Vatsaguṇa</td>
<td>sixth century</td>
<td>Vaidarbha (Vidarbha) Berar and part of Madhyadeśa</td>
<td>Basīma Plates of Vindhyasakti II, EP.IND. XIV, No.37, pp.261 ff.</td>
<td>The genealogy of Vākāṭakas. They gave a grant to certain brāhmaṇas of Atharvaveda.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Pravarasena I</td>
<td>probably origin in Madhyadeśa</td>
<td>Śaivas</td>
<td>Vālaṇāvas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Mādhava Sena II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Prithviśena</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Pravarasena II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. N.N.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Dēvasena</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Hariśena</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(This genealogy was arranged by B. Bühler)

General features of the Vākāṭakas: They appeared as the most orthodox rulers of their times. They revived the Brahmical tradition after the Kuśāṇa pro-Buddhist rule. They performed many solemn ceremonies at holy tīrthas to celebrate their triumphal accomplishment of dharma. Their style of rule was a typical expression of "divine kingship."

(iii-a) Sailodbhavas or Sailōvaśas:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DYNASTY</th>
<th>ANCESTRY</th>
<th>RELIGIOUS AFFILIATION</th>
<th>CAPITAL</th>
<th>PERIOD</th>
<th>EPIC CONTENTS OF THE INSCRIPTIONS</th>
<th>MAIN CONTENTS OF THE INSCRIPTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Rāṇabhīta</td>
<td>Lunar, kṣatriyās</td>
<td>Śaivas</td>
<td>Kōṅgōda</td>
<td>sixth century</td>
<td>Constant references to Mount Mahēndra (Śrī-kakalām Dist.)</td>
<td>Parikud (Puri Dist.) Plates of Sailodbhava Ayasabhīta II, EP.IND., II, pp.284 ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Mādhava-Sai-nyabhīta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Ayasabhīta I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Mādhava-Sai-nyabhīta II (Śrīnivāsa)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Ayasabhīta II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Dharmaṇāya (Mānabhīta)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Madhyamarāya</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"A", issued by Ayasabhīta II (c.465 AD). It is about the pious of the family who performed many sacrifices. "The king was as a royal ascetic, he was as the god Saumhū."

- **DYNASTY**: The name of the dynasty.
- **ANCESTRY**: The relationship of the ruler to other family members.
- **RELIGIOUS AFFILIATION**: The religious affiliation of the dynasty.
- **CAPITAL**: The capital of the dynasty.
- **PERIOD**: The period of the dynasty.
- **TERRITORY**: The territory controlled by the dynasty.
- **EPIC CONTENTS OF THE INSCRIPTIONS**: Information about the inscriptions found in the area.
- **MAIN CONTENTS OF THE INSCRIPTIONS**: The main contents of the inscriptions found in the area.

---

*Note: The table continues with additional entries and information.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DYNASTY</th>
<th>ANCESTRY</th>
<th>RELIGIOUS AFFILIATION</th>
<th>CAPITAL</th>
<th>PERIOD</th>
<th>TERRITORY</th>
<th>EPIGRAPHICAL EVIDENCE</th>
<th>MAIN CONTENTS OF THE INSCRIPTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9. Kāpaksōbha</td>
<td>Pētavyāḷḷaparāja</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cuttack Museum Plate of Madhavarman Sainyabhi</td>
<td>&quot;B&quot;, issued by Mānabhita, who performed the aśvamedha and donated land to an ascetic named Prabhakarṇanda and his monastery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Madhyamarāja</td>
<td>III - Tālāponibha</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The legendary and fabulous genealogy of the family. The capital of the kingdom is Madhavapura or Śrīhara. The inscription is of A.D. 656.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

General features of the Sailōdhavas: This family represented Brahmanical orthodoxy in an area of tribal traditions. They preserved the Vedic sacrifices and performed several aśvamedhas, desproportionate to their dominions. They even claimed the rank of cakravartin (supreme monarch).

(iii-b) Sailōdhavas from Śrīvardhana:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( \text{Śrīvardhana} )</th>
<th>( \text{Vindhyēvara} )</th>
<th>( \text{Saivas} )</th>
<th>( \text{Śrīvardhana} )</th>
<th>( \text{Śrīvardhana} )</th>
<th>( \text{Śrīvardhana} )</th>
<th>( \text{Vindhyā region} )</th>
<th>History of the family. They came from Orissa, from the valleys of the Kailāsa Mountain. Their genealogy is given.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Śrīvardhana</td>
<td>Vindhyēvara</td>
<td>( \text{Lunar, they are a branch of the Sailōdh of Kongoda.} )</td>
<td>Śaivas</td>
<td>Śrīvardhana pura (near Ramtek, Nagpur); Māndīvardhanapura</td>
<td>seventh to eighth century</td>
<td>The Parisad Plates of Madhyamarajadeva, EP. IND., IX, No.20, pp.281 ff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Pritavardhana or Suwardhana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ragholi Plates of Jayavardhana II, EP.IND., IX, No.5, pp.41-47.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Jayavardhana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jayavardhana, devout worshipper of Mahēśvara, glorified and honoured the brāhmans. He donated a village with all the rights to the temple of Āditya at Cattullīha.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Suwardhana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Jayavardhana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### (iv) Naukharis or Mukharas:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dynasty</th>
<th>Ancestry</th>
<th>Religious Affiliation</th>
<th>Capital</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Territory</th>
<th>Epigraphical Evidence</th>
<th>Main Contents of the Inscriptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Harivarman</td>
<td></td>
<td>Śaivas (mostly but tolerant)</td>
<td>Śrīpura (Sirpur, archaeological remains of temples and other religious buildings)</td>
<td>sixth to seventh centuries</td>
<td>Kosāla country</td>
<td>Sohnag terracotta Seal of Avantivarman, EP.IND. XIV, No.14, 62 ff.</td>
<td>Emblems indicating the paramount level of the dynasty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Ādityavarman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Iśvaravarman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Iśānavarman</td>
<td>Śravvarman</td>
<td>Lunar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Śravvarman</td>
<td>Avantivarman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Avantivarman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Brahavarman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Bhūga varman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Yāsōvarman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Sūryavarman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### (v) Kakairas:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dynasty</th>
<th>Ancestry</th>
<th>Religious Affiliation</th>
<th>Capital</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Territory</th>
<th>Epigraphical Evidence</th>
<th>Main Contents of the Inscriptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Madhurantakadēva Bhanudeva</td>
<td>Lunar, Chhindaka Nagas.</td>
<td>Śaiva/Sāktas</td>
<td>Silhawa, Kakaira (Kanker)</td>
<td>ninth to twelfth century</td>
<td>Bastar (M.P)</td>
<td>Rajapura Copper Plate of Madhurantaka, EP.IND., IX, No.25, pp.174 ff.</td>
<td>A grant to compensate a family for supplying a victim to sacrifice to the goddess Dantēśvarī. The sacrifice was for the general prosperity of the kingdom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kanker Inscription of the time of Bhanudeva, EP.IND., No.14, pp.123-30.</td>
<td>The Minister Nāyaka Vāṣudēva constructed two temples of Mahādeva and others in honour of the &quot;local deity of the fields&quot; plus other pious works. The genealogy of the family is given.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

General features of the Kakairas: This dynasty ruled over an area with primitive and tribal traditions, cults to the Mother Goddess, Nagas and magic occult powers. They permitted the combination of such primitive beliefs with Brahmanism. These kings represented the mystic forces accepted by their people. They tolerated bloody sacrifices as manifestations of popular feelings and as meant for the general welfare.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DYNASTY</th>
<th>ANCESTRY</th>
<th>RELIGIOUS AFFILIATION</th>
<th>CAPITAL</th>
<th>PERIOD</th>
<th>TERRITORY</th>
<th>EPIGRAPHICAL EVIDENCE</th>
<th>MAIN CONTENTS OF THE INScriptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Kāṁcanastambha</td>
<td>Lunar, kṣatriya.</td>
<td>Śaivas,</td>
<td>Kōdalgā,</td>
<td>About ninth</td>
<td>Gondrama maṇḍala</td>
<td>Talcher Plate of Raga-</td>
<td>Genealogy of Raga-stambha, devout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Vikramaśītya (Kalastambha)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Stambheśvarī was the goddess of family.</td>
<td>Dhenkanal,</td>
<td>to tenth</td>
<td>or Gondama; the borderland was</td>
<td>stambha EP. IND., XIII,</td>
<td>worshipper of Mahēśvara.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Kulastambha (Ragastambha or Alastambha)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Orissa</td>
<td>centuries</td>
<td>Sankhajotih</td>
<td>pp.157, ff.</td>
<td>Salutation to Śambhu and in bājī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Kulastambha II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>About the Lunar race of the Śulka family. Recounts the heroi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Also, about the many teapies to Siva, Hindol Plate, EP.IND., XIVIII, No.20, pp.167 ff.

(vii) Bhaumakaras of Guhēśvarapāṭaka:

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Lōlabhāra</td>
<td>from the legendary king Uma-</td>
<td>Śaivas,</td>
<td>Guhēśvarapāṭaka</td>
<td>The Bhaumaka-</td>
<td>Kongoḍa-maṇḍala,</td>
<td>Bhimnagarigadh (Dhenka-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kṛṣṇaśihara</td>
<td>ttasiāha.</td>
<td>in general Brahma-</td>
<td></td>
<td>kara era</td>
<td>(Benjam, Drissa)</td>
<td>nal) Plate of Tribhuvan-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Kusumabharā</td>
<td>nical orthodoxy, they also</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>started</td>
<td>plus the Danda-</td>
<td>namahēdevī, J.B. &amp; ORS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Lalitabhāra</td>
<td>gave support to</td>
<td>Guhēśvarapāṭaka</td>
<td>c.A.D.640</td>
<td></td>
<td>bhuki maṇḍala.</td>
<td>II, pp.241 ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śivakara</td>
<td>Buddhists.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Šantikara</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Tribhuvana Mahādēvi (queen)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Šubhakara</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. N.H. (queen)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Bāṇḍi Mahādēvi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Śivakara</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Baud Plates of Tribhuvan- | The Kara family was touched by | | | | | | e fortune. All these kings were |
<p>| namahēdevī (of AB 609), | models of virtue, givers of | peace and prosperity and pro- |
| EP.IND., XXIX, No.30, pp. | | | | | | | tecutors of Dharma. The queen |
| 210 ff. | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DYNASTY</th>
<th>ANCESTRY</th>
<th>RELIGIOUS AFFILIATION</th>
<th>CAPITAL</th>
<th>PERIOD</th>
<th>TERRITORY</th>
<th>EPIGRAPHICAL EVIDENCE</th>
<th>MAIN CONTENTS OF THE INSCRIPTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. Śeṅtikara II</td>
<td>Subhākara II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Plate of the PMP. Dandi- mahādevī, E.P.IND., VI, No.13, pp.137-42.</td>
<td>Tribhuvanamahādevī ascended to the throne and received the imperial titles. At the request of the wife of the feudatory Mangalakalasa, the queen gifted an endowment to the Wannēśvara temple, for repairs and maintenance of brāhmaṇas.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

General features of the Bhaumakaras: They showed an extraordinary piety and helped in the diffusion of Brahmansism on the tribal areas which were under their dominion. From their family came the Bhanja branches of Haruppēśvara and the Bhaumakaras-Pālas of Durgayanagiri. The direct line of the Bhaumakaras of Gohēśvarapātaka were the Bhaṇjas of Kīņjali-maṇḍala. The later Bhaumakaras had matrimonial alliances with Sūmavāṃsi kings of Kōśala.

(viii) Bhaṇjas of Kīņjali maṇḍala:

| 1. Śilābhaṇja I | Andajavaesa | Saivas and Vaiṣṇavas. | Bhritipura; Vañjulvaka | 8th century | Kīņjali maṇḍala (southern areas of Mahanadi river) | Songpur Plates of Satrubhanja, E.P.IND., XI, No.8-C, pp.98 ff. | Genealogy of King Satrubhaṇja the devout worshipper of Višṇu. |
| 2. Satrubhaṇja or Gandhata | | | | | Udbhaya Kīņjali maṇḍala | The Baudh Grant of Rana- bhajadeva, E.P.IND., XII, No.3b, "A", pp.322-25. |
| 3. Raṣṭhaṇja | | | | | | |
| 4. Netribhaṇja or Kalyanakalasa | Vidyādhara-bhaṇja | | | | | |
| 5. Deśaṇja | | | | | | |
| 6. Śilābhaṇja | Vidyādhara-bhaṇja | | | | | |
| 7. Vidyādhara-bhaṇja or Amōghakalasa | | | | | | |
| 8. Netābhaṇja or | | | | | | |

Ranabhāṇjadēva is styled parama- mahēśvara mahāraja i.e., under the auspices of Śīva. He gave village Konatinti in the Khatiya viṣaya to a bhaṭaputra (brāhmaṇa) who was emigrant from Apīmuleri.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DYNASTY</th>
<th>ANCESTRY</th>
<th>RELIGIOUS AFFILIATION</th>
<th>CAPITAL</th>
<th>PERIOD</th>
<th>TERRITORY</th>
<th>EPIGRAPHCAL EVIDENCE</th>
<th>MAIN CONTENTS OF THE INSCRIPTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kalyanakalaśa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rapabhañjadeva, the devotee of Virgo. He meditated at the feet of his father and mother, is worshipped by his mahāśāntas and has obtained the five sounds. Gave a village to a learned brāhmaṇa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vañjulvaka</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>approx. until</td>
<td>Khyajali</td>
<td>Daspallia Plates of Šatrubhañjadeva, Tribvanakalaśa, EP.IND., XXII, No.26, pp. 189 ff (of AD 850)</td>
<td>Satrubhanja donated village Kohka in the Pascīa khanda to the brāhmaṇa Bhaṭṭa Ajapāla, belonging to a family of brāhmaṇas at Santoshanadheva (Orissa).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Varadda, a temporary capital</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>temporary century</td>
<td></td>
<td>Orissa Plates of Vidyādharabhañjadeva, E.P. IND., IX, No.27, pp.271 ff.</td>
<td>Vidvādharabhañjadeva, the devout worshipper of Mahēśvara, also called king Dharmakalaśa, he granted village Tundurava in Ramalavva viṣaya in free enjoyment to Bhaṭṭa Darubhandi, student of Ṛg Veda.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Russellkonda Plates (Ganjra) of Nettabhañja EP.IND., XVIII, No.41, pp.258 ff.</td>
<td>Nettabhāṇja, the devout worshipper of Mahēśvara, gave village Candutama in Kaivera viṣaya to a group of 14 brāhmaṇas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Petitasara Grant of Nettabhañja, EP.IND., XVII, No.53, pp.337 ff.</td>
<td>The grant, by Nettabhāṇja consisted of village Petitasara to the Brāhmaṇa Kesavarudra.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

General features of the Bhanjas of Khyajali: A very long family tree, their origin probably was around the fourth-fifth century. In the Kosala country, from that time, there were Bhañja kings. However, it is impossible to establish the relation among the four branches of early medieval times. Their own ignorance about their roots is reflected in the legendary stories included in the inscriptions.
### (xi) Bhanjas of Bhaud:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DYNASTY</th>
<th>ANCESTRY</th>
<th>RELIGIOUS AFFILIATION</th>
<th>CAPITAL</th>
<th>PERIOD</th>
<th>TERRITORY</th>
<th>EPIGRAPHICAL EVIDENCE</th>
<th>MAIN CONTENTS OF THE INScriptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Sōjanabhañja</td>
<td>also claimed to be the descendants of the sage Kāśyapa.</td>
<td>Śaivas and Vaiṣṇavas</td>
<td>Kolada (Gumur) probably a temporary capital</td>
<td>until twelfth century (approx.)</td>
<td>Khīnjali (Keonjhar)</td>
<td>Baudh Plates of Kanaka-bhanjadeva, J.B.60.R.S., Vol. II, pp.367 ff.</td>
<td>The great family of Bhañjas sprang from Kāśyapa. Many great kings were born into this family; some of them were Kamaśevaras (Lord of Saudas). Among them was Sōjanabhañja who in his old age retired to Vārāṇasī. His son was Durjayabhañja.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Durjayabhañja</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Kanakabhañja</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### (x) Later Bhañjas:

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Rājādhānīya)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Rāyabhañja I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Vīrabhañja</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Rāyabhañja II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Yaśobhañja</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Jayabhañja</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### (xii) Bhañjas of Mayūrbhañj:

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(prajāpāli)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Khiṭṭabhañja</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Digbhañja</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Rājabhañja</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Rābhañja</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Narendrabhañja</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"A" gives the genealogy from the founder, Vīrabhadra, the Gana-dāṅga. Narendrabhañja donated.
### Early Gaṅgas of Kāliṅga

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dynasty</th>
<th>Ancestry</th>
<th>Religious Affiliation</th>
<th>Capital</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Territory</th>
<th>Epigraphical Evidence</th>
<th>Main Contents of the Inscriptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Indravarman 1</td>
<td>Probably they had brāhmaṇa origin</td>
<td>Śalivas, with special devotion to Gokarnāṣvāmin.</td>
<td>Kaliṅgagana, actual Mukha-liṅga</td>
<td>sixth century</td>
<td>Kaliṅga</td>
<td>Ulram Plates of Hastivarman, EP.IND., RVII, No. 19, pp.330-34</td>
<td>It records the grant of land as agrahāra to Jayasvarman, a resident of Uramaḷa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Indravarman Rājasimha</td>
<td>(c. A.D.581)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

About the legendary origin of the Bhāṇjas:

Virabhadra, the Adibhāṇa (the first Bhāṇa) was born from the egg of a peahen in the hermitage Kōtyāśrama, and was brought up by Vāsiṣṭha. The legend reflects old and real historical facts. Virabhadra is also called gānḍaṇḍa meaning chief of a Hindu republic. Besides, he is called cakra-vartīsaṁhāra (universal emperor), which could indicate the mixed conceptualization by Bhāṇjas who continued the popular tradition of close political units (gaṇas) and the royal ideology of "Gupta type".

Cf. Majumdar, R.C., Outline of the History of Orissa, Dacca University Studies, Vol. III, No.2, pp 137-70 (it includes a list of the Bhāṇjas’ inscriptions.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DYNASTY</th>
<th>ANCESTRY</th>
<th>RELIGIOUS AFFILIATION</th>
<th>CAPITAL</th>
<th>PERIOD</th>
<th>TERRITORY</th>
<th>EPIGRAPHICAL EVIDENCE</th>
<th>MAIN CONTENTS OF THE INSCRIPTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. Dānārānava</td>
<td>(A.D. 622-48)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>From Kalinganagara, the worshipper of the god Gokarnaśvāmin who is on the Mahendra Mountain, Indravara gave a land in village Tunganna to the brāhmaṇa skandaśarman.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Gupārānava I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Jayavarman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Devendravarman, the devout worshipper of Mahēśvara, from Kalinganagara, gave land in village Siddhārtaka (Varahavartani dist.) to Tamrapārāsī Tikṣita, a resident of Erandapali and student of the Rg Veda.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Nandavarman (c. A.D. 715)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>From Kalinganagara, Avantavarman the devout worshipper of Mahēśvara, who saluted the god Gokarnaśvāmin, donated a village to a brāhmaṇa expert in the Vedas and Vedāṅgas, on the occasion of the consecration of a tank.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Rājendravarman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>From Kalinganagara, Devendravarman, Gokarnaśvāmin, gifted village Purājvāna to a resident of Utrara Radha (Bengali, Murshidabad dist.) named Gīvindarman.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The two next inscriptions have the same style

Dhanantara Plates of Sāmantavarman, EP. IND., XV, No.15, pp.275-78.

Mahārāja Sāmantavarman, the great devotee of Mahēśvara, from his residence in Śvetaka, gave village Vatagrama to Bōvindaśarman.

M.P.P. Anantavarmadeva, who worshipped Lord Gōkarnēśvara, from Śvetaka donated village Svalpa Velura in the Khalgakhandha vishaya to bhatta Nanatasaraṇa.

"... Anantavarmadeva has the entire circle of feudatory chief loyally attached to himself through the excellence of his three-fold power (Trīśāti), who has the supremacy of the whole Kaliṇa, conquered by the strength of his own arm ..."
## Later Ganga of Kalinga:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dynasty</th>
<th>Ancestry</th>
<th>Religious Affiliation</th>
<th>Capital</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Territory</th>
<th>Epigraphical Evidence</th>
<th>Main Contents of the Inscriptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Virasiga</td>
<td>Lunar, descending from Visnu</td>
<td>Śaivas, worshippers of Gōtarnēśvara but also Visnu frequently is invoked.</td>
<td>Jantavura or Dantapura</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Plates of Anantavarman Chōgagāṇa-dēva, IND.ANT10., XVIII, pp.166 ff.</td>
<td>The sacred genealogy of the Gaṅgas, from Ananta (Visnu) through the Moon, to Gaṅgeya, to Kōlāhala, to the 61 kings of Kōlāhalapura, to Virasihā (the kings No.2-6), to Kamarpa, etc to Anantavarman Cōgagāṇa, Lord of Trikaliṅga, devout worshipper of Visnu. (The coronation date Cōgagāṇa was A.D.1081, from that moment started the Visnu affiliation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Kāmārṇava</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Plates of Jayavaramadēva, EP.IND., XXIII, No.42, pp.261-63.</td>
<td>The Lord of Kaliṅga, mahārāja Jayavaramadēva, devout worshipper of the god Gōkarnēśvara, from his residence in Śvetaka, donated village Bhusunda to Ravisēman, a brāhmaṇa resident of the Pratisñhena Viṣṇua.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Gānārṇava</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Guṇārṇava</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Mārasaṅga</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Vajrahaṭa</td>
<td>Gaṅgeya</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Kāmaṇaṇa</td>
<td>Gaṅgeya</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Raṇārṇava</td>
<td>Gaṅgeya</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Vajrahaṭa</td>
<td>Gaṅgeya</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Kamārṇava</td>
<td>Gaṅgeya, Gaṅgeya</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Guṇārṇava</td>
<td>Gaṅgeya</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Vajrahaṭa</td>
<td>Gaṅgeya, Gaṅgeya, Gaṅgeya</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DYNASTY</td>
<td>ANCESTRY</td>
<td>RELIGIOUS AFFILIATION</td>
<td>CAPITAL</td>
<td>PERIOD</td>
<td>TERRITORY</td>
<td>EPIGRAPHICAL EVIDENCE</td>
<td>MAIN CONTENTS OF THE INScriptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Jitāṅkuśa or Potankusa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vizagapattana Plates,</td>
<td>In this inscriptions, it is said that Cūgāgana was also a devout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Kaligalāṅkuśa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Idaem, pp. 173 ff.</td>
<td>worshipper of Mahēśvara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Guṇḍama I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Narasapattana Plates</td>
<td>Genealogy of the Bāgās of Tri-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Kāmārpa IV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>of Vajrahasitadeva V, EP.</td>
<td>kalinga, the coronation of Vajra-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Kāmārpa V</td>
<td>(Devendravarman)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kaliṅganagara and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nadagam Plates of Vajra-</td>
<td>Vajrahastadeva, the devout wor-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Guṇḍama II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sindurapura</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>hastadeva V, EP.IND., IV.</td>
<td>shipper of Mahēśvara, reigning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Vajrahasita V</td>
<td>Anantavarman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bhubanesvar Inscription</td>
<td>(Inscriptions on both sides of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Rājarāja I Dev-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>of Pramadi, EP.IND., XXI,</td>
<td>the doorway of the Kedaresvara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Anantavarman</td>
<td>Cūgāgana or Anangabhīma I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>It records the gift of a perpe-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Rāghava (1156-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>tual lamp to the god Kedaresvara</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Anantavarman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>by Rajan Pramadi, the younger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Amiyankabhiśma II (Anangabhī-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>brother of Cūgāgana. Pramadi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ma I (Anangabhī-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>regarded Lord Kedaresvara to be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ma I (1190-96)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the Supreme being.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anantavarman Cūgāgana, the foun-</td>
<td>Bhubanesvara Inscription of Anantavarman Codagan-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Similar donations like that of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>der of the temple of Purushottama-</td>
<td>ga, EP.IND., XXI No.7, pp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the Bhubanesvar Inscrip-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jaṅgaḥāvat Puri, gave vari-</td>
<td>29-32 (dated A.D.1114)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>tions to Madhukēśvara SII.Vol.V,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ous grants to the god Kirti-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nilakanṭhēśvara temple at Karayana-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>vasa (Siva)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>puram, Bobbili Taluk, Vishakha-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>patnam Dist., SII, vol.I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DYNASTY</td>
<td>ANCESTRY</td>
<td>RELIGIOUS AFFILIATION</td>
<td>CAPITAL</td>
<td>PERIOD</td>
<td>TERRITORY</td>
<td>EPIGRAPHICAL EVIDENCE</td>
<td>MAIN CONTENTS OF THE INSCRIPTIONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 29. Anantavarman  
Rājarāja III  
| 30. Ananqabhīma III  
or Trikaliṅga- 
nātha (1211-38) | | | | | | Ananqabhīma III gave a number of land grants to several brahmanas. The genealogy of the family is also given. It says that the Gaṅgas had descended from brahmanas of the Atriya gotra. |
| 31. Nṛsiṁha II  
or Nṛsiṁha  
| 32. Virabhāṇudēva I  
(c. A.D.1271-78) | | | | | | Records the erection of a temple day Catēśvara temple - by the Minister of Ananqabhīma III, Vīṣṇu. The genealogy of the Gaṅgas is given. It is said that they descended from the Moon. The Minister Vīṣṇu is highly praised. He was a brahmana expert in Vedas and Sāstras and also a powerful warrior. He made many benefactions and pious works. In the inscription is mentioned a certain order of ascetics, the Vaikhanasas, who were experts in the practice of Yoga. |
| 33. Nṛsiṁha III  
or Nṛsiṁha or Na- 
ranārāṣṭrīya (12- 
78-1325) | | | | | | |
| 34. Virabhāṇudēva II (c.A.D.1305-29) | | | | | | |
| 35. Nṛsiṁha III  
or Nṛsiṁha or Na- 
anārāṣṭrīya (c.A.D.1329) | | | | | | |
| 36. Virabhāṇudēva III (c.A.D.1355) | | | | | | |
| 37. Nṛsiṁha IV  
Nṛsiṁha (c.A.D.  
1379) | | | | | | |

### Caukukyas:

| 1. Rājū | Kṣatriyas | Śaivas and Vai- 
śnavas. | Anahilapāṭhaka  
or Anahilanagara  
or Anahilapat- 
ma. | Tenth Century | Northern Border  
Sāncūr (Jodhpur)  
Sāncūr (Jodhpur) 
Sāncūr (Jodhpur)  
Sabarmati river | Kiradu (Jodhpur) Śiva  
| 2. Mālarāja  
(A.D.942-44) | | | | | | | (Mālarāja founded temples at Manḍali and in Anahilapāṭhaka) |
| 3. Cāmudgarāja  
(A.D.944-1008) | | | | | | | Jayasiṁha Siddharāja consecrated the temple of Śiva (where this) |
<p>| 4. Vaiḍgharāja | | | | | | | A.D. 1149. Jayasiṁha captured |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DYNASTY</th>
<th>ANCESTRY</th>
<th>RELIGIOUS AFFILIATION</th>
<th>CAPITAL</th>
<th>PERIOD</th>
<th>TERRITORY</th>
<th>EPIGRAPHICAL EVIDENCE</th>
<th>MAIN CONTENTS OF THE INSCRIPTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. Jayasañhadeva Siddharāja</td>
<td>Kumārapāla</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Genealogy from Mūlarāja I to Jayantasiṃhadeva</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Mūlarāja II</td>
<td>Ajayapāla</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Bhāmadēva</td>
<td>Jayantasāhadeva</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Mūlarāja II</td>
<td>Jayantasiṃhadeva</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Ajayapāla</td>
<td>Trībhuvaṇapāla</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(xvi) Saindhavas or Jayadrathas:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Ancestor</th>
<th>Ancestry</th>
<th>Capital</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Territory</th>
<th>Epigraphical Evidence</th>
<th>Main Contents of the Inscriptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Puṣapajadeva</td>
<td>Jayadratha-vaṃśa</td>
<td>Vaiṣṇavas, Lakṣṇi was considered goddess of their royal fortune.</td>
<td>A.D. 734</td>
<td>Western Sau-rashtra</td>
<td>Plates from Bhusali, EP. IND., XXVI, No.27, pp. 185-226.</td>
<td>The chart shows that the family was influential in western Kāthiawar. They had considerable naval strength and described themselves as &quot;masters of the ocean&quot;. Their emblem was a fish. They had excellent relations with their paramount lords, the Pratihāras. In plate &quot;A&quot; the brāhāmapas are mentioned as the most important class of citizens but, at the same level are the merchants, which demonstrates the high status of these last in the commercial society of Kāthiawar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Kṛṣṇarāja</td>
<td>Vaiṣṇavas, Bhūtabālika or Bhumālikā (Bhumāli)</td>
<td></td>
<td>A.D. 724</td>
<td></td>
<td>Six Saindhava Copper Plates from Bhusali, EP. IND., XXVI, No.27, pp. 185-226.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Aggukā</td>
<td>A.D. 774-794</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Rāṇaka</td>
<td>A.D. 794-814</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Kṛṣṇarāja II</td>
<td>A.D. 814-824</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Aggukā II</td>
<td>A.D. 824-834</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Jaika I</td>
<td>A.D. 834-848</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Cūmāṅgaṇāja</td>
<td>A.D. 849-874</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Aggukā III</td>
<td>A.D. 874-899</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Jaika II</td>
<td>A.D. 899-919</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(xvii) Yādavas:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DYNASTY</th>
<th>ANCESTRY</th>
<th>RELIGIOUS AFFILIATION</th>
<th>CAPITAL</th>
<th>PERIOD</th>
<th>TERRITORY</th>
<th>EPIGRAPHICAL EVIDENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bhīllama</td>
<td>Lunar</td>
<td>Śaiva/Sākta</td>
<td>Dēvaṇīti</td>
<td>from ninth</td>
<td>The northern</td>
<td>Grant of the title of Krishna III, EP. IND., XXXII, No.4-2, p.55.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Singhana      | this branch came  | they also protected  |         | century till A.D. 1317 | Godāvāri (Au- | At the same place was a monastery constructed by Kautuka. On the gate of same place was a monastery constructed by Kautuka. On the gate of Krishna III. E.

About the god Bhīllamaladeva or Madhusudana (Viṣṇu). The deity was installed by the merchants' descendants of Bhīllama (Sīla), Jodhpur. At the same place was a monastery constructed by Kautuka. On the gate of the deity was installed by the merchants' descendants of Bhīllama (Sīla), Jodhpur.

The legendary history of the monasticism in the area of Kalēgaon. Yamālīrtha or Yameśvara. The grant of a village to 52 brāhmaṇas on the occasion of the Mahādeva coronation. They received 11 types of privileges or enjoyment.

Kalaēgaon Plates, EP. IND. XXXII, No.3, pp.31-6 (off Yadava Mahadeva)

(xviii) Śilāhāras of North Kōṅkana:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>The claimed status of Mahākṣa-</th>
<th>Mostly Śaivas, practice of Brah-</th>
<th>Sthānaka (Thana)</th>
<th>A.D.790-1265</th>
<th>Kōṅkana (Puri Kōṅkana, Sahta Kōṅkana, plus the Kolhapur branch</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Kaparadīna I</td>
<td>mostly Mahākṣa-</td>
<td>practice of Brah-</td>
<td>probably then it was Puri.</td>
<td>A.D.790-1265</td>
<td>Kōṅkana (Puri Kōṅkana, Sahta Kōṅkana, plus the Kolhapur branch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Pullaśakti</td>
<td>triyās.</td>
<td>triyās.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>kōṅkana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Kaparadīna II</td>
<td></td>
<td>triyās.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>kōṅkana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Vappuvanna</td>
<td></td>
<td>triyās.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>kōṅkana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Jhanjha</td>
<td></td>
<td>triyās.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>kōṅkana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Goggi</td>
<td></td>
<td>triyās.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>kōṅkana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Vajjada</td>
<td></td>
<td>triyās.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>kōṅkana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Chadvaidēva</td>
<td></td>
<td>triyās.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>kōṅkana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Apparajita</td>
<td></td>
<td>triyās.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>kōṅkana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Vajjada II</td>
<td></td>
<td>triyās.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>kōṅkana</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are many grants given by the Śilāhāras, by their ministers and bright officials for construction and provision of temples and maintenance of ascetics living in mathas attached to the temples. Śaiva sects: Pāśupatas, Kālāmukhas, Kāpālikas and mostly Māttamayūras operated freely in the kingdom.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DYNASTY</th>
<th>ANCESTRY</th>
<th>RELIGIOUS AFFILIATION</th>
<th>CAPITAL</th>
<th>PERIOD</th>
<th>TERRITORY</th>
<th>EPIGRAPHICAL EVIDENCE</th>
<th>MAIN CONTENTS OF THE INSCRIPTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11. Arikesarîn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ambarnath Temple Insc. of Mamvaniraja, CORP. INSC.INDIC., VI, No.17, pp.110 ff.</td>
<td>About the construction of the temple of Ambarnath at Patapaili</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Chittarâja</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Akkaikut Insc. of Andaroga, EP.IND., IV, 111, No.15, p.65.</td>
<td>Donation to the Siddhajâsêvara temple at Pattaya Varamajina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Nâgârjuna</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lonad Stone Insc. of Aparaditya II, CORP. INSC. INDIC., VI, No.30, p.156</td>
<td>Vyômaâmbhu, Bhôpaka in charge of Shatshâthi viçâya (he was a chief of an Mattamayûra monastery) with the permission of the king gave land to the Vyomasaâradêva temple (where the Siva-liîga was). This ācârya became Minister (mahâpradhâna) of Apara-ditya II.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Mûmûnî</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Inscriptions about Saiva ācâryas and Saiva sects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Anantadeva I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Jnañâsîva, Mattamayûra ācârya received a gift on behalf of the Bhaiyapêsvâra temple.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Aparârka</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- The Pâsûpata pañçita Brahmësvara (the same of Mira) Plates was the Councillor of many of these kings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. visramûdîva</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>It mentions Vedângaraî, the great Pâsûpata master</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Haripûlalêva</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>It mentions Sovarâsî, the great Pâsûpata acârya head of the Sedambala Siva temple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Mallikârjuna</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Aparâditya</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Anantadeva II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Kesidêva II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Anantadeva III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Sâmeśvara</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General features of the Śilhâras:**
They were feudatories of Rastrakûtas and Cûlukyas, and entitled themselves as mahâsâmântas.
They were very generous with Śaiva ascetics. Constantly Śaiva guru visited the capital and received gifts.
Śaiva ācâryas of Pâsûpata and Mattamayûra sect had a strong influence in the Śilhâra court.
III.2. Early medieval kingship and Brahmanical asceticism

One of the crucial institutions of early medieval India, intimately related to its religious transformation, was kingship, with its sacred character. The divinity of the king of ancient times, however, made way to a more functional role. The king's divine and royal duty per excellence consisted in conducting the government in pursuit of dharma. The following pages seek to bring out the realtionship that developed between the ascetic Brahmanical organizations and kingship and how they helped and supported each other.

III.2.1 Ancient kingship/early medieval kingship, the evolution and the influence from the esoteric thought.

The Manusmṛti says that the king inhereis himself the sacred particles of the eight devas who were the guardians and protectors of the world: the Sun, the Moon, Fire, Wind, Yama, Kubera, Varuṇa and Indra. From each, the king received particular characteristics that could aid in his divine task.

The king, as the Sun, could burn eyes and hearts (tapati). He dispelled darkness, slayed enemies and outshone any rival in splendour. He had pratāpa, the majesty which irradiates by itself, and tejas, the authority coming from his own splendour as symbol of the unity of the kingdom. As the moon, the king sprinkled the Soma or the joyful juice. He brought good luck, made people happy and increased the fertility of human beings, animals and plants. Inspiring fear in the wicked, he was like
Yama. He controlled his subjects energetically and administered justice. As Kubera, he possessed the marvellous power of ruddhis (prosperity); he generated the creative energy (ojas) and secured the wealth and abundance of the kingdom.

The king was Agni, the fire that destroys evil and cleanses sin, universal monarch who purified the world and scattered the enemies, he was the main celebrant at the sacrifice, the divine mediator between earth and heaven. The king also was Varuṇa, the great Lord of dharma, protector of Truth and Righteousness, ruler of the correct ordering of the world, responsible for the balance, equilibrium and order not only of the community of subjects but of the entire world. As such, he was entitled to a portion of the wealth of his subjects. The levy of taxes and contributions and redistribution of the material resources and maintenance of a balance of wealth was, in fact, a part of the king’s sacred duty.

As the leader and people’s force of society, he was Indra. He cemented a bond among people, in peace and in war, against the enemies of dharma. This characteristic of Indra gave the mentioned king’s ojas (the creative energy), that set him apart from the rest.

As Vāyu, the Supreme breath, the quick messenger of the gods, the king was mobile, agile, progressive, anxious of victories, the energiser. The character of Viśnu, the mighty
universal sovereign, gave his rule eternity, transcendence and continuity. The *āśvamedha* sacrifice was directly related to this characteristic. Kingship thus represented the harmonized unity of the world — the collective consciousness — as it were in an individual. The king was the nucleus of the collective consciousness. He represented and symbolized the mystic social unity. He was the embodiment of right purpose for all his subjects. He was beloved by everyone and was present in everyone, which was why he was also called *virāj*, an epithet reserved for Viṣṇu. From this omnipresence came his majesty. A king who could not maintain the unity of his people ceased to be the leader. 185

It will be appreciated that these characteristics of the king had much in common with the fundamental concepts of asceticism that we analyzed in Chapter I. Asceticism consisted in the awakening of the superior powers within the individual by the constant practice of penances and the elevation of the mind through the absorption in the Self after withdrawing the senses from material objects and even the mind from thinking and internal activities; the king was the focus of the collective concentration.

The king's duty was to dam all collective forces concentrated in him or channelized through him solely for *dharma*. Success in this singular task was equivalent to the success attained by an ascetic in reaching *samādhi*. The king, together
with his subjects, also practised elements of collective asceticism, manifested in the practice of prudence, morality, sharing of surplus, zeal for religious works, etc. In several sources coming from early medieval north India, always is stressed that the construction of mathas, vihāras, wells, artificial lakes, planting trees and groves, and other religious works was considered as high meritorious tasks which must be endeavoured by kings as duty and as manner to motivate the imitation by the kingmen. Both the collective concentration and the collective righteousness accumulated in the kingdom built up a tremendous power (śakti), akin to the mystical power of the ascetics, the śakti of the kingdom being vested in the person of the king. A great king had great power which came from his people in unity. The best elements to help in that concentration of śakti were the experts in the art of concentration, namely the community of ascetics.

Śakti was understood as a worldly social power emanated from the people (prakṛtis) and personified in the king. The concept could be originated from archaic ideas of tribal participation in a "mystic social force" (manas), following the interpretations of Ernst Cassirer or "social reproductive force" in the sense have been explained by Claude Levi-Strauss. Śakti, from any perspective, would be understood as a derivative force coming from the community. Śakti was a concept which was incorporated by the Brahmanical thinkers into their orthodoxy as
part of the process of development of early medieval beliefs and
ideologies. The Purāṇas included the idea of śakti in several
parts.\textsuperscript{169} In the Purāṇas śakti is not only the female aspect of
Mahādēva (or the half of the fold nature of Śiva, female and
male) but śakti was comprehended as the female nature which is
the basis of the whole creation, giving it the character of
infinite creative power. And such creative power would be
interpreted as the country and "her" people, and the king was her
husband as a Śiva incarnated, a Śiva on earth (Parama-
mahēśvara).\textsuperscript{170} This phenomenon of "political Saktism" is related
with the emergence of the Śākta religion and the social process
which was its background. Such process was taking place
preferentially in the eastern kingdoms (Bihar-Bengal) in early
medieval times. This problem was registered in several records
written during the period. Bāṇabhatta depicts the wild forest
which surrounded Harṣa's kingdom as the constant presence of
Cāndikā (or Cāṇḍi, Cāṇḍa, Cāmuṇḍā).\textsuperscript{171} Bhavabhūti's Mālatī-
Mādhava\textsuperscript{172} refers to the terrible goddess Cāmuṇḍā and Sōmadēva
also describes Cāmuṇḍā in her most terrible form.\textsuperscript{173} Besides, the
text on Tantra, the Sāradātilaka\textsuperscript{174} explains this capacity of
generating life by earth, country and people. The relation
between king and country as a "political intercourse" through
which is generated the full social life was reflected through
mythical explains in several chapters of the Śiva\textsuperscript{175},
Mārkaṇḍeya,\textsuperscript{176} Devī, Garuḍa,\textsuperscript{177} and Skanda Purāṇas. This matter
on the social power understood as \textit{\textbf{sakti}} and personified in the king ("the husband of the country") was also considered by the writers of later \textit{Arthasāstras} who included some reflections about the relation between power of king and power of people.\textsuperscript{178} Therefore, the \textit{\textbf{sakti}} power represented the natural (even, the savage) force of peoples, groups and clans who ceded their terrible and uncivilized energy (well symbolized in the fierce nature of \textit{\textbf{sakti}}) to the state. Consequently, the state governed such dynamism in the direction of the highest goal established by doctrinal and institutional principles. And these principles were the Brahmanical conception of society.

\begin{center}
\textbf{Dharma}, the \textit{Bṛhadarāṇyaka Upaniṣad} \textsuperscript{177} says, is the ruler of rulers (\textit{kṣatrasya kṣtram}). \textit{Dharma} is the \textbf{real} principle of royalty, for \textit{dharma} it is that must reign in the world, and not caprice. The king was the defender and promulgator of \textit{dharma}, himself being subject to the dictates of \textit{dharma}. Precisely for this reason the king, as the protector of \textit{dharma}, and the \textit{brāhmaṇas} as the experts in the Sacred Laws, and by implication, the upholder of \textit{dharma}, maintained mutually supportive relation. Their cooperation brought glory and success to both parties and general welfare to the kingdom.\textsuperscript{180} The \textit{purohitas} protected the king and the kingdom with their spiritual power, and the king in return sustained and gave care to the \textit{brāhmaṇas}.\textsuperscript{181}
\end{center}

Kautilya's \textit{Arthaśāstra} emphasized that the king's ultimate
goal must be universal conquest (*cakravarti-ksetra*), so as to universalize Brahmanical administration and to achieve a cosmic attainment of *caturvarnasramadharma*. The Mauryan Empire was the example par excellence of such doctrine. Aśoka was doubtless the *cakravartin* — the universal emperor of ancient India, the great ruler of dharma. At the transition from the ancient to the medieval times the Guptas, too, wanted to revive the imperial aspirations. The early medieval dynasties emulated that character but in a radically changed social and economic context (vide Chapter II), the presence of new ethnic groups — such as Hūnas — being a new element and of a Brahmanism which was learning to be tolerant of a broad-based and mixed religion. The erstwhile king-đrāhmaṇa team changed into a combination of king and ācāryas of different sects, and, later on, ascetic institutions.

Early medieval times had a new generation of political thinkers who, rooted in the old Śṛiti tradition, formulated a modified theory of sacred kingship in keeping with the changed circumstances. Among these were Kāmandaka’s *Nītisāra*, Medhatīthi’s and Viśvarūpa’s commentaries on *Śṛitis*, Sōmadēva’s *Nītvākyamrita*, Lakṣmīdhara’s *Rājadharmakāṇḍa* and Kṛtyakalpataru, Caṇḍeśvara’s *Rājanītiratnākara*, the Yuktikalpataru of king Bhōja of Dharā, Bṛhaspati’s *Arthaśāstra*, Kalhana’s *Rājatarangini*, Harṣavardhana’s works and those of his biographer Bṛṇabhaṭṭa, and the writers of the *Purāṇas*, specially the Matsya, Mārkaṇḍeya, Viṣṇu, and Agni.
These writers, generally, accord the kṣatriya status to a rājan. Anyone who possessed a kingdom was a kṣatriya. Their success in the warfield demonstrated that they had been "touched by Fortune" and favoured to be organizers of a kingdom. Those who had obtained by arms a kingdom, had, therefore, the right to assume the duties of kṣatriya. The correct performance of the kingly role was more important than the king's ancestry. If the need arose for the display of an acceptable and noble ancestry, his poets and brāhmaṇa councillors rose to the occasion, and prepared and consecrated for him an enviable pedigree.

Medhatithi is quite clear about this, and his point of view is typical of the thinking of his time: "rājan can be named any territory: ruler (janapadeśvara) even if he is not kṣatriya". "Kṣatriyas without consecration can be named rājan". "What is important is for the king to perform the duty of protector of people (nṛpa) and ensure the general welfare".183

Like almost all the aforementioned authors184 and also like the ancient writers, Medhatithi limited the king's tremendous authority to being the defender of the dharma. The king submitted to the supreme mandate of the Smṛtis. He could not alter the holiest traditions, nor could he participate in religious dogmatic discussions (which several ancient kings did) but had to concentrate on the realization of pious works, and the protection of brāhamaṇas and holy ascetics. Medhatithi felt
called upon to make these imperative categorical to guide the
king from going astray amidst the claims for support by the
ruling families from the many squabbling sects, and from
involving themselves in religious controversies with more than
one king did, probably influenced by the tendency of their
rājagurus. Perhaps the most classical example of that king-
ācāryas cooperation (or palace-maṭhas connection) was the
Kalacūrī kingdom and the Mattamayūra monastical order. This
subject will be analysed in detail in Chapter V.2. Also, a
comparative list of the Kalacūrī kings, their corresponding
rājagurus and the inscriptions where these names appear would be
consulted in the work of V.S.Pathak, History of Śaiva Cults.

Apparently, the new dynasties of the early medieval times
were expected to do better job of protecting Brahmanism and
orthodoxy than descendents of the pure kṣatriyas. Viśvarūpa even
complained that the old kṣatriya families were so relaxed that
they were not fit to hold the royal titles — "nothing in their
lives showed interest in dharma" — and it would be better if
they were replaced by a new race, without sin, ready to
accomplish the kṣatriya code. Indeed, this was what the
Purāṇas had foretold about the Kali Age, where the varṇas would
replace each other. The Purānic authors, however, thought just
the contrary, and trenchantly criticized the "Kali Age
Dynasties". Their support to the idea of the divine origin of the
kṣatriyas, and to status quo, was as firm as ever. Ironically,
however, the later Purāṇas broke away from the Brahmanical imperviousness of their predecessors, admitting a whole lot of sources, such as regional developments, Saktism and Tantric tendencies, as Hazra noted in his excellent study.146 Regarding the concept of kingship and its sacred character, some esoteric interpretations were introduced, such as that the power of the king (śakti) was related to the mystic power generated in the kingdom from the holy centres, tīrthas and maṭhas, by the action of brāhmaṇas, yogins, sādhus, siddhas and ascetics.147 The powerful yogins, who concentrated on their secret routine, were the fountain-heads of the kingdom's welfare and the king's success. Their magic power could drive away danger and dispel chaotic tendencies. The rājas came much closer to the gurus and ācāryas. Harṣavardhana's being an ascetic king was symptomatic of the new associations between kings and ascetics. The Agni Purāṇa148 eloquently expresses this connection:

"(The king) should arrange for (the proper pursuit of) the orders of the varṇa (castes) and āśrama (stages of life). He should worship the ascetics. He should not trust everyone and trust only the ascetics. He should make (others) trust him adducing reason (to show that his words) are not impeachable ..."

The early medieval Purānic thought reinforced the concept of the king as being an omnipotent lord limited only by dharma. He was the supreme person who alone received the allegiance of his
subjects. He exercised authority over his dominions (rajya) as if he was the father and the subjects his family. Sukra in his Nitisara said that the king must be to his subjects like father, mother, preceptor, brother, friend, Kubera and Yama. Kāmandaka and Yājñavalkya's commentators, besides Sukra, viewed the kingdom as an organism comprising a head (the king), arms (the army) and so on, the different parts making up the government. Good sense, manifested in actions promoting dharma, was the vital energy which animated and sustained that body. The Matsya Purāṇa reiterates the concept of the kingdom being an organism whose health is ensured by being rightly commanded and by its members working in harmony. In the context of the Yogic doctrine enunciated in several Purāṇas, such as the Liṅga Purāṇa, (which explains the highest states of the mind and the body attained through the practice of yoga), the king's achievement in concentrating power amounted to something like "social yoga": a perfect state of harmony between the government (the mind) and the social body.

The kingdom, led by a wise king well supported by an assembled body would create trivarga, the perfect state of social virtue that a kingdom attained when dharma was faithfully followed. The greatest responsibility for its realization rested on the highest castes and on the king. The king who obeyed the dictates of niti, would realize trivarga in his kingdom. In the niti decrees, devotion to pious works is decreed as the
The king’s first concern. As the epigraphical records of the period show, this was the ideal stressed by all the dynasties of the period. Obviously, therefore, the new alliance between kingship and ascetic organisations in the early medieval times had, as its ultimate goal, the creation of the ideal kingdom. The kings felt themselves blessed to be in the company of holy and wise men, for as the Bhāgavata Purāṇa advises, "... nothing gives more blessings and accomplishes realization in the path of perfection than associating with saints". The king who attracted holy men from everywhere and gave them facilities for performing their sacred routines, was probably doing more for the security and prosperity of his kingdom than one who spent time, lives and resources in conquests.

The Mārkaṇḍeyya and Matsya Purāṇas exhort the king to be generous to and protective of learned brāhmaṇas and holy ascetics, promising, in return, infinite rewards for honouring and for being generous to those who maintain the Vedas alive. The Śiva Purāṇa speaks of how much the leading kings were devoted to Mahēśvara. In many chapters it praises Śiva as the highest goal for any yogin; Śiva is the end of Yoga, and, as Advaita Vedānta says, perfection itself. The king personified Śiva in his kingdom, as the frequent use of the paramount title of parama mahēśvara and the protection of sensitive holy tīrthas of Śiva indicates. Kṛṣṇarāja founded and protected the Kṛṣṇēśvara tīrtha and Śaṅkaragaṇa did the same for Śaṅkara tīrtha.
Both Kalacūri kings considered themselves Śiva's administrators in the world. Not only was the symbol of Śiva a means to improve these kings' image of being excellent administrators; equally importantly, it gave them conviction of being the head of a system through which the world could be controlled. Śukra and Kāmandaka held that the king must achieve total self-control if he was to introduce self-control among the subjects. The king as Śiva, or supreme lord, had the high responsibility of controlling his mundane nature which inclines a person towards sin. He could do that with self-power (prabhu śakti), the supreme consciousness or collective consciousness concentrated in the symbol of unity (the king). But for the attainment of that self-power the support of the learned sector of society — the brāhmaṇas — and the experts in the control of the mind — the ascetics, gurus, ācāryas, etc. — was indispensable. They constituted the intellectual power (mantra śakti). The king could use his coercive capacity (utsaha śakti), which comprised his own power assisted by men at arms, to force subjects to follow the path of dharma or to defend the kingdom against internal disorder or external menaces. This was the divine task of the king as the first agent of dharma: to achieve the full use of power (tri śakti) for the unity of the kingdom and over all other partial power (as that of the feudatories), eliminating any chance of discord.

In the attempt of early medieval dynasties to build up
legendary ancestries to prove their divinity, they were well assisted by their intellectual councillors who praised these kings as descending from the holiest sages, or from divine objects, or from mythical heroes, or even fabulous animals (such as the Nāgas). A classic case is that of the Kalacūrī family of Tripurī, successors in Central India of the Vākātakas. They came in close contact with the Mattamayūra pontiffs of the prestigious Gōlakī-maṭha (Dāhala country). Vāmadēva, the founder of the Kalacūrī dynasty, apparently was a great warrior and a devotee of Śiva. By and by it came to be said that Vāmadēva had been an emanation of good Śiva himself. Also conserved, in the royal records or in local tradition was the spiritual genealogy of the ācāryas of the Gōlakī-maṭha, which probably dates much earlier than the Kalacūrī ancestry. In course of time, however, both genealogies got mixed up, it is a matter of conjecture whether this happened with deliberate design and king Vāmadēva began to be considered to be the same Vāmaśambhu, the great Mattamayūra ācārya and second after Sadbhāśambhu, the founder of Gōlakī-maṭha. In any event, from this strong association, the Kalacūris obtained high prestige all around as being paramamahēśvaras, and they reigned with the conviction of being "the arm of Śiva".

The usual claim by the kings of the time, to be incarnations or direct representatives of Śiva, Viṣṇu or Śūrya, was advocated by the Purāṇic writers or promoted by the
intellectuals of the court. The kings displayed the divinity in numerous pious works that the epigraphs of the period recorded. The promotion of religion, the observance of duties and vows and the patronage of temples and mathas were the application *per se* of the divine position widely acknowledged. Zeal in doing all these works or in protecting the caturvarṇāśramadharma was necessitated by the pressure to demonstrate their real noble, pure sacred ancestry. We find a possible exception to this phenomenon in the Pālas, who ascended to power by a delegation of authority made by the princes of Bihar-Bengal. That vote of confidence made in favour of Gopāla reflected the popular acceptance of the special qualities of this chief, who appeared as one who is clearly marked by the royal Fortune. The divine power that must vest in a king already was within him.

The Khalimpur Plate of Dharmapāla209 relates how the prakṛtis made him to accept the hand of Lakṣmī (the royal Fortune):

Mātsya - nyāyam = apōhitum
prakṛtitibhir = Lakṣmyān karaṃ = grāhitaḥ
śrī-Goṇāla iti kṣitiśa - śirasām 
chūḍāmaṇis = tat-sūtaḥ

yaṣy = ānuśrikṛṣṭe sanātana - yaśorāśir =
dīśām = āśayē śvētimnā yadi
paurnāmaśa-rajanī jyotising-ātibhāra-śriyā210

"His son (of Vāpyaṭa) was the crest jewel of the heads of kings, the glorious Gopāla, whom the people made take hand of Fortune to put an end to the practice of fishes; whose everlasting great
fame the glorious mass of moonlight on a full-moon-night seeks to
rival by its whiteness in the sky".

Gopāla was made king by the people (prakṛtis) which may perhaps
mean the council of rājas and chieftains of the region.
He put an end to a chaotic situation in which everyone was the
prey of his neighbour ("... the practice of fishes"). Gopāla
married king Bhadra's daughter, Dēddāvēvi and from her was born
Gopāla's son and successor, Dharmapāla.211

Touched by divine power, the kings carried, the sense of
sacred mission. In all that they did in their symbols they had to
emulate the gods in their divine power as the gods manifested it
while on earth. In the display of the magnificence of his palace
and in the splendour of his court, in the care of his people, in
his generosity, and most of all, in his ferocity and warlike
temperament, unmerciful with his enemies, he displayed his divine
qualities. The centre of his kingdom, however, showed another
manifestation. Just like the gods who spent millions of years in
meditation and ascetic penances,212 the king also maintained
thousands of ascetics in meditation in the royal maṭhas.

The concept of sacred mission is well formulated in the
Agni Purāṇa213 and was related to the theory of Viṣṇu avatāras.
It is said there that god Viṣṇu in his supreme mercy, came to the
earth on several occasions to restore order any time chaos rocked
the world and evil strove to neutralize and expel dharma. In the
Kali Yuga,²¹⁴ the Supreme Being operates through kings, who have the sacred mission to diminish the people's distress. Viṣṇu will come again as Kalki at the end of the present Kali Yuga²¹⁵ but, in the meantime, it is the sacred mission of the kings to strive for the increase of purity (sattva) through exceptionally devoted service, protecting the brāhmaṇas and holy ascetics,²¹⁶ the latter being the best elements to diminish the total expression of Kali. Thus, apart from political and military duties, the king had the highest obligation to lead the religious activities in the kingdom. The Matsya Purāṇa,²¹⁷ expected the kings to firmly promote the study of the Vedas. This was not the only Brahmanical pursuit the kings participated in actively. Other monarchs ruled in accordance with Jaina or Buddhist percepts. In the Rājatarāṅgiṇī is celebrated the prohibition of killing animals made by king Meghayāhana of Kaśmīr throughout his kingdom.²¹⁸

Tension could not always be avoided from this kind of sectarian attitudes and edicts. There used to be friction among the sects, given the impossibility of satisfying everybody. Probably to avoid such predicament the kings often delegated religious matters to the care of their main ministers, chosen from among the most outstanding brāhmaṇas. The latter took direct care of the right maintenance of customs and sacred traditions. The king could have but limited religious control over the varṇas. The Mārkaṇḍeeya Purāṇa²¹⁷ permitted the king to interfere in the social life if changes came about in it of the kind that
endangered dharmā, the Supreme Law. For that reason and for the arguments given in Chapter II, the religious institution enjoyed a relative autonomy and had the authority to censure the king if he did not follow the sacred laws.

III.2.2 The Magic Powers and the Perfect Kingdom

In several tales and legends of the Purāṇas, the theme is that the association between a king and an ascetic brahmana culminated in positive advantages to the whole kingdom. In the legend of the Descent of Bhāgīrathī, in the Brahma Purāṇa, for example, is narrated the tale of King Sāgara and the boon conceded to him by an ascetic whom that sovereign revered. The ascetic conceded to the king a large number of sons but the envy of another ascetic resulted in their being killed by some evil spirits. Just one son was saved who also turned himself into an ascetic. From him emerged the lineage of Bhāgīrathī. 

Bhāgīrathī = Gaṅgā

Bhāgīrathī is derived from Bhagiratha who brought Gaṅgā down to the earth through his penances in order to revive the sons of Sāgara, who had been turned into ashes.

The quantity of legends that piled up through the centuries suggest in our context that the wandering sannyāsins, sages and ācāryas were well received in the royal courts. The legends also reflect the royal as also popular respect for these ascetics because of their tremendous powers. The Indian Antiquary, Volumes X, XI and XII give various tales originating in the
folklore of Rajasthan. They are beautiful in their transparency and simplicity, invariably concluding in a pedagogical and happy end. The tale of "The flying chappals (sandals), the staff of the powers and the shawl of invisibility", for example, recounts the story of a guru who died and bestowed on his disciples those three magic objects. While they were disputing about which of them was to have the different precious objects, an astute young man fooled these selfish disciples and ran away with the magic objects. Thanks to these objects the ambitious but prudent boy won for himself the love of the royal princess and finally became king.

Early medieval literary sources over and over again speak of how the ascetic men were admired and feared. With the magic powers accumulated through penances and ascetics practices, they even made the gods submit to them. In Śākuntalam of Kālidāsa, for example, the sages, ascetics and ācāryas had a position predominant even to the gods. The kings sought their favour. The Nārada Purāṇa\textsuperscript{223} refers to "The Power of the Austerities of Gautama" who had a hermitage where devas and sages used to stay. It is said that this Gautama, through the power of his concentration, brought to an end a severe drought which was producing terrible suffering to the world. Thanks to him there was food in abundance for many generations. The powers achieved by the ascetics are described in various other passages of the Purāṇas. In the Bhāgavata Purāṇa Śiva himself, the Great Yogin,
the bestower of these powers, described these powers. 224

Not only was the active association between kings and ascetics notable; kingdom itself was built around the holy places consecrated by the presence of holy sages. Most capitals of early medieval dynasties came to be conceived also as holy tīrthas, like Chittor, Gwalior, or Ranathambore in Rajasthan, bringing about a certain correspondence between the religious maps and the political maps. However, chronologically it is not possible to say whether the capital was earlier or the tīrtha earlier. Same commentary is valid to many cities. Ramendra Nath Nandi 225 have attempted to demonstrate the relation between tīrthas and the whole social and religious process suffered at the end of ancient Indian period. Nandi's thesis analyzes the apparent decadence of cities and towns which happened between the third and of fourth century A.D. Nandi establishes a relation between the lost of clientele by the jajmani brāhmaṇas, who were settled at these urban centres and give sacred services to citizens and kingmen. And because of such decadence could start a partial emigration of brāhmaṇa families to the country side or towards new kingdoms just in full power. Thus, several emigrated brāhmaṇas slowly had new process of elevation of category when associated themselves with new ruling families and accepted land grants. So, they transformed in sacred landlords, previous incorporation into the Brahmanical ethical framework of a new appropriate doctrine on Brahmanical landlordism. Nandi thinks that the Brahmanical
literature written after the third century A.D. was specially concerned about the declaration of tirthas on many spots where still lived large number of brähmaṇas endangered by the decadence process. The mode of such proclamation, sometimes made by gods and sometimes by godmen, was the fabrication of a new mythology which sanctified the tīrtha by associating it with the "sacred", besides publicizing the performance of dāna rituals at the proclaimed tīrtha as acts of unparalleled religious merit. Besides, through such constant proclamations also it was sanctified the custom of pilgrimage and giving gifts to the brähmaṇas living at these tirthas. The Brahmanical propaganda had been emphatic in claiming the enormous spiritual gains for these pilgrims who visited such tirthas and generously gifted brähmaṇas. Nanji sees in the doctrine of tirthas a "push up" for towns suffering a sharp deterioration in their economic life. The affluence of people to such sacred spots must have increased the general movement of the town life. Consequently that decay of towns motivated the proclamation, for a large number of them, as places of pilgrimage. So, the new scheme and ritual order gave fresh opportunities to jajmani brähmaṇas for offering their services. Therefore, the construction of a sacred origin for such tirthas was an important task for the same brähmaṇas of these places. But, there are several contradictions in Nandi's theory. He supported many of his postulates on archaeological evidences about city decadence which still is a controversial
matter. Also Nandi emphasizes in sustaining that there was chronological coincidence between the "city decadence" and the accumulation of records into the body of Purānic literature, which had given a new hopeness to the needs and the search for preminences by the Jajmani brāhmaṇas. But Hazra and other experts in Purāṇa records have explained on the very late accumulation of the Purāṇas and all the difficulties which implicate the use of the data provided in them. Only some sections of the early Purāṇas are possible to make coincidence with the period of "city decadence". May be that the rest of reports on tīrthas are dated on early medieval period. The holy tīrthas, in the mythological accounts of their origin, began as seats of sages or holy ascetics who practised penances at those spots for a long time. The legends about the origin of hundreds of tīrthas, detailed in the Purāṇas, make this clear. In the Brahma Purāṇa, Brahma says to Nārada that the knowledge about the sacred tīrthas is secret even for the yogins. That is one of the highest forms of knowledge a man would attain. Then persuaded by Nārada, Brahma explains about the main tīrthas and their mystery powers such as Kumāra-tīrtha, Kritikā-tīrtha, Paśāca-tīrtha, Kṣudhā - tīrtha and so on. The Nārada Purāṇa contains descriptions of various other very holy centres, such as Kāśi, Puruṣottama (Puri, Orissa), Prayāga, Kurukṣetra, Puṣkara, etc. Most of them are related with sacred myths and theophanies but their importance is increased by the constant presence at these
places of sages and ascetics who elevated the real power of these pieces of heaven on earth. Puṣkara, the celebrated sacred place near Ajmer, was created "by a lotus flower thrown by Brahma to kill the demon Vajranābha". The sanctity of Puṣkara is complemented by the presence nearby of other tīrthas such as the hermitage of the sage Agastya. A pilgrimage to Puṣkara cannot be complete if the devotees do not have a bath in the Agastya Kūṇḍa.231

When cities were founded by victorious kings, they promptly built in the centre of the metropolis a Śiva temple, as being "the best manner to secure a sacred kingdom in the Kali Age". The Śiva Purāṇa, in that sense, gives exhaustive information about why the temples of Śiva counteract the effects of Kali, how to build these temples and when, etc.232

The founders of ruling families used to be present in the epigraphy as a Śiva on earth, possessors of magic powers like the great Yogin Śiva.233 They were blessed by special astronomical confluences and by the local ascetics and knowers of secret sciences. The new genealogy (rājavāmśa) was like a mystery tree, appearing at many places like the Śiva Liṅga, accompanied by myths. The Liṅga Purāṇa is rich in explanations about the origin of Liṅgas and the Liṅgam symbol.234 The Bayana Inscription of Chitralēkā235 (discovered at Bayana, Bharatpur district, Rajasthan, and dated in A.D. 955 begins its description of a
family tree thus:

"from (his) mouth was born the fire and from the head the sky. From the moon sprang the royal family (tree) which had thick foliage and kept off the heat (or suffering) of the people through its thousands of branches and was productive of such fruit (or good) and which, though high (or noble), was free from encountering shocks and breaking down (or fear and destruction)".

In search of authenticity the royal families strove to find a link for their genealogies with the origins of the world, giving the dynastic history a standing with the universal flow of dharma, a place in the permanent ordering of the universe. The prabhu śakta, the ancestral majesty, was in direct proportion to the forces of expression of that mythical genealogical tree.\textsuperscript{236}

The ruling family's dharma consisted in participating in the universal dharma. The ideology of the government was, therefore, magical and holistic. The mystical circle of the king's maṇḍala -- the prabhu surrounded by the sāmantas -- was equivalent to the sacred yantras manipulated the ascetics associated with the court. At the material level, the kingdom itself consisted of a mystic maṇḍala, with the capital surrounded by holy centres. Tirthas, towns villages, etc., all of them connected by the political cum religious life.\textsuperscript{237} At least, at the theoretical level, the erection of the capital was not a simple fact of engineering. The technical aspect was subordinated to the holy
foundation which was taking place, for the kingdom was repeating
on earth the holy body of the presiding deity of a place. The
structure of the kingdom was like a sacred nervous system. This
aspect of revealing the presence of a god in the construction of
temples, forts or cities is explained in the Agni Purāṇa for
the sake of "the prosperity of the kingdom".

The Agni Purāṇa recommended a careful planification of a
city before it was founded. It says that "the presiding deity of a
place should be worshipped in a mystic diagram (whose measures
are given) for the prosperity of the city, town or village".
The planification of the city must have been a strict religious
matter because it reproduced the deity (or gave abode to
her/him). In this same Purāṇa names of "the occult nervous",
dimensions and dispositions of temples and palaces are given.
Vāstu was the worshipping of the presiding deity of a place
relating to a city for the prosperity of its kingdom. The Agni
Purāṇa gives the precise position for the court city gates,
which were oriented respectively to north, south, west and east,
each one under the protection of a guarding deity. The manner to
realize the foundation of a city and distribution of areas of
guilds, markets, storage buildings, etc. and precise places for
brāhmaṇas, ascetics and holymen are recommended to be kept.
Temples, palaces and other main buildings were distributed on the
city-plan also in a punctilious manner.
The structure of the kingdom was also meant as an armour against attack by the wicked forces of the Kali Age.

The determination to dispel the darkness of Kali Yuga with its state of corruption, distrust, disorder, anarchy and failure and to replace it with confidence, trust, right dependency, and success inspired every early medieval ruling family. The main duty of the king was to become a prītanasaḥya (or nrisāhya, or abhimātisāhya), an unquestioned victor, not only over enemies but on any adversity. To this end, the king had to activate the full potential of that "secret nervous system" of the kingdom, certainly with the help of the experts in the subject — the ascetic organizations. Purification at all levels was the essence of this work. The Bhāgavata Purāṇa explains that sattva, rajas and tamas are the three attributes (guṇas) of matter; at the individual level they are the attributes of the intellect (buddhi); in the world they are the property of Nature (prakṛti). All striving is to achieve the domain of sattva over the other two guṇas. The rājan, too, must strive to attain this in his domain. That is the way to dharma. By promoting sāttvika activities in his kingdom, the king ensured peace and prosperity. Sattva par excellence was generated in the monasteries, by the ascetics through yogic practices. But a complication arose when different sects claimed the king's attention.

In the Śiva Purāṇa, the god Śiva is acclaimed as the
almighty, the all-encompassing emperor of the world. His supreme magic encompassed all power and all capacities. Śiva married, in an impressive celestial ceremony, the goddess Pārvatī, daughter of Himavat, lord of the mountains (Himalayas). The erotic symbolism of the union of this couple was the basis of the Śākta principle of supreme energy (śakti). In the early medieval Purānic conception, the confluence of rivers was closely related with the flux of power (śakti) liberated by Pārvatī from her union with Śiva. Pārvatī was present, as the secret river Sarasvatī, at these junctions of sacred waters.

In the human microcosm, the secret river of śakti flowed into the human body through the artery susuma, the great course of the superstructure. The collective group of people living under a wise king also could be imbued with this mysterious phenomenon if the king plus the sector of the society expert in magic, i.e., the ascetics, activated the sacred and mystic flow of the infinite śakti. The mystic union, like the erotic embrace of Śiva and Pārvatī, took place in the maṭhas with the ascetic work of the monks. The ascetics had the capability to make the river śakti flow for the kingdom. The large number of epigraphical testimonies of foundations and the detailed instructions about them incline us to conclude that these activities were considered to be the most important among the duties of the early medieval kings. In addition, they brought about the association of both sectors: the monarchical and the
ascetic organizations.

III.2.3 Cult centres/royal cult centres: Puri, a classical case of holistical kingship.

It has been discussed the frequent mention, definition and hierarchization of holy centres in the literary and epigraphical records of early medieval period.

In the process of political consolidation made by several royal families often they took advantage of the prestige of holy places, to establish near or into such centres themselves their own political nucleus. This was understood by the accepted kingship ideology as a natural manner to consolidate and assure the effective dominion on a country. In other more specifical cases, a king built up his own sacred centre and managed to raise it in a focus of popular attention, transforming it finally in a centre of power.

The first case happened frequently in Rajasthan, as it is discussed in the work of Kailash Chand Jain. The second has a typical and perhaps unique example in the clever action of Anantavarman Cōḍagaṅga and the rise of Puri as royal religious centre for the whole eastern India.

The next commentary is based on the publication of the Orissa Research Project of the University of Heidelberg, edited by Anncharlot Eschmann, Hermann Kulke and Gaya Charan Tripathi, with several monographies, related with the cult of Jagannatha
and its role in the historical process of Orissa, prepared by a team of scholars belonging to the South Asia Interdisciplinary Regional Research Programme.248

The central subject of this mentioned study is about the elevation of the Jagannātha Puruṣottama cult from a modest local position to a supreme religious expression into the regional process of Orissa, and the relation of such process with the decided support given by Anantavarman Caḍagaṅga and his descendents. They extended their royal patronage over the tribal deities and put in the midst of the religious scenary the cult of Jagannātha-Puruṣottama as a manner to legitimize hierarchical Brahmanical power on a tribal area, consolidate their universal rule and as an effort for building up a certain social equilibrium as well as to achieve a control over the feudal tendencies in the local groups they themselves favoured. This development took a concrete form since the construction of the great Jagannātha temple of Purī and the dedication of the Gaṅga Empire to the deity. However, that process had a more complex background. Anantavarman just utilized well the momentum and arranged in his favour several tendencies which commenced long time before his rule. H.V.Stietencron249 studied the previous existence in Purī and in the area of a very rooted Śaiva tradition. There was a tradition of building up Śaiva sanctuaries, as the archaeological remains around the great temple of Purī indicate. And perhaps older than the Śiva temples
are the sanctuaries to the Mother Goddess, lately expressed as the goddess Vimalā, "the śakti of Puri". Stietencron concludes that there are proofs enough to assert that Puri was for long time a Śaiva centre devoted to Śiva under the form of Mārkandeyeśvara. Together with that, several Tantric influences channalized the varied local beliefs in the natural powers into a catholic principle of śakti/sākta which was materialized in a group of temples built in the place where today lays the great Jagannātha.

That very old tradition and tendency was concreted during the Somavamsi rule (around A.D.900-1000). The Somavamsis' enthusiasm for the local tradition of Puri transformed that locus in an important Śaiva/Sākta pīṭha. Probably was under the Somavamsis' patronage that a serie of important constructions were started at Puri and at least two Śaiva temples and a shrine to the Mother Goddess in the middle, were erected on the same small hill occupied completely after that for the Jagannātha temple. Even more, a primeval Puruṣottama (or Nilamadhava) temple was iniciated by Yayāti I and continued by the next Somavamsi kings. But the Somavamsis spent most of their fortunes in Bhubanesvar, for them, a more strategical centre. The enormous structures of the Liṅgarāja temple and others exhausted the royal treasure. However, the proudly symbol of the Somavamsi rule — Ekāmra (Bhubanesvar) — continued been a big drain of their resources in detriment of their military capabilities. The
Somavamśī kingdom was an easy prey for the Gaṅgas' fresh power and also for the Pāla expansionism.

The various works started at Purī were ceased with the collapse of the Somavamśīs and the first temple of Purusottama became in ruins.

After sometime and when Anantavarman Cōḍagaṅga secured well his frontiers, he appreciated the important social power which was capable to conduct the new Vaiṣṇava faith which just was in a rising process and in association with the cult of Purusottama.

Anantavarman Cōḍagaṅga, with an excellent intuition and perhaps good knowledge, reassumed the works on the Purusottama temple and planned the construction of a colossal śikhara which opposed and supplanted the symbols of power of the temples of Ėkāmra, the Somavamśīs' centre. Anantavarman's strategy was right. His total support to Vaiṣṇavism (political opportunism?) implicated the fast spread and growth of the new faith — well represented in a "Vaiṣṇava-Purusottama" — in the whole Utkala.

Therefore, in Purī is possible to distinguish two main political cycles immediately after the local for native process of the Jagannātha cult. 250

a) Yayāti I, conqueror of Utkala, built Śaiva temples and settled crown the symbols of his majesty. He started the formation of a local hierarchy composed for royal addict
brāhmaṇas and in good understanding with the political hierarchy. That politics was continued by the next Somavāpaśis who achieved a good dominion over the coastal areas of Drissa.281

b) Anantavarman Cōḍagaṅga, conqueror of the whole Utkala, found the Puruṣottama image among the ruins and decided to built a new temple. He also organized a local court and declared Purī a new religious centre.282

The local religious background was studied by Annacharlotte Eschmann. She observed a clear Sankritization of tribal deities in Drissa since long before Anantavarman’s times (A.D.1078-1147). Such process was an typological accumulation of deities and religious concepts under Śākta and Śaiva symbols. In a later development, Jagannātha was absorbed into the Vaiṣṇava typology, assimilated to Narasiṁha, and Kṛṣṇa, and acquired a place into the doctrinal Viṣṇava structure.283

G.C.Tripathi added to Ms.Eschmann’s explanation the description on the formation of Balabhadra-Subhadra-Puruṣottama triad. He says Puruṣottama evolved from local forms together with Brahmanical concepts until was accepted as a manifestation of Viṣṇu. It was also supplemented to the personality of Puruṣottama erotic aspects (as Trailokāyamohana) and a Tantric form (as Śrīkara). Together with that was emerging the figure of a Brahmanical Mother Goddess who finally (Post Gupta period) was
associated with Lakṣmī and finally to both deities — male and female — was added Balabhadra, staying Subhadra in the middle as divine sister, and the triad as compounding the Jagannātha-Puruṣottama character of "the Lord of the Universe".

But this "Lord of the Universe" became the Lord of the Gaṅgas' universe. Because the history of Puruṣottama is intrinsically related with the social and political processes in Kāñcōda and Dākṣiṇa-Kōśala. H. Kulke\textsuperscript{294} goes deeply in that elucidation and says that such process consisted in the gradual "Sanskritization" of the regional society, directed by the spiritual leaders who took over the tasks, under royal patronage, of indoctrination of the people. The evolution of the Brahmanization of the society was in connection with the social ascension of small elites (or "Kṣatriyatization" of the aristocracy) and the inclusion of large tribal groups into the caste system. They became situated in the lower strata and possibly such process is in relation with the introduction of new economic exploitations and land holdings. Thus, the ruling dynasties appropriated of the tribal and popular symbols anathematized those elements in the direction of their power-reinforcement and political interests.

The mechanism for the exercise of such subjection consisted in the development of:

a) Main religious centres which, consequently, could pump resources, culture, technological advances, influences and
well calculated political trends into local centres (or subcentres). In such policy, the building of temples and protection of religious institutions which gave high category to them, was the first objective of the royal effort for consolidating the rule. These royal centres were places for spreading or the royal fame and prestige.

b) Local (or innerland) centres, which were strengthened through the links with the bigger and entrusted to the supervision by the brāhmaṇas who took over the duty of control on customs, traditions and heterodoxy.

Both mechanism were favoured by the very old Indian tradition of pilgrimage, as have been studied by R.N.Nandi, which facilitated the diffusion of the central ideas and an effortless promotion of the king’s purposes.

The possibility of independization by the localities, considering that they were receiving all the elements for discovering and exercising their identity, was counter-balanced with a prestigious central court and concentration of the most reverenced brāhmaṇas and spiritual leaders in the “great centres”.

This is the theoretical explain just derivable from the process suffered in Puri. The gigantic temple and the huge concentration of brāhmaṇas, ascetics, teachers, religious institutions and so on, was the counter measure for avoiding also the rise of any other local claim but tightening the centripetal
tendency towards Puruṣottama.

The historical facts related to the development of the great Jagannātha-Puruṣottama centre at Purī, H. Kulke250 have been analyzed in his incisive and documented paper concluding that "Anantavarman's decision to concentrate, in his later years, all his means and building activities in central Orissa, must have been essentially a political decision". Anantavarman Cōḍagāṅga did not break his familiar tradition but accommodated the circumstances to a better dominium over the kingdom.

Besides, there are connections between the Gaṅgas of Kaliṅga and the Colas, who used similar policies. That problem have been studied by Sastri, Stein, Kennedy, and Subbarayalu.257

Finally, the dedication of the Orissa Empire to Jagannātha by Anangabhīma III in circa A.D. 1230258 was the culmination of that socio-political phenomenon of transformation of a religious centre in a centre of power. The following ruling dynasties in the region understood very well the possibilities of subjection and domination through this way.

The next centuries of the history of Orissa elapsed in a game of relations between the brāhmaṇas of Purī and the royal houses of the region, the first ones endeavoured in maintaining their independence and spiritual leadership, on the other hand the rulers interested in a reasonable level of cooperation and mutual benefits.
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   Sinha, C.P.N., Mithilā under the Karṇāṭas c.1097-1325 AD, Janaki Frakshan, Patna, 1979;
65. The name of Rapaśuṇa, the ruler of the tract situated to the north of Dāṇḍa-bhukti, raises the question of the
authenticity of the Śūra kings of Bengal, who are mentioned in the genealogical lists of Bengal match makers (ghaṭakas). The kulapaṇījkās of these ghaṭakas contain the following list of Śūra Kings:

Āditaśūra
|
Bhūsūra
|
Kṣitiśūra
|
Avanisūra
|
Dhārapaṇīśūra
|
Rānasūra


66. Rampal Copper-Plate Grant of Śrīchandradēva, published by Basak, Radhagovinda, EP.IND., XII, no.18, pp.138-40.


70. Ray, op.cit., p.324.

71. Vide the scheme on Earlier Gāṇgas, infra, pp.218-20.

The followings inscriptions belongs to this dynasty:
- Dhanantara (Gumsur) Plates of Sāmantavarman, EP.IND., XV, no.14, pp.275-78;
- Ganjan Plates of Prthvivarmā, EP.IND.,IV, no.26, pp.193-201;
- Achyutapuram Plates of Indravarman, EP.IND., III, no.20, 127-30;
- Parlakimedi Plates of Indravarman (alias Rajasimha), IND. ANTIO., XVI, pp.131-34;
- Chicasole Plates of Indravarman (of the year 128), IND. ANTI0., XIII, pp.119-22;
- Chicasole Plates of Indravarman (of the year 138), IND. ANTI0., XIII, pp.122-24;
- Vishramagiri (Aska, Ganjam) Grant of Indravarman, EP.IND., XIX, no.23, pp.134-37;
- Chicasole Plates of Devendravarman (of the year 183), E.P. IND., III, no.21, pp.130-34;
- Vizagapatnam Grant of Devendravarman, IND ANTI0., XIII, pp.273-76.
- Alamanda (Vizagapatam district) Grant of of Anantavarman (of the year 304), E.P. IND., III, no 3, pp.17-21;
- Chicasole Plates of Satyavarman (of the year 351), IND. ANTI0., XIV, pp.10-12;
- Ural Plate of Hastivarman (of the year 80) EP.IND., XVIII, p.308;
- Tekkali (Ganjam) Plates of Indravarman, (of the year 154), EP.IND., XVIII, no.31, pp.307-11;
- Tekkali Plates of Devendravarman (of the year 310), E.P. IND., XVIII, no.32, pp.311-13;
- Durmila (Ganjam district ?) Grant of Devendravarman, J.B.J.R.S., June, 1929, pp.274-77;
- Korashanda (Ganjam) Grant of Vīśākhavarman, J.B.O.R.S., June, 1929, pp.282-84;
- Purle (Vizagapatnam district) Grant of Indravarman (of the year 137), EP.IND., XIV, pp.360-63; and XVIII, p.308.

72. Supra, note 51-4.
73. Ray, Dynastic History of northern India, op.cit., p.450.
74. Vide the scheme on Gaṅgas of Kaliṅga, infra, p.218-19.
75. Infra, part III.2.3.
76. Vide, the pious foundations of Gaṅgas and their deep religiosity in the Kapila Inscription of Narasiṁhadēva, E.P.IND., XXXIII, no.5, pp.43 ff.
77. Tod, James, Annals and Antiquities of Rajastan, Motilal Banarsidass, New Delhi, 1987 (1920), p.98, "List of the 36 Royal Faces".


82. Stone Inscription of Yasōvarman, of the year 1011, E.P.IND., I, no.19-II, p.125 ..." protectors of the whole earth."


84. Plates of Madanavarman, EP.IND., XXXII, no.41-I, pp.118-19.


87. Ibid., verse 14-15.

88. E.P.IND., XVI, no.2, pp.9-14.


91. The magnificent works at Khajuraho carried out by the Candellas can be appreciated in Lal, Kanwar, Immortal Khajuraho, Asia Press, Delhi, 1965; vide "The Candellas of Khajuraho", pp.14-35 (a historical sketch related to the construction of Khajuraho); and "The Soaring Shikar", pp.51-76 (the architectural explanation). The book contains 234 plates of main temples and sculptural examples at Khajuraho. Also, the small but well explained work of Anand, Mulk Raj and Kramrisch, Stella, Homage to Khajuraho, Marg Publications, Bombay, 1965, (the book commences with the phrase "Khajuraho, the capital of Candellas", and then comes a representation [p.13] of Viṣvakarma, "the architect of Heaven, the Master builder"). It is interesting to comment on how these Candellas were inspired by the idea of doing on earth a celestial kingdom.

93. Saugor Inscription of Śaṅkaragāṇa, EP. IND., XXX, no.10, p.48. In other inscriptions it is said that the founder of the Gōlakhi-māṭha was Dūrvāsa.


95. In the Prithvirājavijaya, which is a poem and chronicle in honour of the Cauḥāns and their deeds (conquest of Ajmer and Dillī), it is mentioned that the Kalacūris used to be taught and counselled by Śaiva ascetic gurus.


98. Goharwa Plates of Kārṇadēva, EP.IND., XI, no.13, pp.139-46 (text : pp.142-45). The Inscription opens with the genalogical line of the Kalacūris till Kārna. The genealogy, as others, starts from the Moon. The devotion of Kārna, and of all the family, to Śiva is evidenced. Bhandarkar, APP. to EP.IND., XIX-XXIII, p.392, adduces the information about the Hūṇa wife of Kārna.

99. Rēwāh Stone Inscription of the Times of Kārna, EP.IND., XXIV, NO.13, PP.101-B. Twelve verses are dedicated to the campaigns of Kārna.


101. For details about the kings Rājaputra, Śīvārāja, Śaṅkaragāṇa Gunasagara I, vide Ganguly, D.C., "Central and Western India", in Majumdar, R.C. (ed.), The Age of the Imperial Kanauj, op.cit., pp.92-93.
102. Kharod Inscription of Ratnadēva III, EP.IND., XXI, no.26, pp.159-65. The genealogy, as in other inscriptions of the Kalacūrīs of Ratnapura, always mentions Kokkalla and his eighteen sons, which would mean one of them founded the branch. The genealogy given here must be checked with other inscriptions.

The Kalacūrī of Ratnapur considered themselves of the Solar race, which is a paradox because their relatives of the house of Tripūrī claimed to be coming from the Moon.

103. Konī Inscription of Kalacūrī Prithvidēva, EP.IND., XXVII, no. 45, pp.276-85 (text: pp.280-84). The brahmāṇa Puruṣottama appears to have been a very long-lived and powerful statesman who was a king maker and governed as supreme minister collaborating with three generations of kings: Ratnadēva II, his son Prithvidēva II, and his son Jajalla II. The genealogy of this brahmāṇa is given immediately after that of the king, and it is said that this family of brahmāṇas was "the ornament of the community of earthly gods (i.e., the brahmāṇas)". The family of Puruṣottama had served the Kalacūrī princes for several generations (verses 14-19).


106. Agni Purāṇa, Tr. by Gangadharan, N., Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi, 1965, 109.10, p.327; "Arbuda" (Mt. Abu) is pointed out as a very sacred spot, and it is compared with the greatest tīrthas such as Puṣkara, Gayā or Vārāṇasī.

107. Vide, for example, the "Fragmentary grant of Paramāras of Abu", EP.IND., XXXII, no.16, pp.135-36.
   ii) Mahākalēśvara temple Inscription, EP.IND., XXXI, no.4-A, pp.25-8.


109. The political facts of Siyakadēva (or Harṣa), (c.A.D. 945-972) in Bhatia, Pratipal, The Paramāras, (c.A.D. 800-1305), Munshiram Manoharlal, New Delhi, 1970, pp.37-45; Cf. Ganguly, D.C., The History of the Paramāra Dynasty, Dacca University Press, Dacca, 1933; and Seth, K.K., The

110. Padmagupta, Navasāhasāṅkacakarita, XI, verse 8, tells us that in later part of his reign, Siyakadēva adopted the life of an ascetic and devoted himself exclusively to the practice of religious austerities. Quoted by Bhatia, P., op.cit., p.45n.

111. Vide, Bhōja’s date and epigraphical records in Bhatia, P., op.cit., pp.75-78.

112. Bhōjadēva of Dharā, or Dhāreśvara, perhaps the most famous Indian prince as a patron of learned men. He was also styled ācārya and sūri. There are many works from the period signed by Bhōjadēva or Dhāreśvara. It is difficult to know what of them were composed by the king. However, the Rājamārtanda (a commentary on Yogasūtra) was written by him without doubts.


115. Mahākāleśvara Temple Inscription, EP.IND., XXXI, no. 4-A, pp.25-26; See also the "Two Inscriptions of Shergadh". Inscription A is of Naravarman’s father Upayāditya, who gave a village to the Sōmanātha situated in the fort of Kōssavaridhāna (or Shergadh), EP.IND., XXIII, no. 20, p.131.


120. Hansot Plates of Nagavolka, EP.IND., XII, no.23, pp.197-204 ("Hansot Plates of the Chāhamāna Bhartrīvaddha").

122. Bijholi Rock Inscription of Chāhamāna Sōmēśvara, EP.IND., XXVI, no.9, pp.84-112. The genealogy from the founder to Sōmēśvara (reigned c. A.D.1170).

123. Bhandarkar list of northern dynasties, APP. to EP.IND., Vol. XIX-XXII, p.381.


128. Inscription of the time of Hammīra of Rāṇāthambhor, EP.IND., XIX, no.6, pp.45 ff.


130. Three Copper Plates grants of the time of the Chāhamāna Kelhana, EP.IND., XIII, no.18, pp.206-11.


132. Mount Aśu Inscription of Luṇṭigadēva, EP.IND., IX, no.9-D, p.79.

133. Sundha Hill Inscription of Chāchigadeva, EP.IND., IX, no.9-C, pp.70-4.

134. Cf. with the Bhinmal Inscription. Here Udayasiṃha is called Udayasiṃhadēva.


1. Bhōja
2. Mahīndra
3. Nāga
4. Śilāditya
5. Aparājita
6. Mahīndra
7. Kālabhōja
8. Khōmmāṇa I
9. Mattata
10. Bhārtṛbhaṭṭa I
11. Simha
12. Khōmmāṇa II
13. Mahīyaka
14. Khōmmāṇa III
15. Bhārtṛbhaṭṭa II (or Bhārtṛbhaṭṭa)
16. Alalāta
17. Naravāhana
18. Śālivāhana
19. Śaktikumāra
20. Aṁbāprasāda
21. Suchivarman
22. Naravarman
23. Yaśovarman or Kirtivarman
24. Yōgarāja
25. Rājamalla


138. Partabgarh Inscription of the time of (the Pratihāra) King Mahēndra Pāla II of Mahōdaya (Kanauj)". EP.IND., XIV, no.13, pp.176-88 (text pp.182-88; the grant of Bhārtṛbhaṭṭa, lines 27-31).


142. Āghāṭa was located where today is the village of Ahar (24° 35' north/73°44' east), distant three kilometers east from Udaipur. Also it was known as Āghāṭapura and Ātpura (IND.AN’10, XXXIX, p.187). In the tenth century, A.D., it became the Guhila’s capital. However, Āghāṭa had a much long history as great commercial and religious centre. Very probably for these various reason it was chose as political centre by Guhilas and others ruling families. Āghāṭa was great Brahmanical centre and a famous tīrtha, known as Gaṅgodbheda-tīrtha, nevertheless also was an important Jaina nucleus. Vide Jain, Kailash Chand, Ancient Cities and Towns of Rajasthan, a study of culture and civilization, Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi, 1972, pp.119-224.

143. Vide, the M.Phil. dissertation (unpublished) of Sinha, Nandini, The Guhila lineages and the emergence of state in

144. Ahir (now Victoria Hall), Udaipur, fragmentary Inscription, D.R.Bandarkar, APP. to EP.IND., vol. XIX-XXIII, P.211.


147. First and Third slabs of Kumbhalgarh Inscription, EP. IND., XXIV, no.44, pp.304-28. (text : pp.314-28). The builder of the temple, where these slabs were engraved, was the Maharana Kumbhalkarna.

148. (i) These two legendary heroes, it is said, attended upon the Ekaliinga in Treta and Dvapara ages respectively. Both personages and the name of the city they founded have relation with the primitive cult of the Nagas (serpents) or terrestrial forces. Probably, it is a mythological explanation of the aboriginal culture of the region and the mixture with the Aryan immigrants.

(ii) Kāmadhenu is a deity always related with cattle, or even is called the mother of all cattle. Takasaka is a fierce serpent or a Lord of serpents. Mani, Vettam, Purānic Encyclopaedia, Motilal Banarsidas Delhi, 1984 (1964), pp. 379-81 and 782-83.


152. IND. ANT10., XXXIX, p.234.


158. Monier-Williams, Sanskrit English Dictionary, Munshiram Manoharlal, New Delhi, 1981 (1899), p.652/p.661, : a superlative proposition (pra), and (tapas) : to heat, to burn, light. It is apt that we look again into the meaning of tapas. Here the meaning is that the king is capable of generating the highest tapas or mystical heat into the social body over which he presides.

159. Yama is the Dharmarāja. In the Purāṇas it is said that Yama or Kala punishes without mercy those who abandon svadharma (one's own duty). Vide "Kala" in Muni, V., Purānic Encyclopaedia, op.cit., pp.367-70.

160. Cf. Shrīrama, Social Structures and Values in Later Sāṁśī; Social Philosophy in some later Sāṁśī, Indian Publications, Calcutta, 1972, pp.141 ff. The author discusses on Rājadharma or the kingship doctrine, which was elaborately treated by Kātyāyana and Bṛhaspati. Both Sāṁśī writers defined as one of the main duties of the king to perform the police functions of ensuring the security of life and property.

161. The Hymns of the Rg Veda (Rg V.), Tr. by Griffith, Ralph, Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi, 1986 : Rg V., I, 26, 1. "Agni lord of prospering powers"; Rg V., I, 31, 14 "(Agni) Thou art called Father, caring even for the weak, and wisest, the simple one thou teaches love"; Rg V., I, 67, "(Agni) He claims obedience as a King"; Rg V., VII, 8, 1, "The King (Agni)".

162. The proper term for royal tax, which is bali, exactly means "offering to the god" because the economic system was part of a sacred function.
163. Kātyāyana refers such Indra aspect of king. He says the chief (adhyakṣa) of the gods — Indra — comes down from the heaven in the form of a king, Kātyāyana’s Smṛti, Kātya S.8 quoted by Srirama, op.cit., p.144. Besides, Nārada declares that Indra himself moves on the earth in the form of king, Nāradasmṛti, Prakīrnaka, 22, ibidem.

164. Ojas also was one of the powers developed through the ascetic penances. Here, the king had ojas because he channelized the social energy to the highest goals.

165. Vide Mahābhārata, "Rājadharmaṇucasananaparvan, (the section containing the teaching of the duties of kings), in the edition of Belvalkar, Shripad Krishna (ed.), Mahābhārata, The Śantiparvan, Vol.XIII, Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona, 1961, the (Rājadharmaṇa section, first edition 1949-50). Between brackets, the concordance with the Calcutta and Bombay editions and P.C.Roy’s translation, as it is compared by Sørensen, S., An Index to the names in the Mahābhārata, Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi, 1963 (1904). The Supreme Being is in the community of people well represented by their beloved king. It is the first responsibility of the king to increase that sense of community and participated force.

- 12.67. 1-39, pp.312-17 (2495-34; 215-18): The duties of the king. He is in the world to give happiness to the people. He is as a god on earth (rāstre rājakaraṇavacaya-katvakathana);
- 12.69. 1-105, pp.325-26 (2596-2600; 223-31): the thirty six virtues that a king should possess;
- 12.72. 1-26, pp.343-47 (2749-74; 235-37): the desunion between kṣatriyas and brāhmaṇas produces terrible effects and brings the ruin to the kingdom.
- 12.73.1-32, pp.347-50 (2775-2807;237-41): the excellent relation between the king and the priest implicate the sure preservation of kingdom.
- 12.75.1-37, pp.357-60 (2834-68; 242-45): the king is the lord of all wealth, except that belonging to brāhmaṇas.
- 12.80.1-41, pp.378-80 (2962-82; 254-56): how the king should conduct himself to be beloved.
- 12.81.1-31, pp.380-85 (3024-54; 259-62): same matter, how the king must conquer the heart of his people.
- 12.89.1-26, pp.421-24 (3335-3361;287-90): (the Kṣatra-dharmān, explained by Aṅgiras Utkatha to Mandhātṛ Yauvanācva) The King’s power is trusted on him only for the good of the people and not for the gratification of his own caprices. He is called rājan and he must be the symbol of the righteousness (rājeta = the shining of the king’s righteousness).

167. Cassirer Ernst, The Myth of the State, Yale University Press, New Haven, 1969, vide "The mystic mind" (as a social phenomenon), pp. 11 ff. Cassirer’s comments the theories of Lucien lévy-Bruhl, Edward Burnett Taylor and Sir James Frazier on the "ancient mind". The possible understanding of the ancient social organisation in terms of mythological realization (if the myths are as "social dreams"—Freud—so, the social expressions of such myths are based on certain mystic perceptions of what is a group and what is its ontology). Cf. Idem, An Essay on Man, Yale University Press, New Haven, 1964, pp. 82 ff.

168. The general thesis of this author is to treat the cultural developments and institutions as creations made looking for the conservation of certain natural genetical rules in order to avoid alterations on the human nature, besides the cultural creation also result from the effort for making perfective any type of bloody mixture. The application of such framework to the Indian social process is in Levi-Strauss, Claude, The elementary structures of Kingship, Eyre and Spottiswoode, London, 1969 (1949), pp. 393-458. Here is analyzed the problem of social basic organisation (the caturvarṇadharma) and the fundamental institutions related to the kingship into the general structure of creation of rules for maintaining the social body. That reproductive aparat, actuating in all levels is the expression of the śakti. Vide also the work of this author Totemism, Beacon Press, Boston, 1981, Introduction, pp. 1-14.

169. Śiva Purāṇa, Tr. by a board of Scholars, Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi, 1988, "Vāyavīyasamhitā", Ch. 5, 20 ff.
(Māyā is the sakti of Mahēśvara); Ch.16,7-27 (Sakti is born form Śiva but at the time is the eternal universal manifestation); Cf. with the concept of PraKṛti in the Linga Purāṇa, Tr. by a board of Scholars, Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi, 1982, as Māyā, p.456; as Mother, pp.9 ff; identical with Śakti, or Śaivism, p.9; as the universal cow, pp.56 ff.

170. This conception of Śakti as the earthly power would explain the various denomination and definitions for Śakti. One was her character of Sita or priest nature, which is expressed like several Śaktis:
- Durgā, as appears in CORP. INSC. INDIC., IV, I, p.200, verse 3; a
- Kālī, or Karālā in Bhavabhuti’s Mālatī-Mādhava, Act.V, vide infra, Chapter VI;
- Bhairavi, Bhimā, Kātyāyanī, EF. IND., XII, no.11, The Kinsariya Inscription, pp.56 ff.;

The other form of Śakti is like Asita or the benevolent goddess, which could be: Haiṁavatī, Śailaputrī, Lalitā, Annapūrṇa;
- Umā, CORP. INSC. INDIC., IV, I, p.212, verse 40;
- Pārvatī, CORP. INSC. INDIC., IV, II, P.506, verse 29;
- Aparna, Kalhana’s Rājarātarāngini, Tr. by Pandit Ranjit Sitaram, Sahitya Akademy, New Delhi, 1977, I, I, 29;
- Māheśvarī, CORP. INSC. INDIC., IV, II, P.590, verse 4;
- Bhavānī, EF. IND., XII, no.11, p.56;

171. Harshācarita of Bānabhaṭṭa, Tr. by Kane, P.V., Motilal Banarasidass, Delhi, 1986, v, 135.


173. Sūmadēva’s Yaśastilaka vide in the study of Handiqui, K.K., Yaśastilaka and Indian Culture, quoted by Mishra, V.B., Religious Beliefs and Practices of North India, op.cit., p.56.

174. Śāradātilaka Tantra, quoted by Mishra, op.cit., ibidem.

175. Śiva Purāṇa, op.cit., Vāyavyasamhitā, Ch.16, 8-14, (p.1826).

176. Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa, Devi Māhātmya khaṇḍa, in Banerjea, J.N., Paurāṇic and Tantric religion, Early phase, University of Calcutta, Calcutta, 1966, is about the nature of Śakti
worship. The great rṣi Medhas explains to king Suratha on the nature of Mahāmāyā. He relates various episodes in which the goddess, through different manifestations, destroyed enemies and save the universe. So, the correct association by a king with the goddess ("the earth") gives maxime expression to royal ākṣaṭi.


180. Gonda, J., "The Sacred Character ... ", in History of Ancient Indian Religion, op.cit., p.481.

181. Cf. Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, where frequently it is stated that kṣatriya and brāhmaṇa varṇa conform a self. Both are like a couple, married by dharma. Specifically vide in Rig Veda Brāhmaṇas : The Aitareya and Kauśītaki Brāhmaṇas of the Rig Veda, Tr. by Keith, Arthur Berriedale, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1920, - The Ādiḥṣaya IV, "The Mahābhistaka of kings", viii,15 (XXXIX.1) --- VII 20 (XXXIX, 6), p.331-35, ... " (Kings well associated with brāhmaṇas) ... attain the superiority, pre-eminence and supremacy over all kings, and overlophship, paramount rule, self-rule, sovereignty, supreme authority, kingship, and suzerainty. - The Āchāryya V, "The Purushottam", viii, 24 (x1.1) --- viii. 28 (x1.5) p.339-43, ... " the Purushottam (s) guards the kingdom.

182. Commentary of Wink, André, "Sovereignty and Universal Dominion in South Asia", in Indian Economic and Social History Review, XXI, no.3, pp.270-72.


184. For a synthesis of their opinions about the subjects vide the work of Singh, Ram Charita Prasad, Kingship in Northern India, Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi, 1968, pp.1-20.


190. Vide, Viśnu Purāṇa, A system of Hindu Mythology and Tradition, Tr. by Wilson, Horace Hayman (published in 1840), reedition, by Wilson, H.H. (ed.), Punthi Pustak, Calcutta, 1972, with the general view of "the sovereigns of the earth", specifically those dynasties which were reigning during the Kali age. Besides, there is the myth of the brth of Viṣṇu as Hari from Devakī — the princess who represents the earth — Book V, Ch.II and III, pp.401 ff. Hari is the supreme sovereign, but for the practical effects of coming to the earth he incarnates from the earth herself. From her and through her he can receive his terrestrial power (śakti).

An specifical example of this matter is in Kalhana's Rāgatarāṅgini, Tr. by Pandit, Ranjit Sitaram, Sahitya Akademi, New Delhi, 1977, where is related the case of kings who had a balanced power based in their support to tīrthas and maṭhas, and their riches thanks to their largess with brāhmaṇas. King Uccala (AD.1101-11) was famous and powerful because "he was devoted to his people and, by nature, was not avid for wealth" (Taranga VIII.85, pp.412); this king Uccala, "to acquire merit, erected a maṭha in the name of his father, who had gone to heaven, on the site of his ancestral property (Taranga VIII. 243, p.426). About the sacred kingship of Uccala vide all verses of Taranga VIII, 74-87, pp.411 ff.


   (i) The king must be a father, because he must guide his subjects and take care of their moral conduct;
   (ii) As a mother, he must look into the offences and punish or pardon these according to the seriousness;
   (iii) As a guru, because he must be a model and an archetypical man;
   (iv) As a brother, because he shares the wealth of the kingdom and receives the tributes.
   (v) As a friend, because everybody is confident in him and feels he is the protector of all;
   (vi) As a Kubera, he gives wealth and generates abundance;
   (vii) As a Yama he is a terrible punisher of the sinners.

Many of these elements repeat the arguments given in the Manusmriti, The Laws of Manu, op.cit., VII.1-226, pp.216-53.


198. Trivarga also is defined as the perfect balance of dharma, artha and kama. In that definition many authors of the period concurred. Singh, Ram Charitra Prasad, op.cit., p.15.


200. Śiva Purāṇa, Ch.XXXII, 24-28, "The Race of Manu", p.1602, ff.

201. Roy, S.E., The Heritage of Śaṅkara, Munshiram Manoharlal, New Delhi, 1982, studied the re-evaluation of the monastic Upaniṣadic principle by Śaṅkara and his approaches to a type of non-dualistic Buddhism.

202. Kāraṇḍēva or Kāraṇḍāja appears in the Saugor Stone Inscription, EP. IND., XXVII, no.29, pp.163-70.


204. Singh, Ram Charita Prasad, op.cit., p.17.
205. The earliest known official grant of the Kalacūris of Tripūrī is the Benares Copper Plate Inscription of Karna.


207. Vide the Goharwa Plates of Karnādēva, EP.IND., XI, no.13, pp.142-46; these two plates were discovered at the village of Gohara, Manjhanpur tahsil, Allahabad district, U.P., and are dated in A.D. 1047. The inscription is one of the P.M.P. Karnādēva, the devout worshipper of Mahēśvara, the lord of Trīkalinga, who meditates on the feet of the P.M.P. Vāmādēva. The chart was issued at the holy tirtha of Karna or Karnatirtha.
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