The sixth century A.D. is an important landmark in the history of the Deccan. It is noted for the emergence of a new power which held sway over extensive areas in that region from the middle of the sixth to about middle of the eighth centuries A.D. At a time when there were a number of kingdoms fighting for supremacy, the Chalukyas emerged triumphant after defeating the early Rashtrakutas, and then forced the other small powers to rally round them, thus justifying in letter and spirit the concept of Mātsyanyāya. The rulers of this dynasty strove their best to bring about political unity in that part of the country. They never compromised with their set ideal of Ekarāta and continuously struggled for the attainment of their mission of supremacy. They were opposed, challenged and sometimes also beaten back, but even then they were able to establish an empire in the Deccan and thus justified the coveted title of Dakshināpathapati, which they assumed. They also measured strength with the rulers of the North, and even Harshavardhana, called Uttarāpathanātha, failed to have an upper hand over Pulakesin II.

The Chalukyas of Badami were eventually successful in uniting major portions of South India between the two Seas. Their metropolis was Vatapi, a city of Pauranic antiquity, now known as Badami, in the Bijapur district of Karnāṭaka. The dynasty is occasionally called the early Western Chalukyas to
distinguish it from the family of the same stock and lineage, which ruled at Veṅgi and Lāṭa.⁶ There were some other Chālukya royal families as well, flourishing several centuries later. There were the Chālukyas of Kalyāṇa, those of Vemulavāḍa and the Chaulukyas of Gujarāt.⁷ The records of the families of Veṅgi, Lāṭa, Kalyāṇa and Vemulavāḍa, however, claim their descent from the Badami family.⁸ Nothing, however, can be definitely stated about the relations of the Chālukyas of Gujarāt with the original line of Badami. The capitals of all these royal Chālukya families were different. In the light of these differences in the nomenclature of these families, it would be better to call the one under study as the Chālukyas of Badami, which ruled over the Deccan and the adjoining regions from circa 540 A.D. to 757 A.D. with its capital at Vāṭāpi, the present Badami.

**Deccan on the eve of the Chālukyas**

The political condition of the Deccan at that time was one of a disintegrated state with petty ruling families scattered all over the entire area. Barring a few exceptions, these states were always engaged in struggle against one another, with the result that there was no progress, political or material.

The central parts of the Deccan were earlier ruled by the Vākāṭakas⁹ and the Nalas.⁹ The Chālukyas most probably did not come into contact with the Vākāṭakas but the Nalas did clash with them, resulting in their defeat and acknowledgement of Chālukyan supremacy. It seems that the Vākāṭaka power had vanished prior to the conquest of the region stretching upto the river Narmadā by Pulakeśin II.¹⁰ The Nala rulers had played a significant role in defeating the early Rāṣṭrakūṭas along with the Mauryas of Koṅkaṇa.¹¹ The Nalas and the Mauryas at first defeated their strong neighbour, namely, the early Rāṣṭrakūṭas of Mānapura,¹² but they could not enjoy the fruits of their victory for long. The Chālukyas, who were probably the vassals of the early Rāṣṭrakūṭas, invaded them and occupied the territories earlier taken by the Nalas and the Mauryas from the early Rāṣṭrakūṭas. This struggle continued for some years and Kṛttivarman I was able to force them to accept his overlordship. Then followed Nala
rule subordinate to the Chālu kyas.

The western parts of the Deccan were ruled by the Bhojas, the Traikūṭas, the Kalachuris and the early Rāṣṭrakūṭas. The Bhojas were North Indian people, who, during the period under review, were ruling in Vidarbha round about modern Amaravati in Maharashtra, as is evident from an inscription of the Vākāṭakas and the Rāghuvamśa of Kālidāsa.\(^{13}\) Probably a section of the Bhojas was also controlling the Goa region of Konkan. A few records belonging to the Bhoja rulers of Goa have been discovered there.\(^{14}\) These inscriptions are assigned to the seventh century A.D. on palaeographic grounds.\(^{15}\) According to R.S. Panchmukhi, king Anirjitavarman, referred to in one of the records, was a ruler of the Bhoja dynasty,\(^{16}\) while N. Lakshminarayan Rao has suggested that the above-mentioned king belonged to the Maurya dynasty of Konkan.\(^{17}\) Thus, on the basis of these records, it appears that the Bhojas, who were ruling over Goa in the fifth and sixth centuries, were overpowered by the Mauryas, who themselves were later subjugated by the Chālu kyas of Badami.

The Traikūṭas derived their name from Trikūṭa, a hill in north Konkan, as indicated by the Anjaneri Grant of Prithivichandra Bhogaśakṛti, an ally of the Chālu kyas.\(^{18}\) They were ruling over the Aparānta and the surrounding region. Their power extended over the coastal country from Kanheri in the south to Surat in the north.\(^{19}\) The Traikūṭas lost their political entity due to the attacks of the Kalachuris and the Gurjaras. The rise of the Mauryas and the Sūras forced them to retire in political wilderness.\(^{20}\) The Sūras were the masters of the area in the neighbourhood of Surat which they had occupied after the downfall of the Traikūṭas.\(^{21}\) The Sūras lost their stronghold to the Kalachuris in the second half of the sixth century A.D., who in turn lost it to the Chālu kyas of Badami under the leadership of Maṅgaleśa, as is evident from the Nerur Plates and the Aihole Prāsasti.\(^{22}\)

The Kalachuris (Kaṭachchhuri, Kaṭasuri, Kaṭachchhuri or Kalichhuri) were a powerful people during the second half of the sixth century A.D., having their occupation over Northern Maharashtra, Gujarat and some parts of Malava.\(^{23}\) Originally, they belonged to the Anūpa country on the Narmadā.\(^{24}\) At one stage the Mauryas of Konkan submitted to their supre-
macy but about the beginning of the seventh century A.D., they were attacked and ousted from the southern parts of their dominions by the Chālukyas. The Grujaras and the Maitrakas of Vallabhi forced them to vacate the Malava region and to settle down at Tripuri in Jabalpur. It is from the latter place and after long obscurity, that they rose to power in the ninth century A.D. with the defeat of the Kalachuri rulers by Mañgalesa and Pulakeśin II. The Chālukyan frontiers were then extended upto the Anūpa country on the river Narmadā.

The early Rāṣṭrakūṭas were one of the prominent rulers of the Deccan prior to the establishment of Chālukyan power. Earlier, some scholars doubted their political existence, but we do find references to the two early Rāṣṭrakūṭa families ruling in the Deccan. One such family was founded by the Rāṣṭrakūṭa Mānāṅka, who was ruling at Mānapura, identified by Prof. Mirashi with modern Mān in Satara district of Maharastra, which must have been their area of domination. Another family was ruling in Berar, as is evidenced from their records. They held sway over the Betul-Amaravati region of the upper Deccan, having their headquarters at Achalapura. The mysterious absence of any reference to the Rāṣṭrakūṭas in the prāśastis of the early conquerors of the Chālukya dynasty and a good bit of similarity between their records and those of the Kadamba dynasty led scholars to believe that the early Rāṣṭrakūṭas may have lost their territories to their immediate neighbours—the Nalas and the Mauryas. The Nalas and the Mauryas were defeated by the Chālukyas and that explains why the Chālukyan records refer to them and omit the early Rāṣṭrakūṭas, who were not directly involved in the conflict. If we accept the identification of Jayasiṁha of the Undikāvāṭikā Grant with Jayasiṁha Vallabha, it will follow that when the Nalas and the Mauryas overpowered the early Rāṣṭrakūṭas, the Chālukyas declared themselves independent; and after defeating the Nalas and the Mauryas, they consolidated their power and snatched the territory held by the early Rāṣṭrakūṭas.

The Eastern Deccan was ruled by many small dynasties, viz., the Ānandas, the Śālaṅkāyanas, the Vishnukundins, the Pitṛbhaktas, the Mātharas, the Vāsishṭhas, the Eastern Gaṅgas, the Śarbhapurīyas, the Pāṇḍuvarṇīs of South Kośala and
Mekala and several other insignificant families. The ancient Andhradesa was governed by the Ānandas, the Śālaṅkāyanas and the Vishṇukunḍins. The Ānandas were having their hold over the area near the present Guntur. The Ānandas never came into direct contact with the Chāluṣkya. Probably their territory was snatched by the Pallavas in the third quarter of the sixth century A.D. Afterwards, the Chāluṣkya conquered that region from the Pallavas. The Śālaṅkāyanas are known to have occupied the country between the Kṛṣṇā and the Godāvarī. Their sway extended over the West Godāvarī and Kṛṣṇā districts of Andhra Pradesh. The Maṅgalur Grant of Simhavarman shows that the Pallavas successfully conquered the territories of these dynasties. In the beginning of the sixth century A.D., they were deprived of their territory by the Vishṇukunḍins. Later on, in the second half of the seventh century A.D., the Chāluṣkya ruler Pulakesin II exterminated the Vishṇukunḍins and wrested the country which they were controlling. The Chāluṣkya ruler then placed his younger brother Vishnūvardhana at Pithapuram after finally uprooting the Vishṇukunḍins from their territory. Some scholars, however, believe that the territories conquered by Pulakesin II actually belonged to the Pallavas, and the Chāluṣkya uprooted the Vishṇukunḍins during their march towards Southern India for making their conquests.

The parts of the Eastern Deccan, forming the region of Kaliṅga—the coastal land between the rivers Mahānadi and Godāvarī—were ruled by many dynasties in the fifth and sixth centuries A.D. The Vāsisṭhas, the Pitṛbhaktas and the Māṭharas were prominent among them. In the early part of the above-mentioned period, the Pitṛbhaktas were ruling from Simhapura in central Kaliṅga and the Māṭharas were ruling from modern Pithapuram. Later on, both these powers were subdued by the Vāsisṭhas, who transferred their capital from Devarāṣṭra to Pishṭapura. When the above-mentioned families were busy in the struggle for supremacy, a new dynasty of the Eastern Gaṅgas came into prominence. They were the rulers of Kaliṅga in the last quarter of the sixth century A.D. The Chāluṣkya under Pulakesin II also supplanted them and annexed their territories. Besides these, there were several other powers in the Southern Kośala and Mekala regions of the
Eastern Deccan. These included the Šarbhapurīyas and the Pāṇḍuvamśis of South Kośala and Mekala. It appears that these dynasties were also subdued by the Chālukya conqueror Pulakeśin II during his successful march into the Veṅgi country. They were exterminated prior to A.D. 618 or a year earlier, as is evident from the Māruṭūru Plates of Pulakeśin II.

Sources

The sources for reconstructing the history of the Chālukya dynasty are mostly archaeological, including a few contemporary texts relating to the later Chālukyas of Kalyāṇi. In this connection, it is rather astonishing that we do not find any composition of the court-poets of the Imperial Chālukyas, although they themselves were men of letters and equally patronised poets like Rāvikṛtti, comparable in literary talents with Kālidāsa and Bhāravi, as is evident from the Aihole Praśasti. The main sources of information about the Badami Chālukyas are, however, either their own epigraphs or the records belonging to their feudatories and adversaries. These sources may now be considered in detail in order of importance thus: literary, epigraphic, monumental, numismatic and accounts of Hiuen-Tsang.

Literary Sources

The literary sources pertaining to the Imperial Chālukyas are no doubt a few. Among these works, special mention may be made of the Vikramāṇkadevacharita of Bilhana and the Mānasollāsa of Someśvara. The Vikramāṇkadevacharita primarily deals with the famous Chālukyan emperor Vikramāditya VI Satyāśraya of the Kalyāṇi family and his times. Besides this work, Abhilashīrthāchintāmaṇi, also called Mānasollāsa, of Someśvara III is equally important for the cultural history of the time. Recently, a work entitled Vikramāṇkābhyudaya, said to be composed by Someśvara III, has also come to light. It, no doubt, belonged to the later Chālukyas, but it equally helps us in sorting out a few chronological and cultural problems of the early Chālukyas.

There are no other Sanskrit works of importance dealing
with the Chālukyas, but a few Kannada ones might as well be mentioned. These include works of the Kannada poets Raṇṇa and Pampa. Raṇṇa wrote his Gadāyuddha during the reign of the later Chālukya king Irivabeḍaṅga Satyāśraya.50 Besides dealing with the cultural history of the period, it equally provides a few corroborative pieces of information about the Badami Chālukyas. The Pampa Bharata, another work in Kannada, supplies the genealogy of the Chālukyas and furnishes information about the cultural condition in that region.51 The value of these few literary texts lies in corroborating the information which is ferreted out from the inscriptions of the Chālukyas of Badami.

The Inscriptions

The Chālukyan records are the main source for the history and culture of the dynasty under study. Their authenticity and veracity need not be doubted, as they were issued under the command of the rulers, and were recovered from the regions forming part of the Chālukyan dominions. It was on their basis that a complete history and administrative pattern of the Chālukyas could be recorded and evaluated. So far about 150 inscriptions referring to them have come to light.52 Nearly a dozen inscriptions belonging to the early Chālukyas of Lāṭa, a subordinate collateral branch of the Badami house, are also helpful in this respect.53 The records of the Pallavas of Kāṇchī, the Sendrakas and the other Chālukyan feudatories also go a long way in projecting the political relations of the Chālukyas with the southern powers.54

The Chālukyan records inscribed on stone numbering 96 and those on Copper Plates being 63 in number, no doubt, include a few spurious ones as well, though their number is only 13.55 All the copper plates consist of government orders given by members of the royal family or the feudatory rulers according sanction to the grants, which are mostly donative in nature. In these records, we sometimes find references to administrative officials. The operative parts of the Chālukyan grants usually carry details of donations addressed to the royal officials by the king or his feudatory.56 These records are generally sectarian in character and are associated with the divinity propitiated by
the grantor.

A few Chalukyan epigraphs are purely administrative ones as well, either relating to concessions in taxes and levies or record mutual obligations and rights of the royal authorities and local bodies. In this connection, the Lakshmeśvar Inscription of Prince Vikramāditya II is a good example.57

The bulk of the Chalukyan records are, however, of a mixed variety, donative and administrative. Besides recording donations, these mention officials who were expected to carry out the royal orders. As such, the value of these records lies equally in the administrative information contained in them. Though all the records supply, in general, the information relating to rulers and their titles, there are two in the form of Praśasti. These are the Mahākūta Pillar Inscription of Maṅgaleśa and the famous Aihole Inscription of Pulakeśin II, hereafter referred to as the Aihole Praśasti.59 Ravikirtti, its composer, furnishes the history of the dynasty prior to the rule of Pulakeśin II in this record. The Chalukyan epigraphs are found recorded on rocks, caves, pillars, temples, images, tanks, walls, slabs and tablets. The majority of the stone inscriptions of this dynasty are incised on slabs, tablets and pillars. Among the rock inscriptions of this dynasty may be mentioned the Badami Inscription of the Śaka year 46560 and the Yekkeri Stone Inscription of Pulakeśin II.61 The cave records of the Chalukyas are, however, only found at Badami. In this group, we can mention the Badami Cave Inscription of the Śaka year 500, and the Badami Inscription of Maṅgaleśa.62 The pillar inscriptions of the Chalukyas are found at Badami, Mahākūta and Paṭṭaḍakal. The pillars were generally set up to mark royal victory or spiritual gains, as is evident from the Mahākūta Pillar Inscription of Maṅgaleśa.63 This record engraved on a red sandstone monolithic column, called Dharma Jayastambha, was found in the courtyard of the Mahākūta temple.64 The Paṭṭaḍakal Pillar was set up in the middle of the three temples of Trailokyeśvara, Vijayeśvara and Lokeśvara, with a great triśula symbol. This pillar is known as Lakshmi Khambhā and is an object of worship even today.65

Chalukyan inscriptions recorded on tanks, walls and cisterns are rare, and usually lack any historical information. However, we do find a good number of temple inscriptions belonging to
this dynasty. These are generally engraved on parts of temples such as walls, pillars, pilasters, beams as well as slabs placed in shrines. The celebrated Aihole Prašasti of Pulakesīn II is recorded in the famous Meguti Temple at Aihole. We also find dynastic records at Bāṭṭerappa, Jambuṅga and Durgā temples. Several epigraphs belonging to Vikramāditya II are engraved on the temple wall at Paṭṭadakal. The famous Kāṅchī Inscription of Vikramāditya II is found engraved on a mandapa pillar in front of the Rājasimheśvara temple at Kāṅchī. Some records belonging to this family are also found at the temples at Badami.

A few Chālukyan records are also found on slabs and tablets of various sizes. These are generally mutilated. Sometimes slabs or tablets are sculptured and carry the reliefs of symbols, animals, and other objects. In this connection, the slab recording an assignment of the tax to the Mahājanas of Muguṇḍa is worth mentioning. The incised tablets commemorating the death of heroes in battles are usually well-sculptured and contain three panels. The bottom one in two parts depicts the hero fighting and finally being killed by his enemies surrounding him. The middle panel shows the hero being taken along by the nymphs of heaven and the uppermost panel depicts him in heaven, worshipping his favourite deity. Such tablets or hero-stones are known as viragalas in Kannada. These, no doubt, are peculiar to Karnata, but are also found in the Maharashtra and Andhra area of the Chālukyan empire. It is a unique way of honouring those dying on the battlefield. The inscriptions on these tablets carry the details of the life of heroes and their achievements.

The most noteworthy feature of the Chālukyan records is the general agreement and uniformity in recording genealogical lists. In a few cases, the names of the early members of the family are ignored. In certain other cases, the names of the prominent members of the family have been omitted, though their exploits are recorded. The prose passages of genealogical portions, similar to those found in Bāna Bhaṭṭa’s Kādambarī, recall to one’s mind the classical style of prose-writing of the period under review.

The dynastic records eulogise kings, enumerating their exploits. The chief queen of the monarch is also praised in
certain cases.\textsuperscript{76} The \textit{praśasti} of kings are found both in prose and in verse. The Mahākūṭa Pillar Inscription of Maṅgaleśa is a fine example of a Chālukyan prose-\textit{praśasti}.\textsuperscript{77} The scope of a \textit{praśasti} is not confined to military achievements alone, but personal, physical, and moral attributes also are brought within the purview of the \textit{praśasti}.\textsuperscript{78} Several mythological allusions, set out to praise the kings, evince considerable knowledge of the two great epics and Pauranic lore on the part of the composers.\textsuperscript{79}

The Aihole Praśasti is a fine piece of poetry composed by Ravikīrtti.\textsuperscript{80} The author of this \textit{praśasti} claims for himself the status equivalent to that of poets like Kālidāsa and Bhāravi.\textsuperscript{81} In recording the construction of the Jain temple, the author praises, at great length, the achievements of his patron, namely, Pulakeśīn II.\textsuperscript{82} The historical and poetic value of this record is unique for shedding considerable light on contemporary events. Its language is figurative and the style is classical. Ravikīrtti has used at least seventeen different metres to compose this record.\textsuperscript{83} In this connection, Kielhorn has proposed Ravikīrtti’s indebtedness to Kālidāsa and Bhāravi, on the basis of several parallels traceable to the \textit{Raghuvaṃśa} and the \textit{Kirātārjunīya}, respectively.\textsuperscript{81} The use of \textit{Utprekṣhā alāṅkāra} in this \textit{praśasti} is not only of high poetic order but also shows the poet’s knowledge of Sanskrit poetics.\textsuperscript{85}

The description of Pulakeśīn’s conquests in the Aihole Praśasti appears to be based on the model of \textit{Raghudigvijaya} as recorded in Kālidāsa’s \textit{Raghuvaṃśa}.\textsuperscript{86} The phrase \textit{yathā vidhī-hutāgnīnāṃ yathā kāmarchitārthinām}, occurring in the Mahākūṭa Pillar Inscription of Maṅgaleśa, is probably taken by the author of the aforesaid inscription from the \textit{Raghuvaṃśa}.\textsuperscript{87} The expression \textit{aśvamedhāvabhrītha snānapavatrikṛta śarīrasya} reminds us of the same phrase used in a Vākāṭaka record.\textsuperscript{88} Scholars notice the influence of the Kadambas and Chūtus in a phrase \textit{Hāritiputrānāṃ Manuvāsagotrānāṃ} occurring in various records of the Chālukyas.\textsuperscript{89} The expression \textit{meru malaya samāna dhairya} used by Ravikīrtti to praise Pulakeśīn II appears to have been taken from the Nasik Inscription of Pulamāvi, where we come across the phrase \textit{Himavata merumandara parvata sama sāhasa}.\textsuperscript{90} We also notice the influence of the Gupta style and terminology in the Yekkerīl Stone
Inscription and a few other epigraphs.

**Coins**

The importance of coins as a source of history is well known and very helpful in determining the chronological framework of the dynasty to which they are related. From the cultural point of view, the intrinsic value and circulation of coins point to the prosperity and extent of the kingdom of that family. Sometimes these are important for determining political relations as well, as, for instance, the Guptas supplanting the Śakas in the time of Chandragupta II is well established from the Śaka coins restamped by the Guptas. A good deal of information relating to the dress, ornaments and costumes of the period is also available from a study of the coins. These also serve as corroborative pieces of evidence on matters relating to political history. As such the importance of the Chālukya coins need not be undermined though only a few coins of Vikramāditya I alone have been found. The absence of specimens of other kings is inexplicable.

The dynastic records refer to several coin denominations; namely, gadyānaka (gadyāṇa), rupaka and paṇa. The gadyāṇaka or gadyāṇa were gold coins. The Anjanaṇi Plates of Bhogaśakti mention Kṛṣṇarāja rupaka, a particular type of coin which was recirculated after the occupation of the Kalachuri territory by the Chālukyas. The word Kṛṣṇarāja is prefixed to the general coin denomination rupaka (silver coin), which symbolises the Chālukyan conquest of the Kalachuri kingdom where they circulated their own coins. We also find a reference to the paṇas in the Lakshmēśvar Pillar Inscription of Vikramāditya II, which was probably the copper currency of the early Chālukyas. As the early Chālukyas were the first rulers of the South to adopt the varāha crest as their dynastic emblem, being devotees of the varāha incarnation of Lord Viṣṇu, it may be suggested that varāha coin denomination received its nomenclature from the Chālukyan coins carrying the varāha figure.

Some early medieval coins discovered in the old Mysore State and Andhra Pradesh with the varāha figure stamped on them, are attributed to the Badami Chālukyas by Elliot and
M H. Krishna. Some other coins found in the South are also ascribed to the Chalukyas by Desikachari and others. This is, however, conjectural and doubtful. Shri N. Ramayya has, no doubt, published some coins of Vikramāditya I, which are definitely ascribable to the Early Chalukyas. These gold pieces, carrying the figure of varāha, have the legend Śri Vikrama, besides a few other features.

Monuments

Monuments are the best source for the cultural and religious history of the period. The Chalukyan monuments are confined to three centres, namely, Vāṭāpi, Aihole and Paṭṭa-ḍakal, situated in the Bijapur district of Karnataka. A few early Chalukyan monuments are also found at Alampur and other places. Several temples, associated with different gods and goddesses were erected during their rule by the members of the royal family. Besides the Vaishnava and Śaiva temples, we also find Jain ones and those of Āditya and Gaṇapati built during the paramancy of the Early Chalukyas. The tall and beautiful temples constructed in the period suggest the efflorescence of architecture, sculpture and painting under the Chalukyas, who were patrons of art and great builders. The cave temples at Badami were also excavated during their reign. The Shidalphadi caves near Badami carry paintings of the period. The sculptures engraved in the cave temples and images installed in shrines are helpful in determining the cultural tendencies of the period.

The Testimony of Hiuen-Tsang

During the reign of the famous Chalukya ruler Pulakesin II, the Chinese pilgrim visited India in search of Buddhist gospels. He has given a good account of the Chalukya ruler and the condition of his kingdom and people. His testimony is reliable, since it presents a faithful and objective picture of the time. The information about Pulakesin’s military forces given by the Chinese pilgrim is equally valuable. He refers to the gallant qualities and traditions of the Chalukyan army. He further mentions that the people of Maharashtra were
straightforward, learned, simple and benevolent and equally helpful, but could be rude to those who offended them.\textsuperscript{108} He also refers to the fertility of the land accounting for the prosperity of the country.\textsuperscript{109} He recalls that Śilāditya (Harsha) was the aggressor against Pulakeśin, the ruler of Maharashtra, and failed in his mission.\textsuperscript{110} The Chinese pilgrim has, however, not referred to the different facets of Pulakeśin’s personality.

Before summing up the nature of the source material, it may as well be mentioned that Tabari, the Persian historian, mentions Pulakeśin’s diplomatic relations with his counterpart in Iran, namely, Khusru Perviz II.\textsuperscript{111} Equally important is the evidence of Ma-twan-lin,\textsuperscript{112} who furnishes information about Sino-South Indian relations during the reign of Vinayāditya and his son Vijayāditya, who are known from other sources to have maintained contacts with the east as well as with the western world.\textsuperscript{113}

\section*{NOTES}

1. Some scholars believe that the Chālukyas came to power after defeating the Kadambas. \textit{DKD}, p. 343; \textit{KTA}, p. 221; \textit{EHD}, Vol. I, p. 207; \textit{HK}, p. 89.


3. Ibid., Vol. VI, p. 10.

4. According to legends, Vājāpi and Ilvala were two demon brothers of the Danḍaka forest, who played tricks upon several sages and were finally destroyed by the sage Agastya. The city received the name after this demon. \textit{IA}, Vol VI, p 354; \textit{EHD}, Vol I, p 61 and p. 207, note 1; \textit{HK}, p. 49.


8. The Vākājakas ruled over the extensive area in Deccan and were contemporary to the Guptas in the North. Several inscriptions belonging to them have come to light from Mahārāṣṭra and Madhya Pradesh. Their capital was Nandiavar dhana prior to the foundation of Pravarapura by Pravarasena II. Later on another branch was established at Vatsagulma, the present Basim in Akola district \textit{EHD}, Vol. I, pp. 151-88; \textit{CHI}, Vol. V, \textit{Introduction}, p. 2f; वाकाटक नृपति आणियांचाकांल, डा. भिरावी, p. 1f; \textit{CA}, pp. 177-88; \textit{SEDSI}, pp. 158-69; \textit{PIHC}, 1940, pp. 79-86.

9. The Nalas seem to have ruled over the Deccan before the advent of the Chālukyas as is evident from their inscriptions. In the beginning of the sixth century A.D. they were holding sway over the Bastar-Jeypore region. They appear to
have fought with the Vākṣṭakas and the Pāṇḍuvaiśī kings of Kośala in their bid to expand their territories. During the time of Vikramāditya I and his successors, the Nalavāḍi Vishaya was included in the Chalukyan empire, which lay in the direction of Bellary and Karnul districts. It was probably named after the Nalas. EI, Vol. XIX, p. 100f; Vol. XXI, pp. 155f; JBRs, Vol. XXXIV, p. 33; JNSI, Vol. I, p. 29f; DKD, pp. 245 and 345; EHD, Vol. I, p. 208; CA, pp. 188-90.
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The Origin and Early History

The Origin

The question of the origin of the Chālukyas is still mysterious and controversial. In spite of the availability of a considerable number of inscriptions of the different branches and dynasties of the aforesaid ruling house, we are not in a position to be positive on this point. The available material at our disposal—both epigraphic and literary—fails to provide any clear answer to the positive question of their origin and homeland. The information given by the Kashmiri author Bilhaṇa, the Kannada poet Raṇṇa, and the authors of Tamil lexicons on this subject is equally inconclusive. In fact, the origin of all the ruling families of Mediaeval India could not be precisely determined, though they all trace their ancestry from the heroes of the epics.

The main reason for this controversy is the absence of any reference to the original home of the Chālukyas in their records. The stories, fanciful and contradictory in nature, add to the confusion in this respect. It becomes equally uncertain whether the Chālukyas could trace their ancestry to the lunar or the solar family. Now in the light of these observations, it may be worthwhile studying the entire available evidence de novo.
The Family Name Chālukya and its Variants

The family name Chālukya is variously spelt in the inscriptions of the several Chalukyan ruling families. The dynastic records of the Badami house call it Chalkya, Chalikya and Chalukya and the later ones Chālukya or Chālukya. The common designation is, however, Chalukya which has given rise to the form Chaukukya in the records of the Anahilavāda family, which seems to have derived its origin from the name Chulukya mentioned for the first time in the Manor Plates of Vinayāditya Maṅgalarasa of the Lāta branch dated Śaka 613. The records of the Chālukyas of Veṅgi, Kalyānī and Vemulavāda prefer the term Chālukya or Chalukya. The Lohner Plates of the time of Pulakesin II refer to the family name as Chulukiki, while the Karnul Plates of Vikramāditya I mention Chalekya. A set of Copper Plates of Vijayāditya mentions another variant Chalikya. There is also another variation of the family name in the Kurtākoṭi Inscription as Chalukhya. We also notice another variant Chirikya in one of the records.

According to Fleet, Chalkya is the original family name. This was acceptable to Dr. D.C. Sircar since it occurs in the Badami Inscription of Śaka 500. In the earliest dated record of the Chālukyas, however, it appears as Chalikya. According to Bhandarkar and Indrajī, Chalukya was some vernacular form which was later sanskritised into various forms. R S. Satyāśraya, however, asserts that the word which is said to have undergone sanskritisation according to the above referred scholars is more sanskritic in base. Prof. Nilakanta Sastri, however, suggests that the term Chalkya was the original form and with the insertion of an euphonic vowel, it became Chalukya which was later on embellished to Chālukya and Chaukukya. In this connection, Sircar proposes that the original name of the ancestor of the family was either Chalka, Chalika or Chaluka. It may, however, be mentioned here that the original term appears to have been Chalka and all the variants can be derived from it.

Antiquity of the Term

Besides the earlier reference to the family name in the
Badami Inscription of Vallabhesvara of Saka 465, the term also occurs in a Nagarjunakonda Inscription. It refers to Khaṇḍi-Chalika Remmanaka, i.e., Remmanaka son of Khaṇḍa-Chalika who was Mahāsenāpati and Mahātalavara under the Ikshvāku ruler Vīrapurisadāta. He is the earliest Chāluksyan chieftain known to history. It is tempting to link him with the Chāluksya family, but since he is described as Vāsishṭhīputra and not as Hāritīputra, the relation cannot be accepted. This record is assigned to the second century A.D. The antiquity of the family could be traced further ahead as early as the second century B.C., as is evident from an inscription from Karle. It refers to the Chulayakha of Dhenukākaṭa. It indicates that the homeland of the Chāluksyas was in the Deccan before the dawn of the Christian era. This is the earliest reference to the Chāluksyas which had not been noticed so far. The later references beginning from the Badami Cliff Inscription are too well known to be recorded on the question of the antiquity of this term. The discussion now shifts to the origin of the Chāluksyas as such: whether they were indigenous people or foreigners; if the latter, why are they associated with the Deccan, and if they were Indians, why is their origin traced to some mythological legends and associated with Ayodhya in the North and not in the Deccan, where their inscriptions are found? These points have to be properly studied before we can approach anything definite on this point.

Nationality of the Chāluksyas

The Badami Inscription of Saka 500 records the family legend for the first time. It describes them as Hāritīputras belonging to mānava gotra, who were brought up by the seven mothers. They attained fame and property with the favour and protection of lord Kārttikeya and were successful in subjugating other princely families. The family crest Varāha no doubt associates them with the god Vishṇu, who is venerated in several Chāluksyan records in the opening verses. The same description is also reported in the early Chāluksyan epigraphs with a few minor variations. In spite of their clear assertion, there are still scholars who doubt their native character and consider them to be foreigners. Besides A.M.T., Jackson and James Campbell
were the earliest supporters of the foreign origin of the Chālukyas. The latter too associated them with the Rajput clan and the *agnikula* traditions. D.R. Bhandarkar in his paper on “Foreign Elements in Hindu Population”, however, associated them with the Gurjaras and accorded to both of them the status of foreigners who were later on assimilated in the Hindu socio-religious order. He was supported by Hoernle.

*Chālukyas and Gurjaras*

According to Bhandarkar, as Gujarat, the centre of the activities of Chālukyas, was known as Gurjaratra and not Lāṭa, the earlier name, the change in nomenclature signifies the association of the ruling dynasty with the Gurjaras after whom this part of the country was so called. The foreign origin of the Gurjaras itself is a matter of conjecture now and the mere fact that Chālukyas ruled over that part of the country formerly known as Lāṭa and taken as Gurjaratra or Gujarat did not imply that the Chālukyas did not make any change in the nomenclature because of their close association with the region.

*Legendary Traditions*

The later Chālukyan records appear to be thoroughly confused in narrating their origin. According to the Handarike Inscription of Vikramāditya VI, the Chālukyas were born in the interior of the Chuluka of the sage Hāritī Pañchaśikha when he was pouring out the libation to the gods. According to another version of the Kalyāṇī family, the records trace their descent from Manu through Mānavya and Hāritī to Chālukya. According to the third version, their origin is traced from Brahmā or Moon. In the Kauthem Grant, it is narrated that 59 kings ruled at Ayodhya. After them 16 kings ruled over Dakṣiṇāpatha, followed by the break and restoration under the Chālukyas of Kalyāṇi. The Chālukyan inscriptions of Veṅgi give yet another comprehensive version. It includes Brahmā, Moon, 59 emperors of Ayodhya with Udayana, then comes Vijayāditya, who went on an expedition to the South and lost his life in battle to Trilochan Pallava. His widowed queen gave birth to a posthumous son named Vishṇuvardhana who was
given refuge by Brāhmaṇa Vishnubhaṭṭa Somayāji Mudīvenu. Vishnūvardhana worshipped Gaurī, the goddess of the Chālukya hill, and by her grace regained the royal insignia and established his rule in Dakshināpatha. It is proposed by D.C. Sircar that the Mānavya gotra and the mention of the Hāritīputra associated with god Kārttikeya and the seven mothers were borrowed from the Kadambas and point to an early success of the family against the Kadambas. Though this point is hardly relevant to the study of the term Chālukya, the relationship with the Kadambas by way of early conquest could at least point to their location in the Deccan rather than in any region in the North, which was mooted on the basis of the inscriptions of the later Chālukyas.

Bardic Tales

Reference might as well be made to the traditional accounts based on bardic tales and also recorded in some inscriptions. As such, the Chālukyan traditions noticed earlier are also recorded in the inscriptions of the time of Kumārapala. According to Vaḍnagar Praśasti, the hero who protected the gods against the sons of Danu was produced from the Chuluka filled with holy water of the Ganga. The race springing from him came to be known as Chauukyas. The same story is also repeated by Abhaya Tilaka Gani, the commentator of Dvyaśraya Kavya and also repeated by Merutuṅga in his Prabandha Chintāmaṇi. A different version of the story is given by Jayasimha Surī, who in his Kumārapāla-Charita traces the origin of the race to the Chālukya, who was a great and virtuous warrior, destroying countless enemies, and hence the race emerging from them is known as Chauukya.

Bilhaṇḍa, the Kashmiri poet, in his Vikramǎṅkadeva-Charita, mentions that once during his meditation, Brahmā was requested by Indra to produce a warrior who could put an end to the godlessness in the world and punish the wicked. One such was created by the water of his Chuluka whose family thus came to be known as the Chālukyas. Vikramǎṅkābhhyudaya also refers to the Chālukya giri where the earlier ancestors of the Chālukyas worshipped Gaurī.

The bardic accounts recording the Agnikula tradition trace
their origin from the fire pit (*Agnikunda*) along with the Paramaras, Pratiharas and Chahamanas.\(^46\) This story is no doubt accepted by the majority of scholars for the origin of the Rajputs but this definitely cannot be true in the case of the *Chālukyas*. The reference to the *Chālukyas* or the *Chulikyas* in association with Rajput families, however, needs fresh thinking for the simple reason that the *Chālukyas* could be traced as early as the second century B.C. when there could hardly be any possibility of such a purification rite, as is evident from their *Agnikula* association.

**Testimony of Hiuen-Tsang**

The Chinese pilgrim who visited the greatest Chālukyan monarch Pulakeśin II makes certain statements which are helpful in this direction. He calls Pulakeśin II a Kshatriya by birth and describes him as the ruler of Mo-ho-la-ch'a, i.e., *Mahārāṣṭra*. The total picture as deduced from the testimony of Hiuen-Tsang leaves hardly any doubt that Pulakeśin felt pride over the warrior-like qualities of the people of Mahārāṣṭra,\(^47\) who obeyed him perfectly. Thus, it is evident that much before the beginning of the gap of legends about the fanciful stories of the Chālukyas of the royal family, Pulakeśin II was known as a Kshatriya—a fact eloquently recorded by the Chinese pilgrim.\(^48\)

**Chulikas, Śulikas and Sogdians**

It is suggested by some scholars that the word *Chālukya* is derived from *Chulika* or *Śulika*.\(^49\) The Purāṇas also refer to Chulikas, Śulikas and Chudikas.\(^50\) A few inscriptions also refer to them.\(^51\) Pargiter identified them with the Sogdians.\(^52\) Raychaudhuri suggests that the Śulikas were the Chālukyas.\(^53\) Chakravarty also connects them with the Eastern Chālukyas.\(^51\) However, B.C. Majumdar doubts the identification.\(^55\) Later on, R.D. Banerjee also endorsed the views of Majumdar.\(^56\) R.S. Satyasraya has shown that the Śulikas were not connected with the Chālukyas.\(^57\) Nandimath suggests that the original dynastic name was *Chalukī, Chalki, Saluki* or *Śalkī*,\(^68\) a Kannada term for an agricultural instrument resembling a crowbar.\(^59\) The
earliest ancestor of the family may have taken this term as a proper personal name, as is even common now-a-days in Karnāṭaka. Nandimatha further asserts that we find people whose proper name is Salkeppa, i.e., appa (ārya) added to Śalki. Thus, originally, the Chālukyas may have been an agricultural folk, but later on they became powerful and after obtaining sovereignty, stories were invented to give them Pauranic and legendary origin. This is no doubt convincing but there is no solid evidence to prove it. As Pañchaśikha, a legendary ancestor of the Chālukyas mentioned in the later Chālukya epigraphs, is also known as Chuluka, it does not appear to be beyond the bounds of possibility.

The vast information available from the literature of the tenth to the twelfth centuries and epigraphic data furnished from the records of the later Chālukyas, it is not possible to arrive at any tentative conclusion. The importance of it is reduced by the mere fact that the whole material belongs to an age peculiar to such fanciful stories. It is also not reliable on account of its late date as well as absence of any reference to them in the early Chālukyan records. It appears that the origin of the family was variously interpreted due to the ignorance of the real significance and this led to the present state of affairs.

It seems plausible to believe that the name either originated from the earliest ancestor or from a locality or it may be suggestive of their profession. As even today, surnames are derived from localities in Mahārāṣṭra and Karnāṭaka, it may be proposed that the Chālukyas received their name from the country of their residence. We have, therefore, to look to some geographical association of this name. As so many families and subcastes trace their origin to geographical associations, the same may be said about the Chālukyas as well. Curiously enough, we have references to villages situated in Chālukya Vishaya, as is evident from the Tummeyanūru and Kasar-Sirasi Plates. Dr. Kolte, who had edited the Kasar-Sirasi Plates, locates the Challukideśa in the area falling in Bidar and Osmanabad districts on the basis of the geographical data furnished by the Kasar-Sirasi Plates. He had also located a village named Chalkapur in the same area where also flows a river named Chulki. However, Ramesan locates Chālukya vishaya of the Tummeyanūru Plates in a part of the Rayala-
seema district. Both the above-mentioned identifications locate the Chālukyas on the area where the borders of Kārṇāṭaka, Mahārāṣṭra and Andhra Pradesh meet. The later Chālukyan records also refer to a Chālukya mountain where their earliest ancestors worshipped Goddess Gaurī. Moreover, we also find references about the river Chuluka in the Mahābhārata and the Ādipurāṇa.

Thus, it may be suggested that the Chālukyas belonged to the region known as Challukidesa. There will be hardly any difficulty to trace their connection with Nagarjunakonda, Dhenukākata, Kārṇāṭaka and Mahārāṣṭra, if we accept this place as their original habitat for deriving their family name. This may not be the final verdict but it is worth considering.

Original Home

As regards the original home of the Chālukyas, we are also not in a position to say anything positive on this point. The later Chālukyan records narrate that their original seat was in Ayodhya which is untenable and lacks evidence. As regards their connection with Rajputana, as may be seen from the Agnikula legend, it may be said that there is no doubt that we find the Chālukyan chieftains ruling in the area in close proximity to Rajasthan but we do not get evidence to trace any of their settlements in Rajputana prior to the establishment of the Lāṭa branch of the Chālukyas of Badami. Their association with Rajputana and Gujarāṭ is based on their association with the kingdom of Lāṭa. In view of the antiquity of their relations with Mahārāṣṭra and Kārṇāṭaka, this view based on tales need not be given any weightage.

The Chālukyas most probably were residents of trans-Vindhyan India. Hiuen-Tsang calls Pulakesin II the ruler of Mo-ho-lo-cha, i.e., Mahārāṣṭra. The Samangarh Plates describe the army of Vallabha as the Kārṇāṭakabala which won victory over several rulers including Harsha and Vajraṭa. The Chālukyan records are mostly found from Kārṇāṭaka and Mahārāṣṭra. Even now several families calling themselves Chālukyas reside in Mahārāṣṭra, Madhya Pradesh and Kārṇāṭaka, the area under the rule of the Chālukyas. If we accept the identification of the Chālukya vishaya and deśa, proposed
above, it also falls in the same region. Thus the ChāluKyān homeland was somewhere on the border between Mahārāṣṭra and Karnāṭaka.

Sircar, Desai and others believe that the ChāluKyās were the Kannada people who came into prominence in the beginning of the sixth century A.D., while Vaidya proposes to equate them with the present Chalke, a caste name sounding quite identical to the ChāluKyās, who were Mahārāṣṭrians.72 As already indicated, their original home was in the region on the borders of Karnāṭaka and Mahārāṣṭra, though their metropolis was situated in the Kannada area. Their earliest settlement of Dhenukākaṭa falls in Mahārāṣṭra but their association with the Ikshvaku rulers brings them to Andhra. The term Mahārāṣṭra as used by Rāvikṛttī consisted of three divisions (namely, Karnāṭa, Koṅkaṇa and Mahārāṣṭra); it might be the original word which Hiuen-Tsang had taken down and this provides a solution to the problem73 As Karnāṭa and Kuntala are said to be parts of the three Mahārāṣṭras of the Aihole Praśasti,74 so it might be inferred that the reference to Mahārāṣṭra includes the Karnāṭaka area Thus, it is apparent that the word Karnāṭaka referred to in the Samangarh Plates need not be taken in a narrow sense but as emphasising the warrior-like quality of the people of Karnāṭaka ruled by the ChāluKyās. Therefore, the ChāluKyās originally belonged to the Deccan and we notice their association with both present Mahārāṣṭra and Karnāṭaka. Thus, their original home was somewhere in the area comprising the present districts of Bidar and Osmanabad.

Early Rulers

Jayāsiṁha

The early official ChāluKyā records suggest that Jayāsiṁha was the first ruler of this dynasty. He is also called Jayāsiṁha Vallabha, Śrīvallabha and Vallabhendra in the family records.75 No epigraph belonging to him or his son has hitherto come to light. The non-attribution of any imperial titles to Jayāsiṁha in the early records of the family appears to indicate that he was a feudatory of some paramount sovereign. Fleet proposed that he was a vassal of the Kadamba rulers of Banavāsī.76
Nandimatha, too, upholds that he may have held military or executive office under the Kadambas.\textsuperscript{77} He is treated as a petty chief ruling under the Kadambas, whose traditions were followed even by his successors.\textsuperscript{78}

There is some stylistic similarity in the epigraphs and coins of early Kadambas and the Chālukyas of Badami,\textsuperscript{79} but it hardly warrants the inference that the latter came to power as feudatories of the former, as has been suggested by some scholars.\textsuperscript{80} The history of the reign of Jayasimha is shrouded in mystery. The early records of the Chālukyas hardly say anything concerning his achievements. The later Chālukya records do speak about a few military exploits of Jayasimha.\textsuperscript{81} Though highly eulogistic, the statements of the later Chālukya records deserve closer scrutiny. According to the Daulatabad Plates of Jagade-kamalla, Jayasimha, the founder of the house of the Chālukyas, was the destroyer of the pomp of the Kadambas.\textsuperscript{82} Moraes doubts these victories of Jayasimha on the ground that a fortunate soldier like him (Jayasimha) could not rout the contemporary Kadamba rulers of the repute of Mṛgeśa and Rāvivarmanā, who defeated the Pallavas and the Gaṅgas time and again.\textsuperscript{83} But a closer study of the political condition of the Deccan in the sixth century A.D. gives ground to believe the statement of the Daulatabad Plates, as the following would show.

The Kauṭhema and several other later Chālukya records credit Jayasimha, the founder of Chālukya sovereignty, with victory over the Rāṣṭrakūṭa ruler Indra, son of Kṛśṇa.\textsuperscript{84} Further, the Kannada poet Rāṇa also maintains that Jayasimha defeated the Rāṣṭrakūṭas.\textsuperscript{85} However, some scholars are not inclined to accept this as a part of sober history, as no Rāṣṭrakūṭa ruler bearing these two names is to be traced in the genealogical tables of the early Rāṣṭrakūṭas. The references to the glorious acts of Jayasimha are treated as echoes of the subsequent Rāṣṭrakūṭa defeat at the hands of Taila II.\textsuperscript{86} The Rāṣṭrakūṭa referred to above may have been a member of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa family of Mānapura holding sway over the Satara-Kolhapur and adjoining regions at the beginning of the sixth century A.D., as is evident from their records.\textsuperscript{87} The Undikāvāṭikā Grant of Rāṣṭrakūṭa Abhimanyu refers to a Jayasimha.\textsuperscript{88} The Grant states that king Abhimanyu granted the village of Undikāvāṭikā to the Śaiva ascetic Jaṭābhāra in the presence of
Jayasimha, the commander of the fort of Harivatsa.\textsuperscript{89} This Jayasimha of the above Grant may be identical with his namesake of the early Chalukyan records.\textsuperscript{90} Scholars have assigned the above record to the sixth century A.D. on the basis of a study of its characters.\textsuperscript{91} Chronological problems do not stand in the way of accepting this suggestion.

If the above suggestion is accepted, the Chalukyas under Jayasimha came to power as the feudatory of the early Rashtrastras. The Rashtrastra capital was somewhere in the Southern Maratha country, as might be evident from the Chalukyan epigraphs.\textsuperscript{92} The Aihole Praśasti of Pulakesin II states that Āppāyika and Govinda, his two adversaries, had advanced as far as the northern bank of Bhimarathī, i.e., modern Bhima.\textsuperscript{93} Āppāyika and Govinda appear to have been of the Rashtrastra lineage\textsuperscript{94} and may be the offshoots of the family of the Rashtrastra Abhimanyu, whom Jayasimha served as his commander. It would have been quite natural for them to fish in the troubled waters of the prevailing confusion and re-establish Rashtrastra power.

The Chalukyas at this time were passing through a state of civil war between Mangalesa and Pulakesin II,\textsuperscript{95} which makes the advance of the above-mentioned kings more likely. Their advance up to the northern bank of the river Bhima\textsuperscript{96} suggests that their seat was somewhere in the Southern Maratha country. This supports the earlier presumption that both belonged to the Abhimanyu family ruling over the regions adjoining Kolhapur and Satara at the beginning of the seventh century A.D. During the reigns of Vijayaditya and Vikramaditya II, the Rashtrastra subordinates figure in the Chalukyan grants found in the above-referred region.\textsuperscript{97} It is an additional evidence to prove the Rashtrastra-Chalukya relationship in the earlier stages of the Chalukyan history.

There is no evidence whatsoever that the Chalukyas rose to prominence after defeating the early Rashtrastras in a direct conflict. They appear to have wrested power from the early Rashtrastras gradually, when the latter were engaged in wars with their neighbours, i.e., the Nalas and the Mauryas.\textsuperscript{98} There is every reason to believe that Jayasimha Vallabha, as a high official of the early Rashtrastras, declared his sovereignty over some parts of the kingdom of his overlord, when the Rashtra-
kūṭas were engaged in a life-and-death struggle with their designing neighbours. Thus, taking advantage of the situation, Jayasimha acquired a small kingdom round about modern Bijapur,⁹⁹ without coming into direct conflict with his masters. Deprived of possible help and succour they could have received from their subordinate Chālukya feudatory, the early Rāṣṭrakūṭas were vanquished by the Mauryas and the Nalas. Sircar appears to be correct in his surmise that the early Rāṣṭrakūṭas were overthrown by their neighbours, namely, the Nalas and the Mauryas, who were themselves overthrown by the early Chālukyas.¹⁰⁰

It would thus appear that the Chālukyas first got hold of the territory around modern Bijapur and were subsequently able to come in possession of the territories of their overlord from the Nalas and the Mauryas who had been responsible for the downfall of the early Rāṣṭrakūṭas.¹⁰¹ This is indirectly supported by the Daulatabad Grant of Jagadekamalla wherein Jayasimha is described as the destroyer of the pomp of the Kadambas.¹⁰² The above Grant refers to the victory of Jayasimha over the Kadambas in unmistakable terms;¹⁰³ it could not be taken as a mere rodomontade. Two alternatives could as well be suggested in this connection. The first possibility is that the Kadambas tried to overwhelm the Rāṣṭrakūṭas and the latter were able to ward off their attack with the help of Jayasimha, who at that time was a faithful ally of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas and claims all credit for this successful defence of his master’s domain. The second suggestion entails consideration of the prevailing conditions after the discomfiture of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas at the hands of the Nalas and the Mauryas. It is possible that the Kadambas, too, tried to take advantage of the situation at the cost of the already weakened Rāṣṭrakūṭas. By that time, Jayasimha had already assumed independence and successfully withstood the Kadamba onslaught. Both these possibilities rule out any subservience of the early Chālukyas to the Kadambas, as has tentatively been suggested by some scholars.¹⁰⁴ The confused account of the later Chālukyan records, in which a certain Vīshṇuvardhana gained victory over the Kadambas, seems to have been a mere echo of the achievements of Jayasimha.¹⁰⁵

Jayasimha started his career as a feudatory of the early Rāṣṭrakūṭas and taking advantage of the time and his high
position, he was able to carve out a small kingdom for himself. According to the Badami Inscription of the Śaka year 465, the grandson of Jayasimha, Pulakeśin I, was ruling over Badami in that year. Jayasimha and his son Raṇarāga obviously, therefore, ruled before the Śaka year 465, i.e., A.D. 543. They could roughly be assigned to the period between A.D. 500 and A.D. 540 and Jayasimha would have started his independent career somewhere near A.D. 500. We may assign to him a reign of 20 years, and he was succeeded by his son Raṇarāga some time in A.D. 520.

Raṇarāga

Jayasimha was succeeded by his son and successor Raṇarāga. The Kannada poet Raṇha refers to him as Raṇarāgasimha. We do not find any conquests credited to him in the early records of the dynasty. But the Yevur Tablet Inscription of the time of the later Chālukyas describes him as a prince of great valour having a stately and gigantic personality. This seems to suggest that like his father, he was holding sway over the small territory in the neighbourhood of Bijapur in Karṇāṭaka. Since nothing particular is credited to him in the Mahākūṭa Pillar Inscription of Maṅgaleśa and the Aihole Praśasti, it may be proposed that he devoted his time in stabilising the newly established dynasty for the next twenty years. He seems to have ruled between A.D. 520 and A.D. 540 on the basis of the Badami Cliff Inscription of Śaka year 465.
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The Foundation of the Dynasty

Emergence of the Chālukya Power—Pulakeśin I

The Chālukyas came into the limelight with the accession of Pulakeśin I, the son and successor of Raṇarāga. The Mahākūṭa Pillar Inscription of his son Maṅgaleśa described him as *priyatamujja* of Raṇarāga. Since the early Chālukyan records furnish this piece of information, the account of the later Chālukyan epigraphs—in which a certain Vijayāditya is introduced as the father of Pulakeśin I—need not be given any serious consideration nor should any importance be attached to the other legends associated with them in the Chālukyan records. The name Pulakeśin appears variously in the dynastic records as Polekeśin, Polikeśin and Pulikeśin. Fleet and following him Sircar suggest that the word was a hybrid of Kannada and Sanskrit meaning “tiger-haired”. Sastri, however, treats both the parts of the name as derived from Sanskrit. According to him, the first half of the word is connected with the root ‘Pula’ or ‘Pola’, meaning to be great, while ‘Keśin’ means a lion. So the word Pulakeśin or Polekeśin means “the great lion”. The word Pulakeśin seems to be the Sanskrit word variously mentioned in the records as Polekeśin, Pulikeśin and Polikeśin due to the linguistic influence of the Kannada region.
The family records confer on him the titles of Satyāśraya (abode of truth), Raṇavikrama (the valorous in war), Vallabha, Vallabharāja, Śrīvallabha and Śripṛthivīvallabha⁹ [i.e., husband or favourite of Śrī (Lakšmi) and the Earth]. The title ‘Vallabha’ or ‘Vallabheśvara’ means the supreme lord, which indicated paramountcy.¹⁰ Actually, Vallabha or Śrīvallabha is the abbreviation of the title Śripṛthivīvallabha which has been adopted by all the Chālukyan rulers equating themselves with Lord Viṣṇu, the husband of the goddess of fortune and the earth. It imparted such a dignity that it is often substituted for the names of the Chālukya emperors.¹¹ The Rāṣṭrakūṭas, who replaced the Chālukyas, adopted it to glorify themselves.¹² Pulakeśin I is also credited with the regal title of Mahārāja in the records of his successors.

In addition to the above-mentioned titles, this Chālukyan ruler was also bestowed with a few military and religious epithets. The Altem Plates credit him with the viruda of Rājasiniḥa, i.e., lion among kings.¹³ The Satara Copper Plate Inscription of Viṣṇuvardhana and the Goḍachi Plates of Kattiarasa bestow upon him the epithet of Raṇavikrama—valorous in war.¹⁴ Besides these military epithets, he is also accorded a religious title. The Goḍachi Plates of Kattiarasa accord to him the title of Dhamamahārāja, besides the above-mentioned title of Raṇavikrama.¹⁵ This epithet is significant because this is the only record, where a Chālukyan king is given this title. Prof. Sastri is of opinion that this title indicated the ruler’s active promotion of Vedic dharma against Jainism and Buddhism.¹⁶ It could definitely be said on the basis of the dynastic records and the titles conferred upon him that he was the first sovereign ruler and the real founder of the dynasty.

With the reign of Pulakeśin I, we start finding records relating to the ruling monarchs, which help us to determine their dates and important events occurring during their time in chronological order. There are at least three epigraphs associated with his period. The first epigraph is the Badami Rock Inscription of Vallabheśvara, which is the first inscription of the Chālukyas dated in the Śaka era.¹⁷ According to this record, Pulakeśin I (Vallabheśvara) was the ruler of Badami and its surrounding regions in the Śaka year 465, i.e., A.D. 543.¹⁸ Evi-
dently, his reign must have commenced prior to that year (Śaka 465 = A.D. 543), as such he may have ascended the throne about A.D. 540. The next record is the Aminabhāvi Stone Tablet Inscription dated in the Śaka year 488 (expired), which states that Satyāśraya, i.e., Pulakeśin I, made certain grants to god Kalideva of Aminabhāvi on the occasion of an eclipse of the sun on the new moon day of the month of Vaiśākha, of the Sarvajīta Samvatṣara, falling in the Śaka year 488 (expired). The record is considered to be spurious by some scholars, but the discovery of the Badami Inscription of the Śaka year 465 and another Badami Inscription of the time of king Kṛttivarman dated in the Śaka year 500, lend authenticity to the epigraph in question. It is evident from the Aminabhāvi Inscription that Pulakeśin I ruled upto the Śaka year 488 (expired), i.e., 489 Śaka year (current). According to the Badami Inscription of Śaka year 500, the 12th regnal year of Kṛttivarman I, the son and successor of Pulakeśin I, corresponded to the Śaka year 500. It would thus appear that Kṛttivarman’s reign commenced somewhere in the Śaka year 489, i.e., A.D. 567. Thus, it is evident from the joint testimony of both inscriptions mentioned above that Pulakeśin I ruled upto 567 A.D. and in the same year he was succeeded by his son Kṛttivarman I. Besides these epigraphs, the records of his son and grandson shed light on the career and achievements of this Chālukyan monarch. These include the records of Kṛttivarman I, the Mahākūṭa Pillar Inscription of Maṅgaleśa and the celebrated Aihole Praśasti of Pulakeśin II.

Achievements

The Badami Rock Inscription of Śaka year 465 describes Chālukya Vallabheśvara (Pulakeśin I) as performer of the Aśvamedha and other sacrificés according to Śrauta rites. He turned Vātāpi into an invincible citadel by constructing a narrow pass, unapproachable from the hill top as well as from the terrain below. It appears that he had conquered the area around the present Badami and made it his capital by constructing a fort there. The Aihole Praśasti, too, clearly indicates that king Śrīvallabha (Pulakeśin I) made Vātāpi his capital. Sastri suggests that he established his independence
from the Kadambas by making himself master of the surrounding areas.\textsuperscript{32} Nandimatha, too, is inclined to believe that he wrested Badami from the Kadambas of Banavāsi.\textsuperscript{33} Moraes is also of opinion that the early Chālukya rulers were subordinates of the Kadambas till the time of Pulakeśin I.\textsuperscript{31} According to him, by virtue of his advantageous position and the weakness of the Kadamba Harivarman, Pulakeśin I wrested the northern territories of the Kadambas of Banavāsi and made Badami his headquarters which was situated in the centre of the snatched province.\textsuperscript{35} These suggestions are based on the assumption that the areas around Badami were under the rule of the Kadambas of Banavāsi at the beginning of the sixth century A.D. This is not in conformity with the available epigraphic data because Pulakeśin I was already in possession of those regions in A.D. 543.\textsuperscript{36}

As indicated earlier, Jayasimha, the grandfather of Pulakeśin I, was the commander of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas of Mānapura\textsuperscript{37} and in that capacity he may have defeated the Kadambas. If the above-mentioned suggestion is to be accepted, there is no room to disbelieve that Pulakeśin I, like his grandfather, had also defeated the Kadambas. Moraes admits that Pulakeśin I was able to achieve this victory due to the insurrection of the Kadamba Harivarman\textsuperscript{38} but this rules out Kadamba supremacy over the early Chālukyas. Whatever may have been the chain of events, it could hardly be denied that Pulakeśin I had gained victory over the Kadambas. A suggestion might, as well, be made here that it was in order to celebrate this victory that Pulakeśin I performed the Aśvamedha sacrifice which lighted up the earth with its brightness.\textsuperscript{39} The fame of this horse sacrifice is recalled even in the later dynastic records of the twelfth century.\textsuperscript{40}

The performance of the above sacrifice symbolises the military exploits of Pulakeśin I which he may have achieved against his neighbours. Unfortunately, the early dynastic records do not attribute any specific conquests to him except the capture of Vāṭāpi.\textsuperscript{41} It has been suggested by Sircar that Pulakeśin I had obtained success mainly through his martial son Kīrttivarman I, who acted as his father’s commander-in-chief.\textsuperscript{42} This suggestion gains weight as the Chiplun Plates of Pulakeśin II credit Kīrttivarman II with the foundation of the
city of Badami. The information could only be justified if we assume that the construction of the capital was started during the reign of Pulakesin I and completed during the time of his son, Kṛttivarman I.

The accomplishments of Pulakesin I are noted in several Chālukyan records. The Badami Rock Inscription of Pulakesin I credits him as the performer of the Aśvamedha and other sacrifices. The Mahākūta Pillar Inscription of his son Maṅgaleśa extols him as the performer of the Agniśṭoma, Agničhayana, Vājapeya, Bahusuvrana and Paunḍarika sacrifices besides the Aśvamedha and Hiranyagarbha sacrifices. The performance of Vedic sacrifices after the purifying āvabhrītha bath also suggests that he had deep faith in the Vedic religion. According to the Nerur Plates of Maṅgalarāja, he was fully conversant with the laws of Manu, and was a master of the Purāṇas, the Rāmāyaṇa, Bṛāhata (Mahābhārata) and other itihāsas. He was like Brhaspati in nīti, i.e., politics. He is described in the Mahākūta Pillar Inscription as yuddhopadesagrāhī (one who heeds the admonitions of the elders), bhrāhmaṇya (who upholds the Brahmanic traditions or teaching of the Brāhmaṇas), speaker of truth and one who never breaks promises (satyavāgvisamvādakāli). The dynastic records compare him to mythological kings like Yayāti, Dilipa and others. He was associated with his son Kṛttivarman I in an endowment to god Makuṭeśvaranātha at Mahākūta, a place not very far from Badami.

The name of Pulakesin's wife was Durlabhādevi, who belonged to Bappura lineage. The Mahākūta Pillar Inscription compares her to Damayanti in her devotion to her husband. It is difficult to ascertain whether it is the same lineage to which Satyāśraya Dhruvārāja Indravarman of the Goa Grant belonged. Pulakesin I had two sons, Kṛttivarman I and Maṅgaleśa, both of whom succeeded him. With the publication of the Mudhol Plates, yet another name Pūgavarman has come to light. It has been suggested that Pūgavarman was the eldest son of Pulakesin I and had predeceased his father. The above suggestion, even if accepted, will not be free from doubt. The name of Pūgavarman's father is not specifically mentioned and he is referred to by the family epithet of Śrīprthivīvallabha Mahārāja. It will be noticed that this title
has been applied to Maṅgaleśa besides Pulakeśin I and also to the other rulers of the dynasty along with other honorific epithets. The epithet Śrīprthivivallabha Mahārāja is applied singly only to Maṅgaleśa. The Aihole Praśasti, however, hints that Maṅgaleśa had a son and that he was anxious to secure the throne for him. As such we are inclined to believe that Pūgavarman was the son of Maṅgaleśa and not that of Pulakeśin I, as the former had also been ascribed the same viruda.

**Kīrttivarman I**

Kīrttivarman I, the son and successor of Pulakeśin I, ascended the throne of Badami after the death of the latter. He is referred to as Kīrttirāja in some inscriptions. The Godachi Copper Plate Inscription calls him Katti-arasa, probably a Kannada rendering of Kīrttirāja. According to the Godachi Plates, he surpassed all his kinsmen in diplomacy and valour. Whether these refer to a clash between the rival claimants or to a fratricidal war, it is difficult to ascertain in the present state of our knowledge.

The dynastic records accord to him the virudas of Śrīprthivivallabha, Vallabha and Satyāśraya, i.e., the refuge of truth. Besides these family epithets, he is also bestowed the regal title of Mahārāja suggesting that he was a paramount sovereign. The Mahākūṭa Pillar Inscription of Maṅgaleśa bestowed on him the military viruda of Pururaṇaparākrama, i.e., valorous in war like Puru.

A few inscriptions referring to his reign have come to light. These include the Badami Inscription of the Śaka year 500 dated on Kārttika Paurṇamāsī in the twelfth regnal year of the king, which corresponds to 31st October, A.D. 578. This record refers to the construction of the Vīṣṇu temple by Maṅgaliśvara, i.e., Maṅgaleśa, younger brother of the king. The Godachi Copper Plate Inscription, dated in the twelfth regnal year of the king, records the gift of a field to a Brāhmaṇa at the request of the royal minister Vyāghrasvāmin, who is described as Rājyasarvasva and Dhurandhara. Besides these records, the inscriptions belonging to the reigns of his brother Maṅgaleśa and son named Pulakeśin II also help us in shedding
light over the events of his reign. In this connection, the Mahâkûta Pillar Inscription of Maṅgaleśa⁶⁹ and the celebrated Aihole Praśasti deserve special reference, which furnish interesting details of his career and achievements.⁷⁰ Some scholars also think that the Adur Inscription belongs to his reign⁷¹ but it would be more appropriate to refer it to the time of Kirttivarma II.⁷²

Date of Accession

According to the Badami Inscription, his twelfth regnal year falls in the Śaka year 500, making it apparent that he ascended the throne in the Śaka year 488 or 489 = A.D. 566-67.⁷³ This fact is also evident from the Aminabhāvi Inscription dated in the Śaka year 488 (expired), which was probably the last reigning year of Pulakeśin I.⁷⁴ Thus it is evident that Kirttivarma I ascended the throne of Badami in A.D. 566-67.⁷⁵ The length of his reign could hardly be precisely determined in view of the paucity of evidence. He seems to have ruled for a number of years and strove a lot to consolidate and expand the newly-founded kingdom of the Chālukyas of Badami.

Important Events

The Badami Inscription of the Śaka year 500 and the Godachi Plates are silent about the political events of Kirttivarma’s reign.⁷⁶ The Mahâkûta Pillar Inscription, however, states that this Chālukyan monarch had won victory against several kings including the rulers of Vaṅga, Aṅga, Kaliṅga, Vaṭṭura, Magadha, Madraka, Kerala, Gaṅga, Mushaka, Pāṇḍya, Dramila, Choliya, Aluka and Vaijayanti.⁷⁷ The Aihole Praśasti describes him as the night of doom for the Nalas, Mauryas and the Kadambas.⁷⁸ The absence of any reference to other kingdoms except the above three led scholars to doubt the veracity of the statement of the Mahâkûta record.⁷⁹ This gains weight because Pulakeśin II, the son of Kirttivarma I, could hardly be expected to withhold the information about the military exploits of his own father.⁸⁰ On the other hand, if we accept it in toto, Kirttivarma I appears to have conquered those far-flung provinces in the North and South which were
not included even in the heyday of Chālukyan supremacy.

Conquest of the Kadambas

The Aihole Praśasti of his son Pulakeśin II mentions that Kṛttivarman I was Kālarāti, i.e., night of death or destruction, to the Nalas, Mauryas and the Kadambas. The Mahākūta Pillar Inscription also includes the ruler of Vaijayantī, i.e., Banavāsī, amongst the kings vanquished by him. Subsequent dynastic records and the later Chālukyan inscriptions of Kalyāṇī also testify to this conquest and narrate that he was Kṛṭhāra or an axe that cut at the very roots of the Kadambas.

During this period, the Kadambas ruled over territories comprising the present districts of North Kanara, Belgaum, Dharwar and the adjoining regions of Karnataka. Several branches of the family held sway over these areas, while the main branch ruled at Banavāsī in the North Kanara district. As stated earlier, Pulakeśin I had occupied their northern regions, but the Kadambas had not been completely subdued. Consolidating his hold over these territories and with a view to expanding them in the same direction, Kṛttivarman I adopted an aggressive policy towards the Kadambas. The Kadambas suffered heavily in this struggle. They were not only deprived of their territory but also dislodged from their metropolis. The occupation of their capital is evident from the Mahākūta Pillar Inscription of Maṅgaleśa. In the dynastic records of the early Chālukyas, Kṛttivarman is said to have established the banner of his fame in the lands of the hostile kings of Banavāsī and other maṇḍalas. But the inscriptions from the time of the regency of Vijayabhaṭṭārikā onwards record that Kṛttivarman had obtained pure fame by defeating the rulers of Banavāsī and other maṇḍalas. This seems to suggest that he not only defeated the Kadamba rulers of Banavāsī but also kings of other branches.

The Aihole Praśasti of Pulakeśin II also refers to the break-up of the confederacy of the Kadambas by Kṛttivarman I. This probably indicates that the latter tried to regain the fallen capital and territory after forging a confederacy of the neighbouring kingdoms. Nothing could be stated definitely about
the kings who participated in the confederacy. It seems possible to assume that the Sendrakas, the Gaṅgas and the Kadambas of the other branches under the leadership of the main branch opposed the territorial expansion of Kṛttivarman I. The latter not only broke the conglomeration engineered by the Kadambas, but also routed and dislodged them from their possessions.\textsuperscript{91} The Mahākūta Pillar Inscription probably refers to this humiliation of the Gaṅgas and the Alūpas.\textsuperscript{92} Probably the Gaṅgas and the Sendrakas were allowed to retain their possessions after acknowledging the supremacy of the victor Kṛttivarman I, but the Kadambas were exterminated and their territory including the beautiful city of Banavāśī was annexed to the Chālukyan dominions.\textsuperscript{93} The Sendrakas transferred their allegiance to the Chālukyas and cemented their relations by giving a Sendraka princess in marriage to Kṛttivarman I. She was the sister of the Sendraka Rāja Śrīvallabha Senananda, as is evident from the Chiplun Plates of Pulakesin II.\textsuperscript{94} The transfer of the Sendraka allegiance signifies the southward expansion and consolidation of the Chālukyan power at the expense of the Kadambas,\textsuperscript{95} whose ruler could not be identified in the absence of any specific mention in the Chālukyan records. According to some scholars, the contemporary Kadamba king was Kṛṣṇavarman II, who ruled approximately between A.D. 550 and A.D. 565.\textsuperscript{96} Moraes has rightly shown that he was Kadamba Ajavarman, son of Kṛṣṇavarman II.\textsuperscript{97} Sastrī and Sircar have endorsed his view.\textsuperscript{98} Thus it seems that the Kadambas were defeated and their territories were annexed to the Chālukyan kingdom.

\textit{Conquest of the Nalas}

Kṛttivarman I is also stated to have defeated the Nalas. During this period, the Nalas were ruling in Nalavāḍī, which lay in the direction of Bellary and Karnul districts.\textsuperscript{99} The findspots of their records suggest that their territories lay in the Bastar-Jeypore region at the beginning of the sixth century A.D.\textsuperscript{100} The Nala territorial expansion resulted in a struggle with the Vākāṭakas and the Paṇḍuvaṁśi kings of Kośala.\textsuperscript{101} The enemy mentioned in the Poḍagarh records has been identified with the Vākāṭaka Pṛthivīsena II.\textsuperscript{102} Sircar identifies him
with Kīrttivarman I who subjugated the Nalas and was 'the night of doom for them'.

Sometimes the Nalas are described as the traditional enemy of the Chālukyas. The later Chālukyan records describe Kīrttivarman I as destroying the habitations (nilaya) of the Nalas. During the time of Vikramāditya I and his successors, a vishaya named Nalavādi was included in the Chālukyan empire. Most probably it was named after, the Nalas. In the light of this, it is difficult to say whether the Bellary-Karnul area was their southern settlement or it was a southernmost province of the Nala territories.

Conquest of the Mauryas

Kīrttivarman I is also said to have defeated the Mauryas. They are regarded to be the descendants of a Mauryan governor in the Deccan. During this period, they were holding sway over the Konkan region of the present Maharashtra, having their headquarters at Purī which has been described as the Lakshmi of the Western ocean. Scholars generally identify it with the present Ghārapurī near Elephanta Islands in Maharashtra. The defeat of the Mauryas at the hands of Kīrttivarman is definite evidence indicating the expansion of the Chālukyan territories in the northern direction. It seems that the Mauryas were defeated and a new governor was appointed for the newly conquered province of Konkan. Fleet and others believe that Satyāśraya Dhruvarāja Indravarman, who was appointed governor of this territory by Kīrttivarman I, was related to him from his mother's side. Some scholars are also of opinion that he was a member of the royal family. The Nerur Plates of Maṅgalarāja show him as donating Kuṇḍivātaka village, which was situated in Koṅkana vishaya. These Plates also mention that Maṅgaleśa defeated the Chālukyan chief named Svāmīrāja and killed him, who had won eighteen battles. The above-mentioned Svāmīrāja was, most probably, the Governor of the Konkan appointed by Kīrttivarman I, after the conquest of the above-referred territory.
THE FOUNDATION OF THE DYNASTY

Defeat of the Alūkas and the Gaṅgas

The Mahākūṭa Pillar Inscription also alludes to the defeat of the Alūkas and the Gaṅgas by Kīrttivarman I. Both the Gaṅgas and the Alūkas were also included among the feudatories of Pulakeśin II. The Kolhapur Plates of Vinayāditya call the Gaṅgas and the Alūpas the hereditary servants of the Chālukyas. On the basis of the Māruṭūrū Grant of Satyāśraya Śripṛthivīvallabha Mahārāja (Pulakeśin II) of the 8th regnal year, Alūpas (Alūkas or Aluvas) appear to be of that small ruling feudatory line of chieftains holding sway in the region round the Guntur district. Sastri suggests on the basis of the find-spots of their inscriptions that they were ruling in South Kanara. In the absence of specific evidence, we could not work out the details of Kīrttivarman’s conquest of the Alūkas but he seems to have defeated them, resulting in acknowledgement of their overlordship by the Alūpas.

The Gaṅgas referred to in the Mahākūṭa Inscription appear to be the Gaṅgas of the Tālakad. They are mentioned in the dynastic records of the Chālukyas along with the Alūpas. The Gaṅga territory lay adjacent to that of the Kadambas, to whom they earlier owed allegiance. Probably they were attacked and subjugated by Kīrttivarman when he undertook decisive expeditions against the Kadambas. The Gaṅgas were allowed to retain their possessions after the acceptance of the overlordship of the Chālukyas. In all probability, the Gaṅga adversary was Durvinīta.

Other Conquests

In addition to the above-mentioned rulers, the Mahākūṭa Pillar Inscription also mentions that Kīrttivarman I achieved victories against several hostile kings including Vaṅga, Aṅga, Kaliṅga, Vaṭṭūra, Magadha, Madraka, Kerala, Mushaka, Pāṇḍya, Dramila and Choliya. Vaṅga, Aṅga, Magadha and Madraka lay in Northern India, whereas Kerala, Mushaka, Pāṇḍya, Dramila, Choliya and Vaṭṭūra were in South India. The statement relating to the conquests of Kīrttivarman I seems to be an exaggeration, and it is extremely doubtful for a ruler of his status to have carved out such an extensive empire cover-
ing the whole of the country. These territories were not even included in the Chālukyan empire when it was at the zenith of its glory. The silence of Raviśrīti casts serious doubt on the above statement of the Mahākūṭa Pillar Inscription. It may, however, be proposed that his conquests have been confined to the Nalas, Mauryas and Kadambas, who were the partners of a confederacy shattered by Kṛttivarman I.

It seems that before launching the scheme of conquest of the neighbouring kingdoms Kṛttivarman I fortified the city of Vāṭāpi, his capital. The Chipuln Plates of Satyāsraya describe Kṛttivarman I as the first maker of Vāṭāpi. As already stated, Badami had become the capital of the early Chālukyas during the reign of Pulakesin I as evinced from the Badami Rock Inscription of Vallabheśvara. As such, it might be presumed that Kṛttivarman I adorned the city of Vāṭāpi by constructing temples and completed the work of fortification initiated during the reign of his father.

The Extent of the Kingdom

With the above-referred military expeditions, Kṛttivarman I had not only consolidated the Chālukyan power but also expanded it in different directions. He had inherited the small kingdom which consisted of the area round about Badami to which he added the territories of the Nalavādi, Banavāsi, Gaṅgavādi and the possessions of the Alūpas, the Sendrakas and the Mauryas. In the north, his kingdom included the Konkan and in the south it extended upto Shimoga district in Karnataka, including Dharwar and Belgaum districts. Towards the Andhra side, his territories were stretched upto Bellary-Karnul and Guntur districts. Thus, his kingdom included Dharwar, Belgaum, Bijapur and Shimoga districts of the present Karnataka, Ratnagiri and adjoining regions of Maharashtra, the Bellary-Karnul region and Guntur area of Andhra Pradesh.

Kṛttivarman I was a paramount sovereign who consolidated the Chālukyan kingdom. His reign marked the beginning of an era of conquests and supremacy in Chālukyan history. The Mahākūṭa Pillar Inscription of his brother Maṅgaleśa states that he was endowed with the sovereignty acquired by
the strength and prowess of his own arms. His feet were rubbed and scrubbed by the jewelled diadems of the hostile kings and whose body was purified by the religious merit of the ablutions performed after celebrating Agnishôma and Bahusuvarga sacrifices. The Goḍachi Plates describe him as one 'who was well-versed in the meaning of all the Śāstras and their interpretations along with the Smṛtis'. He is described as one 'who felt delighted in fostering justice to his subjects'. He had a minister named Vyāghrasvāmin who was not only a man of letters but was also described as Rājyasarvasya and Dhurandhara. All these statements suggest that he was not only a great conqueror but also a patron of literary activities and an accomplished administrator.

Kirttivarman I married a Sendraka princess who was the sister of Śrīvallabha Senānanda, a Sendraka subordinate of the Chālukyas. The dynastic records say that he had at least three sons, viz., Pulakeśin II, Vishnuvardhana and Buddhavarasa. According to the Nirpan Grant, Dhāraśraya Jayasimha was also a son of Kirttivarman. Fleet considers this grant as spurious. Thus, it is clear that Kirttivarman I died leaving behind three sons to succeed him. But we know for certain that after Kirttivarman I, Maṅgaleśa became the ruler of the Chālukyas. In the absence of any specific contemporary evidence, it is not possible to explain this apparent deviation in the line of succession. One might as well ask why the established law of primogeniture was ignored here. In the absence of any evidence, scholars have conjectured that Pulakeśin II was a minor when Kirttivarman I died. Therefore, Maṅgaleśa, the younger brother of the deceased king, became the ruler. This view gains weight with the testimony of the later Chālukya inscriptions which state that Maṅgaleśa took upon the burden of the kingdom during the minority of his brother's son and duly returned the kingdom to Satyāśraya when he attained majority. The Aihole Prāśasti of Pulakeśin II hints that there was a fratricidal war resulting in the murder of Maṅgaleśa. He seems to have ruled up to A.D. 591-92 and in the same year he was succeeded by Maṅgaleśa.

It thus follows from the above evidence that Pulakeśin's supposed minority necessitated the occasion for the regency
administration. Maṅgaleśa, being the uncle of the royal children, probably took up the reins of government of the kingdom as regent. Later on, after gaining full control of the kingdom, he managed to usurp the rights of Pulakesin II and his brothers. Probably this action of Maṅgaleśa invited the occurrence referred to in the Aihole Praśasti of Pulakesin II. Nothing could be stated definitely in this connection till we get some evidence to throw light on the causes for the deviation in the succession to the throne.

Maṅgaleśa

While the chain of events after the death of Kīrttivarman I leaves room for surmises, there cannot be two opinions about the succession of Maṅgaleśa immediately following his brother. Among the early rulers of the Chālukyas of Badami, Maṅgaleśa was the first king to launch upon an extensive scheme of conquests and win laurels for his house. Unfortunately, the internecine war culminating in his overthrow at the hands of his nephew Pulakesin II threw his achievements into the background. Subsequently, he was denied his rightful place in the dynastic records because of his attempt to perpetuate his own line of descent on the Chālukyan throne. Leaving the ethics of the question apart, it has to be conceded that he was a gallant ruler with a vision and was anxious to expand the power and prestige of the Chālukyas in the Deccan.

Maṅgaleśa, the younger brother of Kīrttivarman I, was also known as Maṅgaleśvara, Maṅgaliśa, Maṅgalarāja and Maṅgalārṇava (ocean of auspiciousness). His inscriptions credit him with the regal titles of Śrīprthivīvallabha or Pṛthivīvallabha and Mahārāja besides the appellations of Ruṇavikrānta and Ururāṇavikrānta, which mean 'the puissant in war' and 'puissant like Uru (or Great) in war'. In addition to these epithets, he has also been bestowed the virudhas signifying religious faith. As such the Nerur Plates call him 'Paramabhāgavata', i.e., a devout worshipper of lord Bhagavata (Vishṇu). His faith in Vaishnavism is further echoed in the Badami Inscription of the Śaka year 500, where he has been associated with the construction of a Vishṇu temple in a cave at Badami. The Mahākūṭa Pillar Inscription registers a gift of ten villages by him to Lord Makuṭeśvara-
nātha (the present deity of Mahākūṭa), a local form of Śiva, indicating his leanings towards Śaivism. This might as well mean his catholic attitude towards different Hindu sects.

Sources

A few inscriptions referring to his reign have been discovered so far. These include the Mahākūṭa Pillar Inscription dated Vaisākha Paurṇamāsi, Siddhārtha saivatsara, 5th (?) (7th) regnal year of the king. This fine piece of prose praṇātī sheds light over the political history of the dynasty upto Maṅgalesā. The Nerur Copper Plates of Maṅgalesā inform us that this Chālukyan monarch had driven out the Kalachuri king Buddha, son of Śaṅkaragana. Besides, it also refers to a Chālukyan chieftain Svāmīrāja, slain by Maṅgalesā, and registers a gift of a village to a Brāhmaṇa. He gifted some land to the garland-makers for the temple of god Laṅjiśvara, built by the king himself, as is evidenced from the Badami Cave Inscription. The Goa Grant of Satyāśraya Dhruvarāja Indravarman probably refers to him with his title Śrīprthīvīvallabha Mahārāja dated in the Śaka year 532, i.e., A.D. 610. This record helps us to determine the reign period of Maṅgalesā in the absence of any other fully dated record. In addition to these, several pieces of information concerning his reign are gathered from the Badami Inscription of the Śaka year 500 and the famous Aihole Praṇātī of his nephew and enemy Pulakesin II. Some inscriptions of the later Chālukyas of Kalyāṇī also refer to him as regent ruling during the minority of Kīrttivarman’s son.

His Date

The absence of contemporary dated records and the non-reference to his achievements in any other source give rise to several controversies about his reign. One such concerns his date. All the three epigraphs referring to the reign of Maṅgalesā are not dated in any specific era, and later family records also do not furnish any clue for determining the date of his accession. On the basis of the Mahākūṭa Pillar Inscription, Fleet fixed the beginning of his reign in 597-98 A.D.
which may not be taken as final with the source material at our disposal.

It is, however, amply proved that Maṅgaleśa was overthrown by his nephew Pulakeśin II, the son and legitimate successor of Kīrttivarman I, after a civil war.\textsuperscript{157} We, therefore, have no direct evidence to account for his date of accession and dethronement. However, we know for certain that Kīrttivarman I was ruling over Badami in the Śaka year 500 and his son Pulakeśin II was ruling over Badami in the Śaka year 534 corresponding to the latter's third regnal year.\textsuperscript{158} So Pulakeśin II's reign could not have commenced earlier than Śaka 532 (expired). Therefore, Maṅgaleśa must have ruled somewhere between this period, i.e., Śaka year 500 and 532, corresponding roughly to A.D. 578 and A.D. 610.

The only dated record supposed to be that of the Chālukyas of Badami and belonging to the above-mentioned period is the Goa Grant of Satyāśrāya Dhrūvarāja Indravarman.\textsuperscript{159} Therein Satyāśrāya Dhrūvarāja Indravarman is stated to have gifted the village of Karellikā, situated in Khetahāra desa with the prior sanction of the Śriprthivivallabha Mahārāja.\textsuperscript{160} The inscription is dated in the Śaka year 532, corresponding to his 20th regnal year.\textsuperscript{161} The grant is written in the typical Chālukyan characters of the period and the seal contains the usual Chālukya 'boar emblem'. The title of Śriprthivivallabha Mahārāja is common and regularly applied to the Chālukya rulers of Badami.\textsuperscript{162} On the basis of the aforesaid details, it could be said that the record belongs to the Chālukyas or to one of their feudatories. So the Śriprthivivallabha Mahārāja referred to in the Goa Grant should be some Chālukya ruler of Badami.

There is a title assuming that Satyāśrāya Dhrūvarāja Indravarman was a son of Maṅgaleśa,\textsuperscript{163} as he is described in the record as the crest-jewel of the Ādi-Bappūra family.\textsuperscript{164} Fleet took Satyāśrāya Dhrūvarāja Indravarman of the Goa Grant to be a son of Maṅgaleśa, referred to in the Aihole Praśasti,\textsuperscript{165} but there is nothing in the Goa Grant to support and confirm Fleet's contention. Similarly, there is no truth in the assumption that Satyāśrāya Dhrūvarāja Indravarman was a Western Chālukya on his father's side.\textsuperscript{166} This assumption of Fleet is based on the identification of the word Bappūra with
the Batpura family, to which the wife of Pulakeśin I belonged.\textsuperscript{167} Satyāśraya Dhruvarājā Indravarman is clearly stated to be the crest-jewel of the Ādi-Bappūra family.\textsuperscript{168} As such how could he be regarded as a son or scion of the Chāluukya dynasty? The family of the Chāluukyas was more glorious, better known and more honourable holding sway over a vast country. It is difficult to reconcile the claim of Dhruvarājā Indravarman of quite an unknown family to such a boastful claim in these circumstances.

According to M.S. Sarma, the name Satyāśraya Dhruvarājendravarman contains three parts, viz., Satyāśraya, Dhruvarāja and Indravarman and hence Indravarman was the son of Dhruvarāja, the latter being the son of Satyāśraya.\textsuperscript{169} Such an interpretation from the break-up of the epithet and the name is fallacious.

Satyāśraya Dhruvarāja Indravarman was a feudatory of Śrīprithivīvallabha Mahārāja, and belonged to the Bappūra family. He was stationed at Revatidvīpa as governor (adhipati) of the four viṣhaya-māṇḍalas.\textsuperscript{170} He was a vassal chief and was appointed by Śrīprithivīvallabha Mahārāja, i.e., some Chāluukya ruler of Badami. As Satyāśraya Dhruvarāja Indravarman was administering four viṣhaya-māṇḍalas, it is evident that a petty governor like him would not have dated the record in his own regnal year. The very mention of his overlord and his prior sanction render it even less likely. The status of Indravarman is highlighted from the fact that he could only grant a village to the Brāhmaṇas, after obtaining the prior permission of the Śrīprithivīvallabha Mahārāja, i.e., his overlord.\textsuperscript{171} As such, it was not possible for him to date the record in his regnal year, as has been supposed by some scholars.\textsuperscript{172} The available evidence does not warrant such an assumption. Thus, the Śrīprithivīvallabha Mahārāja of the Goa Grant was some Chāluukya ruler of Badami and the grant is dated in that ruler's 20th regnal year corresponding to Śaka 532, i.e., A.D. 610-11.

Now the question that arises is about Śrīprithivīvallabha Mahārāja's identity. Several scholars have gone to great lengths to identify him with Kīrttivarman I, Maṅgaleśa and Pulakeśin II. It will be better to consider their arguments before arriving at some conclusion. Fleet proposed that after the conquest of Konkan, Kīrttivarman I placed Satyāśraya
Dhruvarāja Indravarman as viceroy about A.D. 590 at Revatīdvīpa. The acceptance of this suggestion involves his identification with Kīrttivarman of the Goa Grant. As regards this, the date of the latter stands in the way. We know from the records of Kīrttivarman\(^{173}\) that he ruled from Śaka 489 = A.D. 567,\(^{174}\) as such his 20th regnal year could not correspond to the Śaka year 532 as given in the Goa Grant.\(^{175}\) According to the Aihole Praśasti, Revatīdvīpa was first conquered by Maṅgaleśa.\(^{178}\) Had it been the conquest of Kīrttivarman I (as the suggested identification would involve), would his own son Pulakeśin II have credited it to Maṅgaleśa, his enemy? That allusion almost set the seal on the fact that Revatīdvīpa (also mentioned in the Goa Grant) was conquered by Maṅgaleśa. When that piece of territory was not at all under Kīrttivarman I, how could he appoint Satyāśraya Dhruvarāja Indravarman as governor of the same? As such, the contention of Fleet and other scholars that Satyāśraya Dhruvarāja Indravarman was appointed by Kīrttivarman I or in his time is untenable.

Some scholars are of opinion that Śrīprithivīvallabha Mahārāja of the Goa Grant is identical with Pulakeśin II. They also hold the view that the Goa Grant is dated in the 20th regnal year of the governorship of Satyāśraya Dhruvarāja Indravarman.\(^{177}\) It has already been made clear that the Goa Grant is not dated in the year of Indravarman’s governorship but in the regnal year of Śrīprithivīvallabha Mahārāja, by whose permission Indravarman donated the village to the Brāhmaṇas. Dr. D.C. Sircar, commenting on the point, held that “it was as a result of the difficult days through which the Chālukya emperor was passing about this time that he (Indravarman) appears to have become bold enough to issue the charter dated in his own regnal year.”\(^{178}\) If we admit for a while that Satyāśraya Dhruvarāja Indravarman could gather courage to bypass and ignore his overlord, i.e., the contemporary Chālukya emperor of Badami, then there was no question of his seeking his permission for gifting a village. When he seeks prior sanction to gift a village, how could he dare to disregard his overlord by dating the charter in his own regnal year? Under these circumstances, it is difficult to agree with the learned scholar. As such the Goa Grant could hardly be regarded as dated in the year of Indravarman’s governorship.
Further, according to the Goa Grant, the 20th regnal year of Śrīprithiviwallabha Mahārāja fell in the Śaka year 532, i.e., A.D. 610-11. We know from the Hyderabad Grant of Pulakeśin II that Śaka year 534 (expired) was the third year of his reign. It is, therefore, evident that Pulakeśin II’s reign could not have commenced earlier than the Śaka year 532, i.e., A.D. 610-11. It means that the 20th regnal year of Pulakeśin II would correspond to the Śaka year 552, and not to the Śaka year 532. As such, Śrīprithiviwallabha Mahārāja of the Goa Grant could not be identified with Pulakeśin II.

Moreover, if we admit for a while that the overlord mentioned in the Goa Grant was Pulakeśin II, how and why did he allow such a vital disregard on the part of his feudatory Satyāśraya Dhruvarāja Indravarman? In fact, the Goa Grant of Satyāśraya Dhruvarāja Indravarman appears to be earlier in date than the commencement of Pulakeśin II’s reign. The Hyderabad Copper Plate Grant of Pulakeśin II is dated in the Bhādrapada Amāvasya, solar eclipse, Śaka year 534, corresponding to his 3rd regnal year. The record appears to be dated in the expired year. The said solar eclipse fell on 23rd July, A.D. 613. The Goa Grant is dated the Māgha Purnamāsī, Śaka year 532, which corresponds to January 4, A.D. 611. Then, if we assume that Pulakeśin I ascended the throne in February-March 611 A.D., the Hyderabad Grant of Pulakeśin falls well in the third regnal year of that king. We may, therefore, conclude that the Goa Grant in all probability must be earlier in date than the commencement of Pulakeśin’s reign, though only by a few months.

As stated earlier, the title Śrīprithiviwallabha Mahārāja denotes some Chālukya ruler of Badami. No doubt, the family records credit Pulakeśin II with this title but it is always coupled with either Satyāśraya or some other imperial viruda like Paramesvara, Bhaṭṭāraka, Mahārāja or Maharājadhirāja. As such, he could not be equated with the overlord of Satyāśraya Dhruvarāja Indravarman mentioned in the Goa Grant, as these titles are wanting in it.

It appears on the basis of available epigraphic data that the overlord mentioned in the Goa Grant was none else but Maṅgaleśa. This identification is further corroborated by
the following facts. Maṅgaleśa conquered Revatīdvīpa, so there is every possibility that he appointed Satyāśraya Dhruvarāja Indravarman at Revatīdvīpa. The appointment of Indravarman by Maṅgaleśa seems almost certain as Kīrttivarman I, the predecessor of Maṅgaleśa, was neither on the throne at that time nor did the territory in question come to the Chālukyas during his period. Pulakeśin II, the successor of Maṅgaleśa, had not become the ruling sovereign by that time, as is evident from the Hyderabad Grant of Pulakeśin II. Maṅgaleśa remained on the throne of Vāṭāpi between Kīrttivarman I and Pulakeśin II, as such he, after the conquest of the said territory, placed Satyāśraya Dhruvarāja Indravarman at Revatīdvīpa.

We know that Maṅgaleśa ruled some time between the Śaka year 500 and the Śaka year 532. The Śaka year 500 corresponded to the 12th regnal year of Kīrttivarman I and the Śaka year 532 was the first regnal year of Pulakeśin II. As such, neither Kīrttivarman’s 20th regnal year nor that of his son Pulakeśin II could have corresponded with the Śaka year 532. The Śaka year 532 could only correspond with the 20th regnal year of Maṅgaleśa, who ruled between these two kings. Therefore, he could safely be identified with Śrīprithivivallabha Mahārāja of the Goa Grant. In addition to it neither in his inscriptions nor in other records of the dynasty had he ever been accorded the title of Satyāśraya. The Mahākūṭa records explicitly state that Maṅgaleśa was also known as Prithivivallabha.

Fleet, who was the first to put the history of that dynasty in a proper form, had propounded A.D. 597-98 as the date of the accession of Maṅgaleśa to the throne of Badami on the strength of the Mahākūṭa Pillar Inscription of Maṅgaleśa dated in his 5th regnal year. This necessitated the suggestion that the Goa Grant is dated in the 20th regnal year of Indravarman’s Government. But then, it has to be taken for granted that the Goa Grant is dated in the regnal year of Śrīprithivivallabha Mahārāja, the overlord of Satyāśraya Dhruvarāja Indravarman. The Goa Grant, therefore, has to be taken as dated in the Śaka year 532 (current) and the Hyderabad Grant (of Pulakeśin II) in the Śaka year 534 (expired). This assumption gives room to the view that Maṅgaleśa was occupying the throne of Badami when the Goa Grant was issued and
very soon after it, Pulakeśin II was able to dislodge Maṅgaleśa in the civil war and ascended the throne in the same year. Commenting on the pros and cons of Fleet’s theory (that Indravarman was the scion of the Chāluṇya family and the related issues), Dr. D.C. Sircar even admits that “the identification of Śripriṅhivīḷḷabha Mahārāja, overlord of Satyāśraya Dhruvaraṇa Indravarman, with Maṅgaleśa is not beyond the bounds of possibility.” On the basis of the above discussion, it could be said that Śripriṅhivīḷḷabha Mahārāja of the Goa Grant is none else but Maṅgaleśa and his 20th regnal year corresponds with the Śaka year 532 (current).

We can fix the termination of the reign of Kṛttivarman I and accession of Maṅgaleśa on the basis of the above conclusion. Kṛttivarman I ascended the throne in the Śaka year 488, i.e., A.D. 566-67, as evidenced by the Badami Inscription of Maṅgaleśa dated in the Śaka year 500, his 12th regnal year. The 20th regnal year of Maṅgaleśa corresponds to the Śaka year 532, meaning thereby that he might have ascended the throne of Badami after the death of his brother Kṛttivarman I some time in the Śaka year 513, i.e., A.D. 591-92, reckoning backwards from his 20th regnal year. This allows a period of about 25 years, between the Śaka years 488 and 513, i.e., A.D. 566-67 and 591-92, to Kṛttivarman I for having been on the throne of Badami.

Maṅgaleśa ascended the throne of Badami some time in the Śaka year 513, i.e., A.D. 591-92. There is no contemporary evidence, direct or indirect, to determine whether he was ruling as a regent or as an independent ruler. According to Fleet and others, Maṅgaleśa ascended the throne of Badami in 597-98. This view is based on the evidence of the Mahākūṭa Pillar Inscription. The said inscription is dated on the Vaiśākha Pauṇamāsi of the Siddhārtha Samvatsara, falling in the 5th regnal year of Maṅgaleśa. According to the southern cycle of sixty years, the Siddhārtha Samvatsara assignable to Maṅgaleśa fell in the Śaka year 522 (i.e., in between the Śaka years 500 and 532). Fleet rejected this suggestion on the ground that it was not in use during that period and in that locality. He preferred the mean sign system according to which the Siddhārtha Samvatsara fell in the Śaka year 524. Possibly, he rejected the southern cycle of sixty years as it did
not suit his hypothesis. The Mahākūṭa Pillar Inscription appears to be dated in the expired Samivatsara. Fleet insisted on the 5th regnal year and Siddhārtha Samivatsara. But Bhandarkar has questioned the reading of Fleet. It must be stated here that the facsimile of the record in question is not clear on this particular point. Both scholars agree that the letter following the letter ‘Pañcha’ is ‘ma’ (as read by Fleet), while the second letter of the word, read by Fleet as ‘ñcha’, appears to Bhandarkar as quite similar to ‘ma’. Similarly, Bhandarkar has also doubted the reading of the word Siddhārtha. Bhandarkar’s objections gain weight as we do not come across the use of the corresponding Samivatsara of the Śaka years or regnal years in the early records of that dynasty.

Thus it would be seen that Fleet’s view that the reign of Maṅgaleśa lasted for 13 years does not hold good. It has been shown above that Maṅgaleśa ruled for at least 20 years, as the Goa Grant is dated in his 20th regnal year. There is nothing worthwhile in the argument put forth by Fleet that the Goa Grant has nothing to do with the date of Maṅgaleśa, but it has been shown above that the said record is dated in the regnal year of Maṅgaleśa.

As regards the possible age of Pulakeśin II at the time of his father’s death, as discussed by Bhandarkar and partially accepted by Fleet, it could now be definitely stated that since Pulakeśin II had at least two younger brothers, he could not have been less than 5 or 6 years old at the time of the death of his father. When Pulakeśin II revolted against his uncle Maṅgaleśa, he was nearly 25 years old, which is quite reasonable and convincing. It establishes his maturity for setting out on an illustrious career. Even with this consideration only, the Śaka year 513-14 as the date of commencement of Maṅgaleśa’s reign could be justified and not the view according to which he came to power in A.D. 597-98.

In view of the above-mentioned facts, it is quite tempting to suggest that the doubtful word ‘Pañchama’ (according to Fleet) might have been ‘Saptama’. It becomes all the more probable as both Bhandarkar and Fleet are agreed upon the last letter in the disputed word (Pañchama) which is ‘ma’. The joint letter which Fleet read as ‘ñcha’ could be ‘pta’. Even Fleet while editing another record of the same dynasty doubted his own
reading of the word ‘Pañchama’ and substituted it with ‘Saptama’ in brackets.\textsuperscript{216} This makes the suggestion still more probable. If, for a while, we admit the above proposed reading, the Mahākūṭa Inscription could be regarded as dated in the 7th regnal year corresponding to Siddhārtha Samvatsara. And this makes the date conform with the information from other available sources.

Leaving aside the above-mentioned considerations, even if we insist on the 5th year corresponding to Siddhārtha Samvatsara, Fleet’s theory\textsuperscript{216} would nevertheless be unacceptable. The Mahākūṭa Pillar Inscription is dated in the expired Samvatsara, i.e., current sixth regnal year. Calculating from the Śaka year 514 (established above), the date would come to the Śaka year 520, i.e., 598-99, which is nearer to the intended date of the Mahākūṭa Inscription. It is indeed difficult to settle the date of a king precisely on the basis of the regnal year in the absence of corresponding definite eras. Usually, a difference of two years is noticed between the regnal year and the era mentioned in a particular record. Sometimes the difference could be of three years. As an example, king Vinayaśīla’s 2nd regnal year corresponded to the Śaka year 604.\textsuperscript{217} While his Jejuri Grant is dated in the Śaka year 608,\textsuperscript{218} corresponding to his 9th regnal year (on the basis of the records), his 10th regnal year corresponds both with the Śaka year 611\textsuperscript{219} and Śaka year 612,\textsuperscript{220} his 11th regnal year corresponds both with the Śaka years 613\textsuperscript{221} and 614.\textsuperscript{222} Thus, his 12th, 13th and 14th regnal years correspond with the Śaka years 614,\textsuperscript{223} 615\textsuperscript{224} and 617,\textsuperscript{225} respectively. Moreover, there is the problem of expired and current years, rendering all calculations rather imperfect. Thus, only rough dates could be determined on the basis of regnal years.

\textit{His Conquests}

The reign of Maṅgaleśa is notable in Chālukyan history for successful military expeditions. In his time the Chālukyas continued the policy of war and expansion, which began with his predecessor Kīrttivarman I. Maṅgaleśa was a strong ruler, gifted with the valorous qualities of a warrior and commander of the first order. He not only determined to consolidate the proud possessions of his elder brother but also strove to extend
his dominions in all directions. The epigraphs belonging to his reign not only speak of his military achievements but also mention the names of the defeated rulers. The Aihole Praśasti of his nephew and enemy Pulakeśin II only corroborates his military exploits and equally extols his gallant qualities. According to the Mahākūṭa Pillar Inscription, Maṅgaleśa was desirous of conquering Northern India and longed to set up a pillar of victory on the banks of the river Bhagīrathī, i.e., Gaṅgā. This, however, he could not achieve but he did launch an extensive scheme of conquests when he set out to conquer the enemies of his growing kingdom.

War with the Kalachuris

The Mahākūṭa Pillar Inscription alludes to the fact that king Maṅgaleśa was interested in the conquests of Northern India and actually defeated a king named Buddha who was deprived of all his possessions. This record further goes on to mention that the wealth of the Kalatsuris (Kalachuris) was spent in the idol-procession of the temple of the god (probably it refers to the temple of Makūṭeśvaranātha). The Nerur Plates also inform us that Maṅgaleśa had driven out a king named Buddharāja, son of Śaṅkaragana, who had elephants, horses, infantry and treasure. It is evident from the details given in the above plates that Buddharāja was of the lineage of the Kalachuris and the son of the famous king Śaṅkaragaṇa holding sway over parts of Gujarāt, Kathiawad and the Nasik region of Maharashtra during this period.

It follows from the above that one of Maṅgaleśa's earliest expeditions was directed against the Kalachuris, and festivities followed the victory in which Maṅgaleśa spent all the booty he had appropriated from the Kalachuris. The reference to this event in the Mahākūṭa Record suggests that it was accomplished before the 5th or 7th year of his reign, corresponding to A.D. 597 or 599. The Aihole Praśasti not only confirms the successes of Maṅgaleśa against the Kalachuris but also adds that the cavalry of Maṅgaleśa raised canopies of dust on the shores of eastern and western oceans, when the fortunes of the Kalachuris were shattered and victory was obtained by the Chālukyas. It resulted in the extension of the Chālukyan
dominion and Maṅgaleśa also enjoyed the Kalachuris’ ladies along with their prosperity.

It appears that the successful invasion of the Kalachuris’ territory probably turned out to be a raid only which enhanced the prestige of the Chālukyas, as the grants of the humiliated king Buddhāraja suggest. The Vaḍner Grant of Buddhāraja shows the Kalachuris’ occupation of the Nasik region in A.D. 608, making it evident that the Chālukya conquest of the southern provinces of the Kalachuri kingdom was not completed before the date of the Mahākūṭa Pillar Inscription. Buddhāraja even ruled upto A.D. 609 over the Gujarat area, as suggested by the latter’s Sarsavani Plates of A.D. 609. This reflects the continuance of struggle between the Kalachuris and the Chālukyas. As we do not hear anything about Buddhāraja’s family after the above referred date and since Pulakesin II was in occupation of the Kalachuri territory, a suggestion can be made that Maṅgaleśa had to attack the Kalachuris more than once. In the second and final encounter which is probably recorded in the Nerur Plates, he defeated the Kalachuri king Buddhāraja. This event seems to have happened just after the issue of the Sarsavani Plates of Buddhāraja. This appears to be the reason for the suggestion of Fleet, according to which the northern province of the Chālukyan dominions extended upto the river Kim or perhaps upto the river Māhi. Sastri doubts it on the ground that the early Chālukyan epigraphs do not say anything to support his view. As this territory was included in the empire of Pulakesin II, and according to available evidence, he had not conquered it, so it seems plausible that the northern invasion of Maṅgaleśa had yielded this territory to the Chālukyan empire. The early Chālukyan inscriptions do not mention anything against this suggestion. Moreover, the later Chālukyan records imply the inclusion of this territory in the kingdom of Maṅgaleśa.

Conquest of Revatīdvipa

The next important event of Maṅgaleśa’s time was the conquest of Revatīdvipa, which was probably in Konkan as Revatīdvipa is equated with the present ‘Reḍi’ to the south of Vengurla in Ratnagiri district of Maharashtra. The Aihole
Praśasti refers to the capture of the island of Revatī with strong naval forces and compares it with the army of Varuṇa. This seems to suggest that Revatīdvīpa was somewhere near the sea and Maṅgaleśa deployed his naval forces to occupy it successfully. The later Chālukyan epigraphs assert that Maṅgaleśa had enough troops to occupy all the islands and that his forces crossed the sea by a bridge of boats to attack Revatīdvīpa. All these scattered pieces of evidence go to prove that Maṅgaleśa had besieged the island of Revatīdvīpa with his naval forces.

We know that Konkan was conquered by Kīrttivarman I from the Mauryas and the territory was annexed to the Chālukyan dominions. The Nerur Plates of Maṅgalarāja state that he had killed Svāmirāja, who was a prince of the Chālukyan lineage and had won victories in eighteen battles. The epigraph under discussion does not refer to Revatīdvīpa but Chālukya Svāmirāja was apparently ruling in Konkan. He seems to have been appointed by Kīrttivarman I after the conquest of Konkan. Probably he (Svāmirāja) sided with Pulakeśin II in the latter’s efforts to obtain his rightful succession. He may have incurred the displeasure of the ruling Chālukyan monarch. Maṅgaleśa had killed Svāmirāja and appointed Satyāśraya Dhruvarāja Indravarman as the governor of Revatīdvīpa. The latter was of Ādi-Bappūra lineage, to which probably his mother belonged. The reference to the conquest of Revatīdvīpa in the Aihole Praśasti makes it clear that he probably tried to defend himself but was besieged by the naval forces of Maṅgaleśa and was killed on the battlefield. This seems to justify the action of Maṅgaleśa in Konkan, which had already become part and parcel of the Chālukyan empire during the time of Kīrttivarman I. The Goa Grant refers to the gift of the village of Karellikā situated in Khetahāradesa to the Brāhmaṇas with the prior sanction of the ruling Chālukya monarch, Śrīprithivīvallabha Mahārāja (apparently Maṅgaleśa as discussed earlier). The Khetahāradesa is identified with Khed taluka of Ratnagiri district which makes it clear that the conquest of Revatīdvīpa was intended to deprive Svāmirāja of the governorship of Konkan and affirmation of the authority of Maṅgaleśa over the territory of Konkan with its headquarters at Revatīdvīpa. The conquest of Revatīdvīpa is also proved by the Goa Grant of Satyāśraya Dhruva-
rāja Indravarman if we accept the identification of Śrīprithivīvallabha Mahārāja with Maṅgaleśa by whose prior permission the former gifted the land to the Brāhmaṇas, when he was stationed at Revatīdvipa.\textsuperscript{264}

\textit{Fratricidal War}

In the concluding part of his reign, he had to fight his own nephew Pulakesin II, plunging the Chālukyas into a fratricidal war. The only contemporary source of our information about this last event of Maṅgaleśa's reign is the Aihole Praśasti of Pulakesin II.\textsuperscript{265} It states that Maṅgaleśa had to lose three things at that time because of his ignoring the rightful claim of Pulakesin II. The three things were—the royal throne, his life, and attempts to perpetuate his own descent.\textsuperscript{266} This suggests that Maṅgaleśa at the time of the death of Kṛttivarman I took the reins of the kingdom as regent.\textsuperscript{267} Later on, he changed his mind and wanted to secure the throne for his own son, ignoring the rightful claims of Pulakesin II and his brothers. Maṅgaleśa might have appointed his own son as Yuvarāja, which made his strategy clear to Pulakesin II. He left the court and probably sought the support of some royal governors of the dynasty like Svāmirāja. With the help of public opinion due to the established rule of primogeniture, he after gaining some sort of military support revolted against Maṅgaleśa, defeated and killed him in the battlefield. Thus, Pulakesin II was able to assert his claim to the throne. As regards the name of the son of Maṅgaleśa, Fleet and other scholars regard him to be Satyāśraya Dhruvarāja Indravarman.\textsuperscript{268} It is, however, proposed earlier that this view is untenable as it lacks evidence. A suggestion can be advanced that Pūgavarman of the Mudhol Plates might be the son of Maṅgaleśa who is described in the records as the son of Prthivīvallabha Māhārāja on the same grounds as have been proposed in connection with the identification of Śrīprthivīvallabha Mahārāja of the Goa Grant.\textsuperscript{269}

\textit{Extent of Empire}

The above-mentioned conquests were achieved by Maṅga-
leśa in the northern direction of his kingdom, as part of his extensive scheme to expand the Chālukyan hold in northern region, where he, being an Uttara Vijigīshu, had a plan to plant a pillar of victory on the bank of the Bhagirathi. Thus, the kingdom of Maṅgaleśa included the lower parts of present Gujarat and Kathiawad along with the Nasik and Konkan regions of Maharashtra. In the south, we do not find any addition to the empire during his reign, he retaining his authority over the northern regions of Karnataka and Karnul-Bellary area of Andhra Pradesh.

Maṅgaleśa was a great conqueror, who did a lot to push the boundaries of his kingdom in the northern region extending it to present Gujarat and Kathiawad. This justifies his titles of Ururanaṃvikrānta and Raṇavikrānta. He accomplished the work of Kīrttivarman I in the northern direction with more vigour and better results. The Mahākūṭa Pillar Inscription of Maṅgaleśa speaks about his many-sided personality, endowed with virtues of polity, refinement, knowledge, liberality, kindness and civility. He is described as the moon of the dynasty of the Chālukyas, who was as difficult to assault as Mahendra, unconquered like Rāma, liberal as Śibi, faithful to his words like Yudhishṭhira, fortunate like Vāsudeva, in possession of Śrī (Goddess of wealth), having fame equal to Mandhātṛ, and in intellect equal to Bhṛhaspati. Further, describing the warrior-like qualities, the author of the Mahākūṭa Inscription narrates that he was an object of desire to crowds of warriors. He had exterminated other lion-like kings with the majesty, vigour and speed of his forearms. Maṅgaleśa was also a great builder, who had accomplished the construction of Mahāvīnṛgha at Badami. The Badami Inscription of Śaka 500 describes this cave-temple as being well-proportioned and of wonderful workmanship. He had not only gifted the land and wealth to the temples of Lord Viṣṇu and Śiva but is also credited with having set up the pillar of victory of religion. Undoubtedly due to the hostilities of Pulakesin II and his successors, he had not only been denied his rightful place in the dynastic records but they also threw his achievements and accomplishments to the background. Unless we come across some new evidence, we could hardly appreciate, with full justification, his achievements.
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Pulakeśin II

Pulakeśin II, the most celebrated and renowned ruler of the Chālukyas, was the son and legitimate successor of Kīrttivarman I. He ascended the throne of Badami after the coup against Maṅgaleśa, his uncle and predecessor. It could be inferred from the Aihole Praśasti that Pulakeśin II probably left the court of his uncle and regent Maṅgaleśa, who tried to appoint his own son as yuvarāja in preference to the legal claimant and legitimate successor of his elder brother Kīrttivarman I. With the help of good counsel and power gathered from outside, this young Chālukyan prince revolted against the authority of his uncle, killed him in a civil war and became the ruler of his father's kingdom. The Aihole Praśasti further informs us that due to the above-mentioned action of Pulakeśin II, Maṅgaleśa in his efforts to secure kingdom for his son had to lose his life and his great kingdom.

There is, however, no positive evidence about the background of this episode. It could only be presumed that Pulakeśin II was interested in his rightful claim to the throne which Maṅgaleśa had usurped during the period of his regency. He was not prepared to part with it in favour of his nephew, who was the rightful claimant to the Chālukyan throne. The move got accelerated when this young Chālukyan
prince had attained majority and sufficient strength to press his claim, finally leading to his taking up the cudgels against his uncle.\(^5\) The latter was naturally interested in passing on the reins of the kingdom to his own son, as mentioned in the Aihole Prašasti.\(^6\)

The dynastic records of the Early Chālukyas give two variations of the name of Pulakeśin II, which were Polekeśin and Pulikeśin, but he is famous in history with his viruda ‘Satyāśraya’, i.e., ‘refuge of truth’? Besides this viruda, generally used as a substitute for his name, several Imperial titles like Mahārājādhirāja, Parameśvara and Bhaṭṭāraka are accorded to him in the dynastic records. He is also bestowed the family epithets of Śrīprithivīvallabha, Vallabha or Śrīvallabha and Satyāśraya, which are constantly added to his name. The title Satyāśraya was subsequently taken as a synonym for the Imperial name of the Chālukyan dynasty by his successors. The name and fame of this monarch shed so much lustre that the succeeding Chālukyas called themselves as of Satyāśrayakula.\(^8\)

The next title of Parameśvara, i.e., ‘the great lord or the lord of lords’, was adopted by Pulakeśin II after defeating Harshavardhana of the North, as is suggested by several Chālukyan records.\(^9\) The Hyderabad Copper Plates, however, mention only the defeat of a ruler by Pulakeśin II, who in turn had won victories over a hundred kings.\(^10\) Huen-Tsang calls him Pu-lo-ki-she, a Kshatriya, the ruler of Mo-ho-la-cha.\(^11\) The Persian historian Tabari remembers him with the name Paramesa or Pharmis, i.e., probably a Persian equivalent for Parameśvara.\(^12\)

The Chālukyan ruler also took certain titles suggestive of his religious faith in a particular deity. Thus, he is described as an ardent devotee of Lord Vishṇu (Paramabhaṅgavata) in the Lohner Copper Plate Inscription.\(^13\) He is also mentioned as belonging to the line of Vishṇu in the Piṃpalner Plates.\(^14\) The Chālukyan faith in Lord Vishṇu is also evident from several other records beginning with the salutations to Him and seals with the varāha emblem.\(^15\)
Sources

We have nearly a dozen records referring to his reign. These shed light on the eventful career and achievements of this monarch. The Yekkeri Rock Inscription probably referring to his first regnal year (?) records certain lands in certain towns which were the property of God Mahādeva. The language of this record appears to be influenced by the Gupta epigraphs. The Hyderabad Copper Plates dated in the Śaka year 534, corresponding to the third regnal year of Pulakeśin II, are helpful in fixing his accession to the throne in the Śaka year 532. The Kanjhargaon Copper Plate Inscription of Pulakeśin II is dated in his 5th regnal year and registers a grant of a village named Pirigipa in the island of Revatīdvipa by the king. This record is considered spurious for irregular formation of the characters and great inaccuracy in language.

The next record, namely, the Maruturu Grant dated in 8th regnal year, notices the occupation of Pissatupura, and the grant of the village Maruturu at the instance of Aluka Mahārāja. Reference might as well be made to the Satara Grant of Vishnudevadhana of the same year which refers to Vishnudevadhana as the crown prince. It is rather strange that there is a big gap of 10 to 12 years in the chronological framework, as is evident from the records. The next inscription from Lohner (Nasik district, Maharashtra) is dated in the year 552, which should be in the Śaka era if it has to fall in his reign. It is addressed by way of command to rājyasamanta and administrative officials for registering the gift of the village Goviyānaka in favour of a Brāhmaṇa named Dama Dikshita. The Kopparam Plates dated in the 21st regnal year are another record of gift of a village in favour of a Brāhmaṇa in Karma-rāṣṭra.

Fuller information about the political events connected with his reign is available from the Ahole Praśasti, a composition of the court poet Ravikirtti. This record enumerates the military exploits of the king in chronological order. This unique inscription was written on the occasion of the construction of the temple dedicated to Jinendra by Ravikirtti in the Śaka year 556. Further details need not be quoted here as these are recorded at appropriate places.
Besides these dated ones, a few undated records are also found. These include the Tummeyanuru Grant of Pulakesin II which bestows the title of Paramesvara on this Chalukyan ruler but significantly ignores any reference to Harsha. The Chipul Plates and the Nerur Plates are fairly important from the point of cultural history. The Chipul Plates refer to the maternal uncle and the feudatory of the king, the Sendraka Raja Srvallabha Senandaraja and record the gift of the village Amravatavaka in Avaretkā vishaya to a Brāhmaṇa Mahesvara. The Badami Fragmentary Stone Inscription refers to this Chalukyan monarch and the victorious metropolis of Vāṭāpi. A few Stone Inscriptions are also assigned to the reign of this Chalukyan monarch. Among these, a Stone Inscription found at Hirebidri in Dharwar records the gift of land by (T)raka. Another Kannada record from Bellary district refers to Satyāsraya and specifies the land measure and the coin to be used at Kurumgodu. The Peḍḍavaḍaguru Īvara Temple Stone Inscription from Anantpur district refers to Ereyiṭiyadigal Satyāsraya and records the grant of the village Elpaṭtu Simhīghe after subjugation of Raṇavikrama, probably a Bāna king.

Some of the records are, however, considered spurious, but it would be worthwhile placing reliance on some of them. These include the Lakshmesvar Inscription and the Pimpalner Plates, which are considered as spurious because of late script and irregular dating. The Lakshmesvar record refers to Sendraka Durggāsakti, and registers the gift of a field measuring 50 nivartanas of land for the Caitiya of Śaṅkha Jinendra, while the Pimpalner Plate Inscription purports to record the bestowal of the village Pippalanagara upon Nagarasvāmī Dikshita by king Satyāsraya.

Some information is adduced about this Chalukyan monarch from the records of the later Chalukyas of Kalyāṇī and also from the inscriptions of the Chalukyan ruler’s adversaries, namely, the Pallavas of Kāṇchi. The Chinese pilgrim, visiting the capital of this ruler, has also some information to provide on this ruler's many-sided genius and his clash with Harsha of Kannauj. The Persian historian Tabārī also records something about him, and the fresco scenes at Ajanta probably refer to the visit of the Persian embassy to his court.
The Date of Accession

Despite several dated records of Pulakesin II, some controversy still exists about the date of his accession. The Hyderabad Copper Plate Inscription records Pulakesin II, ruling in his 3rd regnal year when he gifted a village from Vatapi on Bhadrapada amavasya, which was a solar eclipse day in the Saka year 534 (expired). According to the Indian ephemeris, this eclipse fell on 23rd July, A.D. 613. Fleet, while editing the above record, also agreed with this date in the English calendar and placed the accession of this ruler to some date between A.D. 609 and 610. Later on he changed his opinion and suggested July 23, A.D. 612 as the date of the said plates. This is, however, not possible since the eclipse falling on 23rd July, A.D. 612 was not visible in any part of India, and therefore could not be the occasion for the gift, as suggested by B.V. Krishna Rao. Thus, the earlier contention of Fleet seems more plausible. Now counting back from this date, i.e., 23rd July, A.D. 613, the first regnal year of Pulakesin II falls in the Bhadrapada Saka year 532 (expired) corresponding to 23rd July, A.D. 610.

We know that the last known date of Mangalesa is Magha Puramasi. Saka 532, if we accept his identification with Sriprithivivallabha Maharaja of the Goa Grant. This date appears to be in the current era and not the expired one so as to fit in with the above-mentioned date, corresponding to July 5th, A.D. 610. Thus, it may be proposed that Pulakesin II dethroned Mangalesa some time between these two dates, and assumed power on a date between January, A.D. 610 and July, A.D. 610.

The controversy about the exact date has been revived once again with the editing of the new grant discovered at Maruturu in Karnul district of Andhra Pradesh. Shri Ramesan, while editing this record, fixed the initial year of Pulakesin's accession as A.D. 609, on the basis of the data relating to the solar eclipse in this record. It is dated in the 8th regnal year of the king when the solar eclipse took place on the Jyeshta amavasya. The Amanta Jyeshta solar eclipse fell on 21st May, A.D. 616. If this is the 8th year of Pulakesin's reign, then his accession has to be placed in A.D. 609. This is in conflict
with the earlier evidence from the Goa Grant and the Hyderabad Copper Plate Inscription. The latter one has its importance since it refers to both the year and the contemporary Śaka year. Therefore, the information of the Maruṣu Grant in this respect is obliterated, and could hardly be given the same weightage as to the Hyderabad Plates. Thus, it seems quite natural to assume that as the last date of Maṅgaleśa is 5th January, A.D. 610 and first known date of Pulakesin II is 23rd July, A.D. 610 as calculated above, the latter seems to have ascended the throne between these two dates in A.D. 610.

Main Events

The Aihole Praśasti hints at disruption and general upsurge in the Chālukyan kingdom following the death of Maṅgaleśa in a fratricidal war and the accession of Pulakeśin II to power. Disgruntled forces had come upon the political horizon, causing trouble and anxiety to the new Chālukyan monarch. It was, therefore, incumbent upon Pulakeśin II to contain these forces and bring about peace and stability in his realm. These adversaries included those who were friendly towards Maṅgaleśa or who wanted to benefit out of this state of chaos and disorder for their personal gain, and declare their independence. The conquests of this young ruler, undertaken to consolidate and expand his kingdom, are enumerated in the celebrated Aihole Praśasti, most probably in chronological sequence.

Defeat of Āppāyika and Govinda

The rulers named Āppāyika and Govinda were the first ones to raise their banner of revolt against Pulakeśin II and thus necessitating their clash with the Chālukyas from the country north of the river Bhimarathi, i.e., Bhīmā. Pulakeśin II acted in a diplomatic manner by alienating Govinda from his ally Āppāyika following the policy of creating dissension (bheda), thereby defeating and extinguishing the former. He won over Govinda as a friend and ally by bestowing favours on him. As regards the identity of these two, we have to look to other sources since the Aihole Praśasti is silent on this
point. Ravikīrtti, the author, simply suggests that the rulers named Āppāyika and Govinda approached the kingdom of Pulakeśin with their troops of elephants from the region north of the river Bhīmā, thus pointing their seat of power somewhere in the Southern Maratha country lying to the north of the kingdom of the Chālu kyas.

It has been suggested that the names Govinda and Āppāyika seem to be of Rāṣṭrakūta lineage. Besides the identification on the basis of namesake, the other evidence on this point could be the hereditary clash between the two houses. As the Chālu kyas and the Rāṣṭrakūtas had clashed earlier as well, with the latter finally owing allegiance to the former, it was natural that the feudatories should avail themselves of the opportunity to declare their independence, when there was political tension as a result of the fratricidal war in the Chālu kyas. It is likely that Āppāyika and Govinda belonged to the family of the Rāṣṭrakūtas which was ruling in the Southern Maratha country, as is evident from Undikavyātikā and Pānduraṅgapallī Plates of Abhimanyu. We know for certain that a Rāṣṭrakūta family did exist in the Southern Maratha country prior to the ascent of the Chālu kyas to power at Badami.

These early Rāṣṭrakūtas were deprived of their possessions by the Nalas and the Mauryas who in their turn lost to the Chālu kyas under the leadership of Pulakeśin I. Thus, the Rāṣṭrakūtas' possessions ultimately passed on to the Chālu kyas without any show of force. Unfortunately, we do not find the name of the Rāṣṭrakūtas among the feudatories of Pulakeśin II and Vikramāditya I, but, however, we do find a Rāṣṭrakūta subordinate Śivarāja mentioned in the Narwan Plates of Vikramāditya II. Further, the founder of the main Rāṣṭrakūta line, Dantidurga, was the subordinate of Vikramāditya II and Kṛttivarma II, as suggested by the Ellora Plates. The above-mentioned facts go to prove that the Rāṣṭrakūtas were the subordinates of the Chālu kyas since the beginning of their rule but they became prominent during the reign of Vikramāditya II.

It can as well be suggested on the basis of the above discussion that Āppāyika and Govinda were probably the offshoots of the early Rāṣṭrakūta family of Abhimanyu, ruling
in the Southern Maratha country. Their fate seems to have been sealed by the incursions of the Chalukyas, who occupied their territories at a time when the former were struggling for their survival against the Nalas and the Mauryas. The later Chalukyan inscriptions also point to the above conclusion. These Rāṣṭrakūṭas, however, should not be confused with the Rāṣṭrakūṭas of Mānyakheṇa, who were supplanted by the Chalukyas of Kalyāṇi. Bhandarkar had suggested that Govinda of the Aihole Praśasti is identical with his namesake, the grandfather of Dantidurga, who ousted the Chalukyas of Badami. We know that Āppāyika and Govinda revolted against Pulakesin II immediately after the accession of the latter, probably in A.D. 610 or 611, indicating that Govinda flourished about the beginning of the seventh century A.D. According to the Ellora and Samangarh Plates, Dantidurga ruled from A.D. 742 to 757. Thus, the dates do not coincide and leave a gap of more than a century, making the above suggestion untenable.

Recapture of Banavasi

After consolidating his position at home, Pulakesin II launched an extensive scheme of conquest to reaffirm his claim to the territories conquered by his predecessors. He marched against the Kadamba ruler of Banavasi and besieged his capital, as this southern king, formerly owing allegiance to the Chalukyas, had become indifferent in the period of turmoil between Mangaleśa and Pulakesin II. Besides the Banavasi ruler, there were other Kadamba royal families as well, although there is no information about their relationship with the Chalukyas. Probably they were too weak to raise their heads against this paramount ruler of the South. It was, therefore, the Banavasi house alone, which could in a way try to alienate itself from the Chalukyan supremacy. The result was, of course, obvious with Pulakesin II clashing with the Kadambas and inflicting on them a heavy blow. The latter had put up great resistance, but in the end they were forced to surrender.

The description of the Kadamba capital, as given in the Aihole Praśasti, resembling the city of gods, and a girdle of
swans playing on the high waves of the river Varadā, is indicative not only of the prosperity of the Kadambas, but also of its strong defensive position. It is difficult to name the vanquished Kadamba ruler in the absence of any positive evidence. In all probability, he was the Kadamba Bhogivarman about whom no positive contribution is noted in the Kadamba records nor about his son Vishnuvarman. Thus, the Kadambas were completely dispossessed of their kingdom by the Chalukyas. Their kingdom was annexed to the growing Chalukyan empire. Pulakeśin II, with the intention of exterminating the Kadamba power, parcelled out the conquered territory among his two faithful allies. The Alūpas received the Kadamba maṇḍala consisting of the major portion of the Kadamba kingdom, and the Sendrakas received the Nāgarakhaṇḍa division of Banavāsi. This action was motivated by strategic considerations to eliminate any future chance of the revival of Kadamba power.

The Subjugation of the Alūpas and the Gaṅgas

After extermination of the Kadambas, the Aihole Praśasti narrates the subjugation of the Alūpas and the Gaṅgas. The former were ruling over the South Kanara district of Karnatāka for several centuries; but some scholars believe that their headquarters was at Hīmchā in Shimoga district of Karnatāka. However, it could be suggested on the basis of the Marutūru Grant that this feudatory family ruled over the region of Guntur district in Andhra Pradesh, provided we regard the term Alūka as identical with Alūpa. It is also contended that during the period of Kadamba hegemony, the Alūpas owed their allegiance to them. It seems probable that when the Kadambas of Banavāsi lost to the Chalukyan ruler Pulakeśin II, they transferred their allegiance to the Chalukyas. It is evident from a verse in the Aihole Praśasti that the Alūpas and the Gaṅgas were defeated by Pulakeśin’s predecessors and made vassals. It may as well be mentioned here, on the authority of the Mahākūta Pillar Inscription of Maṅgalesa, that the Alūpas and the Gaṅgas were defeated by Kṛttivarman I, who made them his subordinates Pulakeśin II simply reaffirmed his hold over them. The Alūpas were the first ruler
to receive the possessions of the Kadambas after the latter’s defeat.\textsuperscript{89} This rules out the suggestion that the Alūpas were forced to submit by Pulakeśin II.

Moraes suggests that the Alūpas were not completely subdued by Kirttivarman I, for the conflict seems to have continued during the reign of Maṅgaleśa,\textsuperscript{90} who, along with the Kalachuris, is reported to have subdued the Alūpas.\textsuperscript{91} Further, according to Moraes, the Alūpa king, who accepted the servitude of Pulakeśin II, was probably Kundavarammarasa, a predecessor of Guṇasāgara, who issued the Kigga Grant in A.D. 675.\textsuperscript{92} Pulakeśin II ruled between A.D. 610 and 642, so we can presume that Kundavarammarasa might be the Alūpa chief, who was made governor of the Kadamba manḍala. If the word is identical with Alūpa, then it might be proposed that the Alūka Mahārāja mentioned in the Maruṭūru Plates might be Guṇasāgara, who had come from Maṅgalagiri to take up the government of Kallūra after undergoing several dukhas.\textsuperscript{93} The geographical factor no doubt stands in the way, till we get some definite evidence to prove it.

The next in the list of Pulakeśin’s adversaries were the Gaṅgas, who are referred to in the Aihole Praśasti,\textsuperscript{94} as those of Talakad. They also figure along with the Alūkas or the Alūpas in the Mahākūṭa Pillar Inscription being overwhelmed by the Chālukya Kirttivarman I.\textsuperscript{8} The Gaṅga king defeated by Kirttivarman I was either Avinīta or his son Durvinīta who ruled for an exceptionally long period.\textsuperscript{96} Some scholars suggest that Durvinīta was the contemporary of three Chālukya kings, viz., Kirttivarman I, Maṅgaleśa and Pulakeśin II,\textsuperscript{97} while Moraes believes that Durvinīta was the contemporary of Maṅgaleśa, Pulakeśin II and Vikramaditya I.\textsuperscript{98} Prof. Nilakanta Sastri regards the statement of the Mahākūṭa Pillar Inscription as a clear case of hyperbole and gives the credit for subjugating the Gaṅgas to Pulakeśin II.\textsuperscript{99} It seems that during the period of the turmoil prior to the accession of this Chālukyan monarch, the Gaṅgas, too, like the Kadambas with whom they were connected by matrimonial ties,\textsuperscript{100} tried for their independence. The destruction of the Kadambas by Pulakeśin II, however, forced the Gaṅgas to acknowledge the supremacy of the Chālukyas without any show of force. Further, the Gaṅga ruler Durvinīta gave his daughter in marriage to Pulakeśin II to cement their relations.\textsuperscript{101}
This lady became the mother of Vikramāditya I. The action of the Gaṅga king Durvinita was also motivated by political considerations, especially to get back the portion of his kingdom named Koṅgunāḍu, which the Pallavas had snatched from them, with the help of the Chālukyan forces. The animosity between these two powers, namely, the Gaṅgas and the Pallavas, was nevertheless a perpetual feature in South Indian history. The former defeated Kāḍuvetti of Kāñchī (the Pallava ruler), though the date for this event is uncertain.

Conquest of Purī (The Mauryas)

After establishing his imperial position in the western Deccan, Pulakesin II turned his attention towards the northern parts of the Deccan. He attacked the territory of the Mauryas of Koṅkaṇa, who were earlier defeated by Kṛttivarmaṇa. The Chālukyan overlordship over them continued in the time of Maṅgaleśa, but the Mauryas probably were equally anxious to regain their independence when the uncle and the nephew were engaged in strife for the Chālukyan throne. Pulakesin II, however, did not allow grass to grow under his feet and immediately after consolidating his hold, he besieged the Mauryan capital Purī on the western coast. The Chālukyan navy stormed it successfully and shattered the Mauryan dream of independence.

It is not possible to find out the name of the Mauryan ruler defeated by Pulakesin II in the absence of any specific mention in this regard. The Mauryan capital Purī is identified with modern Ghārapuri, i.e., island of Elephanta, near Bombay, while some other scholars equate it with Rajapurī near Jaṅjira in Kolaba district of Mahārāṣṭra. In view of the above identification as well as with the discovery of several Mauryan records in the vicinity of Goa, it is evident that they were rulers of Goa and the Koṅkaṇa region of present Mahārāṣṭra. The Aiḥole Praśasti also describes the Mauryas as the rulers of Koṅkaṇa. All these facts point that their territory was extending into the western coastal region of Mahārāṣṭra and Gujarāt.
Submission of the Lāṭas, the Mālavas and the Gurjaras

After the capture of the Mauryan capital of Pūrī, Raviṅgūṭti narrates the submission of the Lāṭas, the Mālavas and the Gurjaras, evidently of Broach. He also adds that these powers were subdued by Pulakeśin’s splendour providing an example of emulation for others.¹¹³ Chālukyan sovereignty over the Lāṭa and the adjoining regions is further attested by the establishment of a Chālukya viceroyalty in that area. The Lāṭa territory was situated to the south of the river Kim with its capital at Navasārikā or modern Navsārī in Gujrat.¹¹⁴ This area formed part of the dominions of the Kalachuri ruler Buddharaṇa, whom Maṅgalesa had defeated.¹¹⁵ It seems that Pulakeśin II occupied this territory either after the submission of the Kalachuri ruler or through force, and entrusted it to Vijayavarmanāja, a Chālukyan scion, who was ruling over it in A.D. 643, as is evident from his Kaira Plates.¹¹⁶

The king of Mālavā corresponds to Mo-la-po of Hiuen-Tsang described by him as an independent one.¹¹⁷ It was, however, under the domination of the Maitraka king Śilādiya I as mentioned in the Vallabhi records.¹¹⁸ Further, a grant belonging to the Maitraka Dhruvasena dated in A.D. 640-41 affirms that he was holding possession of at least a part of Mālavā.¹¹⁹ On the other hand, we have little evidence to prove Pulakeśin’s actual hold over Mālavā. This probably enables us to surmise that it might have either been under the suzerainty of the ruler of Vallabhi or was an independent kingdom, before accepting the suzerainty, out of fear from Harshavarudhana of Northern India, along with the two other kingdoms of Lāṭas and Gurjaras.

Historically, it would be more appropriate to equate this kingdom of Mālavā with the one referred to by Bāṇa in his Harshacharita along with the same set of rulers, i.e., the Lāṭas and the Gurjaras, the enemy of Prabhākaravardhana, father of Harsha.¹²⁰ Probably the same king is also referred to in connection with the murder of Graharvarman of Kanauj and also involved in the conspiracy to lure Rājyavardhana to death.¹²¹ This kingdom is said to be the feudatory state of the Chālukya Vinayāditya, who received tribute from its king, as recorded in the Kolhapur Plates.¹²² In view of the above-mentioned fact,
it is natural to suggest that the Mālava kingdom referred to in the Aihole Praśasti was in close proximity to Chālukyan kingdom bordering on the river Narmadā. As such due to probable danger from Harsha’s side, it had to seek the help of the Chālukyan monarch.

The Gurjaras during this period ruled over the territory between rivers Kim and Māhī, with the Lāṭas in the south and the Mālavas in the east. It is difficult to explain the reasons prompting the Gurjaras to accept the overlordship of Pulakeśin II. It is quite likely that the Gurjara ruler Dadda II, who had helped the Maitraka ruler of Vallabhi, said to have been overpowered by Śrī Harshadeva, could find common cause for submission to the Chālukyas.

In view of the clear mention in the Aihole Praśasti that the Lāṭas, the Mālavas and the Gurjaras submitted to the Chālukyan overlord of their own accord, it is reasonable to presume that there was no clash with them. Dr. R.C. Majumdar holds that the Gurjaras of the Aihole Praśasti were those of Mandor and not the Gurjaras of Broach on the following two arguments—firstly, the region occupied by the Broach Gurjaras was included in the Lāṭa kingdom and secondly, the Chinese pilgrim Hiuen-Tsang refers to only one kingdom which was at a distance of 300 miles to the north of Vallabhi. It is not consistent with the available evidence on this point because the Lāṭa kingdom did not include the region occupied by the Gurjaras of Broach prior to A.D. 736. Following Fleet, Dr. Puri suggests that it is evident from the Chālukyan and Gurjara records that the small territory of Lāṭa was bounded on the north by Kim and in the south by Dāmangaṅgā and was separated by the former river from the Gurjara territory. The Chinese pilgrim mentions only one Gurjara kingdom (Bhinmal) and did not take notice of the other feudatory Gurjaras, as in the case of the Lāṭas and the Mālavas.

It can as well be suggested that the country occupied by the Gurjaras, the Mālavas and the Lāṭas was conquered by Maṅgaleśa. After the defeat of Kalachuri Buddha, his Gurjara feudatory might have transferred his allegiance to the new lord (Maṅgaleśa) and the Lāṭas and the Mālavas followed suit. After the overthrow of Maṅgaleśa, these rulers either submitted to Pulakeśin II or the latter reaffirmed his hold over them. Thus,
it is evident that the ruler who submitted to Pulakeśin was the Gurjara ruler of Broach. The non-mention of any specific details about these rulers forbids us from attempting their identification.

*Harsha-Pulakeśin War*

Ravikīrtti, the composer of the Aihole *Praśasti*, next speaks of the debacle of Harsha, the ruler of the North, whose lotus feet were arrayed with the rays of the jewels of the diadems of a host of his feudatories. He also adds that the mirth (*Harsha*) of Harshavardhana melted away by fear, he having become loathsome with his rows of lordly elephants falling in the battle. This clearly indicates that a battle was fought between the rulers of the North and those of the South in which Harsha lost heavily, and especially his elephant force. Further, we get information about this conflict from the account of Hiuen-Tsang and the dynastic records of the Chālukyas as well. Hundreds of inscriptions of the Chālukyas, the Rāshtrakūṭas and the later Chālukyas do notice this clash, and the proverbial victory of Pulakeśin II, ignoring however the other victories of the South Indian monarch. This outstanding achievement of Pulakeśin II was prized so highly by the family that it is prominently mentioned in all the records of his successors, who no doubt took pride in preserving the memory of this great event.

It is mentioned in the dynastic records that after achieving this victory, Pulakeśin II adopted the title of *Parameśvara*, i.e., 'supreme lord'. The Rāshtrakūṭa records also narrate that they defeated the army of Vallabha or the *Karnāṭaka Bala* which was boasting of its victories over the Pallavas, Keralas, Pāṇḍyas, Cholas, Harshavardhana and Vajraṭa, thus indirectly confirming the claim of the Chālukyan inscriptions. Hiuen-Tsang also records this eventful feature. He says that “Śilāditya has conquered the nations from east to west and carried his arms to remote districts, but the people of the country (Mo-hola-cha, viz., Mahārāṣṭra) alone have not submitted to him. He (Harsha) has gathered troops from the five Indies and summoned the best leaders from all the countries and himself gone at the head of the army to punish and subdue these people but