therefore, were compelled to play a pacific role in the Southern political wrangles.

The Chālukyan monarch, thus, had the upper hand and his political influence considerably increased. This is equally evident from the title Samastabhuvanāśraya, i.e., ‘the refuge of the entire earth’ taken by him for the first and last time. While the Southern powers lay prostrate at his feet, there was no strong ruler in the North to question his supremacy after the defeat of this unknown Sakalottarāpathanātha who is proposed to be identified with Ādityasena. The Chālukyan empire under him seems to have considerably extended in his time including Gujarāt and Lāṭa in the Northern India, and extending upto the territory of the Eastern Chālukyas, and from Central India upto the outskirts of Kāñchī.

This extensive empire was governed through the help of the feudatories and the scions of the family, who are mentioned in the records. These include, besides the traditional ones, the Alūpa, Ganga, Sendraka, Bāṇa chiefs, Telugu-Chola of Renadu; others were Narendrāditya, Upendra and Bhupāditya who requested the monarch to make grants of land to certain individuals and institutions. The Alūpa king, a relation of Vijayāditya, was made governor of the area around Banavasī (Shiggaon Plates); while the viceroy of the Lāṭa area was Vinayāditya Maṅgalarasa, the Purī-Koṅkana area was ruled by Bhogaśakti of the Harish Chandra dynasty.

Vijayāditya’s peaceful reign was equally noted for many-sided activities in art and culture. The ruler was broad-minded and tolerant enough to patronise different religions. In his time the temple building activities also received impetus. The ruler himself built a great Śiva temple at Paṭṭaḍakal, which was named after him as Vijayeśvara. Curiously enough, this temple exists even now, though under the name of Saṅgameśvara, probably renamed during the reign of his grandson Kittivarman II, whose inscription at Paṭṭaḍakal begins with the invocation to Hara-Gaurī Saigama. The Alampur Inscription of the Śaka year 636 states that at the command of the emperor Vijayāditya,Īśānāchārya constructed a prākārabandha (enclosure), evidently to the Saiva temple at Alampur. According to the Badami Pillar Inscription of Vijayāditya, queen mother Vinayavati installed the images of Brahmā, Vishnu and
Maheśvara at Vatāpi. The Banikop Inscription refers to the installation of the images of Nandisvara during the rule of Vijayāditya. Several copper plates issued by this Chālukyan monarch granting land to the Brāhmaṇas and religious persons from different camps point to his patronising those engaged in religious activities.

Vijayāditya equally patronised Jainism. The Lakshmesvar Inscription of the Śaka year 651 records that from the victorious camp at Raktapura, this Chālukyan monarch gifted the village Kardam, south of Pulikere, to his father's priest Udayadeva Pāṇḍita, pupil of Pūjyāpāda, and belonged to the Devaguna branch of Mulasamgha, for the benefit of the temple of Śaṅkha Jinendra at Pulikere. The Jain Guru Pūjyāpāda might be the celebrated author of the Jainendra Vyakaranā. The Shiggaon Plates were issued by the king in favour of the Jain monastery constructed by Kuṃkumadevi (sister of Vijayāditya) at Purige at the request of the Alūpa Chitravāhana, the husband of the above-mentioned lady, when Vijayāditya had gone to Banavāsi to see his brother-in-law. This Chālukyan king also gifted the village of Lohagajja Vatāka to Somasārmā at the request of Kuṃkumadevi, as is evident from the Bāgalkot Plates.

Vijayāditya was a patron of fine arts and encouraged music and learning. A record of his son and successor Vikramāditya II mentions the renewal of a grant earlier made by his father to the musicians of Paṭṭadakal. The king had a soft corner for a talented and beautiful courtesan named Vinapotī, who is actually mentioned as his prāṇa-vallabhe in the Mahākūṭa Inscription of his time, who actually gave an endowment as a token of her religious piety.

Vikramāditya II

Emperor Vijayāditya was succeeded by his dear son (priyasūnuḥ or priyaputraḥ) Vikramāditya II. He was appointed heir-apparent before A.D. 710, as suggested by the Satara Plates dated in the 14th regnal year of his father falling in the Śaka year 632. Here Vikramāditya II requests his father to make the grant mentioned in the said plates. Thus, this Chālukyan ruler was actively associated with the administration
of the empire for more than 23 years. In the other record from Lakshmeśvar, this crown prince deputises for his father by consenting to the code of conduct (āchāra vyavasthā) for the officers and mahājanas of that locality. He had also headed the Chālukyan army which successfully invaded the Pallava territory during the later phase of his father’s time. It follows from the above references that he was properly trained in civil and military matters before his consecration.

It is equally necessary to mention his family relations for the purpose of assessing his political involvements. Having married two princesses of the Haihayas, named Lokamahādevī and Trailokyamahādevi, he had naturally the support of this power. The younger sister was the mother of the heir-apparent Kīrtti-varman II, while the elder one probably looked after the administration of the region named Kuruttakuṇte, as is recorded in the Kurtākotī Inscription. Vikramāditya II probably had a brother named Bhīma from whom the Later Chālukyas of Kalyāṇī claimed their descent, though the evidence on this point from the inscriptions of the Chālukyas of Badami is wanting.

The dynastic records credit him with the imperial titles of Mahārājādhirāja, Parameśvara and Bhaṭṭāraka besides the family epithets of Satyāśraya and Śrīprithivīvallabha or Vallabha and Śrīvallabha. He is called Vallabha durjaya, i.e., ‘the unreplicable lord’ and Kāṇchhiyan Koḍu, i.e., ‘the captor of Kāṇchi’. The last attribute was probably an answer to the Pallava epithet Vātāpi-Koṇḍa taken by the Pallava ruler Narasiṃhavarman. It may as well be mentioned that the epithet Samastabhuvanaśraya associated with Vijayāditya is missing in the list of titles accorded to Vikramāditya II and Kīrttivarman II. The reason for this lapse is, however, wanting; though it could be due to the waning of the Chālukyan influence in the North.

The Date of Accession

The date of Vikramāditya II’s accession to the throne could no doubt be fixed on the basis of his two dated inscriptions from Lakshmeśvar and Narwaṇ. He was fairly old at that time since he was the crown prince for more than 23 years. The first record is the Lakshmeśvar Stone Inscription issued on
Māgha Paurnomāsī of the Śaka year 656 in the 2nd regnal year of the king corresponding to Sunday, 24th January, A.D. 734. It suggests that the first regnal year of the king was in the beginning of A.D. 733. The Narwan Plates dated in Śaka year 664 in the 8th regnal year of the king, issued on the occasion of the Sun turning to the North and corresponding to 21st December, A.D. 741 would help in fixing his accession in A.D. 734. It may, therefore, be proposed that Vikramāditya II ascended the throne in A.D. 734. The genuineness of the Lakshmeśvar Inscription is, however, questioned by Fleet because of its late characters. This does not seem to be true since the date appears to be correct on the basis of the astronomical calculations. As such, the date of accession proposed earlier, viz., A.D. 734, seems much probable.

Inscriptions

The events of the reign of this Chālukyan ruler are found in as many as eighteen records. The earliest one dated in his 1st regnal year is a Stone Inscription found at Tippalūru in Cuddapah district of Andhra Pradesh. It registers a Pannasa gift at Marraluru by Annarapule-Vimbulu to a Brāhmaṇa of Venji, when Poramukharāma was overrunning the territory up to the river Penna on behalf of the Bāna king, a feudatory of Vikramāditya II. The next one is the Lakshmeśvar Stone Inscription dated on Māgha Paurnamāsī, the Śaka year 650 in the 2nd regnal year of the king, corresponding to Sunday, 24th January, A.D. 734. It records the repairing and embellishment of Śveta Jinālaya at Sankha tirtha Vasati at Pulikere and also registers the gift of 50 nivartanas of land to Vijayadeva Paṇḍita of Devagūṇa sect and Mūlasamgha lineage. The only set of Copper Plates, issued by Vikramāditya II, so far discovered, refer to his 8th regnal year falling in the Śaka year 664 and corresponding to 21st December, A.D. 741. It was found at Narwan in Ratnagiri district in Maharashtra, and records the gift of villages named Narwana and Chindramaḍa in Chipra- luṇa vishaya at the request of Rāṣṭrakūṭa Govindarāja, son of Śivarāja.

Besides these records, all others are undated though they do mention the name of Vikramāditya II. Among these, a
viragal, found at Hire-Madhure village in Chitaldurga district of Karnataka, is important as it refers to the capture of Kāñchī. The main purpose of the record is to commemorate the death of a hero named Dasiamman in this campaign by someone (name lost), who was the subordinate of Vikramādityaraśar, i.e., Vikramāditya II. Another inscription which confirms the capture of Kāñchī is a record of Vikramāditya from that place itself, and engraved on the back wall of a pillar of the maṇḍapā in front of the famous Rājasimhesvara temple at Canjeevaram. It records that after the conquest of Kāñchī, Vikramāditya II did not confiscate the property of Rājasimhesvara temple but returned it to the god. The edict is written by Anivārita Punyavallabha, under the authority of Vallabhadurjaya. Two inscriptions referring to this Chālukyan monarch have also been found at Aihole. The one which is in Durga Temple mentions a grant in favour of Āditya, the priest of the temple, while the other one records only a few names besides Vikramāditya, Bhaṭāra.

There are as many as five inscriptions referring to the queen-consort Lokamahādevī of this Chālukyan monarch from Paṭṭaḍakal. One record confirms the earlier grant made by Vijayāditya to the singers of the locality in the enjoyment of the grants and privileges by the Chālukyan queen. Another one registers a grant in favour of the temple of Lokeśvara (probably named after Lokamahādevī) by the queen during the reign of Vikramāditya II. A third one from Virūpāksha temple at Paṭṭaḍakal refers to queen Lokamahādevī and architect named Sutradhāri, who built the temple constructed by the queen. The fourth record from Paṭṭaḍakal mentions the construction of the temple by agramahishī in celebration of her husband Vikramāditya II, who had thrice conquered Kāñchī. The last Paṭṭaḍakal Inscription from Virūpāksha Temple records that the temple of God Lokeśvara was built by Lokamahādevī, queen of Vikramāditya II, of the Haihaya lineage, to the south of the temple of God Vijayeśvara.

Of the remaining epigraphs, the Stone Inscription found at Chāndaṇa in Anantpur district mentions Vānarāja and records some gift during the supremacy of Vikramāditya II. Another record from Bhairavakoṇḍā in Karnul district mentions the setting up of the images of Gaṇapatī, Nandīśvara, and Daṇḍīś-
vara by Kallibol during the reign of the Châlukyan ruler Vikramâditya. The last four inscriptions from Devageri, Byâgavadi, Kelavarkop, and Guḍuguḍi in Dharwar district are fragmentary and seem to record some gifts or remission of

Important Events

Vikramâditya II, as heir-apparent, had distinguished himself in the campaign against the Pallavas, as recorded in the Ulachala Inscription of A.D. 731, in the 35th regnal year of his father. His military achievement, therefore, was an asset to him in his career as a ruler of Badami. He had, however, to prove his prowess in a different capacity as well. This is evident from the reference to the Arab invasion in his time.

Arab Invasion

During the reign of Vikramâditya II, the north-western limits of the Châlukyan empire were threatened by the inroads of Arab intruders. The dynastic records do not refer to this outstanding event, but fortunately the details concerning this event are preserved in the Navsari Plates of Châlukya Pulakesîrâja, a son of Dhârâśraya Jayasîmha, dated in Kalachuri year 490 = A.D. 739 This record vividly describes the Arab invasion and the fierce fight that took place at Navsari. Further, it refers to the Tâjîka army (Arab forces), which had plundered the Saindhavas (Sindhu kingdom), Kachchhelas (Cutch), Saurâshṭra (Kathiawada), Chavoṭakas, Mauryas, Gurjaras and other kings invading the Navsâri vishaya during the course of its campaign for conquering all the Southern kings. Avanjanaśraya Pulakesîrâja gave him a fierce fight somewhere near his headquarters in which he emerged victorious. In recognition of this heroic achievement of his scion and feudatory Vallabha Narendra (Vikramâditya II), the contemporary Châlukyan emperor, bestowed upon him the titles of Dakshinâpathasâdhara, Challukikulâlamkara, Prithivîvallabha and Anivartakantivartayitri in appreciation of his heroic achievements.

The praśasti part of the grant includes a passage known to occur in the Gurjara Grants of the period for the first time.
THE ERA OF PEACE AND PROSPERITY

This seems to suggest that the Gurjara kingdom was annexed to the Chalukyan kingdom before the date of this grant. It also suggests that Ananjanāśraya had successfully driven out the Arabs from the Gurjara territory and annexed the same to his kingdom. The last known date of the Gurjaras in that region is the Kalachuri year 486 (A.D. 736). The elaborate description of the battle in the above-mentioned record points to its immediate recording after the defeat of the Tājika army. Therefore, the Arab invasion of the Lāṭa country must be dated some time between the Kalachuri years 486 and 490 (the date of the Navsari Grant) or A.D. 736 and 739 and might have taken place in A.D. 737 or 738. The bestowal of the title Paramabhaṭṭāraka is rather inexplicable. It might be suggestive either of his attaining independence or just a glorification. This was a great achievement and was a turning point in early mediaeval history. If the Arabs had been successful, probably it would have meant the end of Hindu rule in Western India and complete extinction of their power.

Conquest of Kāñchī

The Pallava-Chalukya hostilities were revived afresh during the reign of Vikramāditya II. The solitary Copper Plate Inscription of his reign found at Narwan in Ratnagiri provides details of the Chalukyan aggression against the Pallavas. These are as well confirmed by the Kendur and Vakkaleri Plates of Kirttiavarman II, the son and successor of Vikramāditya II. This Chalukyan monarch is also said to have conquered Kāñchī thrice, according to an undated Paṭṭāḍakal Inscription of Lokamahādevī. Now, according to the Narwaṇ Plates, Vikramāditya II, immediately after his accession to the throne, took up the responsibility of uprooting the traditional Chalukyan foes, namely, the Pallavas, and marched through the Tundaka country, and defeated Nandipotavarman, the Pallava ruler who had come to face him. The Chalukyan ruler received immense booty as a result of his victory and this included precious stones, war-elephants, and the banner of martial music, Katuṇukha-
vāḍitasamudraghosha. The Pallava metropolis was kept intact and the Chalukya monarch gave handsome gifts to Brāhmaṇas, the poor and the indigents. He also visited the temples of Kāñchī,
especially the Rājasimheśvara Temple constructed by Narasimhavarman with stones and did not disturb these by ransacking their treasury.²⁶⁵

The above account is further corroborated by the Kāñchi Inscription of Vikramāditya II found engraved on the back wall of a pillar of the manḍapa in front of Rājasimheśvara Temple.²⁶⁶ It mentions that after the conquest of Kāñchi, the Chālukyan monarch did not confiscate the property of Rājasimheśvara Temple.²⁶⁷ The record is stated to be written by Anivārita Punyavallabha (evidently, the Chālukyan minister for peace and war, Sandhivigrāhika), under the authority of Vallabha-durjaya, i.e., the unconquerable Chālukyan monarch (Vikramāditya II).²⁶⁸ It is clear from the description of this Chālukyan conquest it was motivated by the desire to avenge the capture of Vātāpi, the Chālukyan capital, earlier by Narasimhavarman Mahāmalla.²⁶⁹ In fact, the Pallava Inscription engraved on the wall of Mallikārjuna Temple (Badami) dated in the 13th regnal year of Narasimhavarman,²⁷⁰ was an irritant for Chālukyan prestige and honour. It was, therefore, necessary that Vikramāditya II should get his conquest similarly recorded in the Pallava capital at Rājasimheśvara Temple. Vikramāditya II, thus, paid back his hereditary enemy in the same coin.

It is difficult to fix the date of the occupation of Kāñchi and the place of the clash. The Narwaṇ Plates are dated in the Śaka year 664 = A.D. 741-42, falling in the 8th regnal year of the king²⁷¹ and the defeated Pallava ruler was none else but Nandivarman II Pallavamalla, son of Hiranyakarman, who is supposed to have ascended the throne of Kāñchi in A.D. 730.²⁷² Vikramāditya II became the Chālukyan sovereign in A.D. 733-34. As this event is not recorded in the Lakṣhmēśvar Inscription of the Śaka year 656 falling in the 2nd regnal year,²⁷³ so this event must have happened between A.D. 735 and 740. The Mallam Inscription of the 15th regnal year of Nandivarman II from Gudur taluka of Nellore records a gift of gold to a temple made under the order of the Chalukki-arasar at the request of Aḻuva-arasar.²⁷⁴ According to K.A.N. Sastri, this record probably points to the route taken by Vikramāditya II on his outward journey or the return one.²⁷⁵ Another inscription from Tumkur district in Karnataka also refers to this expedition of Vikramāditya II,²⁷⁶ which was probably the second one against the
Pallavas amongst the three conquests referred to in the Paṭṭāḍakal Inscription of Lokamahādevī.\textsuperscript{277}

Conquest of the Southern Powers

The Narwan Plates also suggest that Vikramāditya II caused distress to some other Southern powers, namely, the Cholas, Pāṇḍyas, Keralas and Kaḷābhras, besides other kings in that region.\textsuperscript{278} The Kendor and Vakkaleri Plates of Kirttiyarman II, the son and successor of this Chālukyan monarch, also give support to the above statement of the Narwan Plates.\textsuperscript{279} However, we do not have details of these exploits of Vikramāditya II. Probably he marched against these rulers after the capture of Kāṇči and the defeat of the Pallava ruler Nandivarman II, thus symbolising the role of his predecessors. This action might have been motivated to frustrate these Southern powers to join hands against the Chālukyas, as they did during the time of Pulakesin II resulting in heavy loss to the Chālukyas.\textsuperscript{280} It is as well mentioned that Vikramāditya's victory was characterised by the setting up of a Javastambha, column of victory, on the sea-shore in that region.\textsuperscript{281}

Renewal of the Pallava-Chālukya Hostilities

Vikramāditya's return to his capital after his successful expedition in the South did not ensure permanent peace in that region. The Pallavas were only marking time and were equally anxious for another round to retrieve their lost prestige. Thus, during the later part of the reign of Vikramāditya II, the Pallava-Chālukya hostilities were once again revived. The credit for the third Chālukyan campaign goes to the heir-apparent, who solicited his father's permission to proceed to the South against the family foes, i.e., Pallavas, who were raising their heads once again.\textsuperscript{282} He was successful in defeating the contemporary Pallava ruler, Nandivarman II Pallavamalla, pushing him inside the fort of the metropolis, till he gave way.\textsuperscript{283} The Pallavas are, however, silent on this point.\textsuperscript{284} It is also narrated that the heir-apparent returned to the capital with a large booty consisting of the captured elephants of the enemy and a vast amount of spoils in the shape of gold and jewels and presented
these to his ruling father Vikramāditya II.\textsuperscript{285} It is evident that this successful Chālukyan raid of the Pallava kingdom headed by the heir-apparent Kīrttivarman II was probably the last in the series of three expeditions mentioned in the record of Lokamahādevī.\textsuperscript{286} Thus, even in his short reign of 14 years Vikramāditya II had to spend a good bit of his time in crushing the Pallavas and their neighbours.

Extent of His Empire

The Chālukyan empire under Vikramāditya II was further extended with the inclusion of the Gurjara territory after the defeat of the Arab forces by a Chālukyan scion Avanijanāśraya Pulakesīrāja, the Lāṭa ruler.\textsuperscript{287} There was, however, a decline in the political influence exercised by the Chālukyas in the North, probably consequent to the emergence of the Karkoṭas under Lalitāditya Muktaṇīḍa and Yaśovarman of Kanauj. The Chālukyas continued to dominate the political horizon of South India without any interruption of their supremacy. Their overlordship was an acknowledged fact in the whole of the Trans-Narmada region of India, except the territory held by their collaterals at Veṅgi. They, no doubt, did wield great influence in the South as recorded earlier, with successful incursions in the life-time of this monarch. Towards the east, the eastern Chālukyas of Veṅgi continued as a political force independent of the Chālukyan house of Badami. The Rāṣṭrakūṭas, exercising control over the regions of Mālavā and Madhya Pradesh, were functioning as the Chālukyan feudatories,\textsuperscript{288} while the Kalachuris, with Tripuri as their base,\textsuperscript{289} had also intimate political relations with them further cemented with matrimonial ties.\textsuperscript{290} The other feudatories, namely, the Sendrakas, Gaṅgas, Bāṇas and Alūpas, were not disturbed.\textsuperscript{291}

Vikramāditya II, thus, had an eventful career, beginning with his role in the Southern conquest and widening his area of political influence and sovereignty. Besides being a good warrior, he was equally a patron of art and encouraged temple-building activities in his time.\textsuperscript{292} His two queens Lokamahādevī and Traiḷoyamahādevī constructed the Śaiva temples at Paṭṭaḍakal besides many more constructed at Aihole and other places.\textsuperscript{293} The end of the reign of this ruler in A.D. 745 marks
the decline of Chālukyan glory, though we do find an uneventful beginning in his successor’s time.
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188. "परंतु: पलायनानीरासाध कवम- 
वितरंबंकितशाधपन्नोति। पत्रापदेव 
विद्य प्रकोपमराजकमुसरायन"


189. वल्लराज इत्यादि रूपंसत्यते 
सर्वाय चतुष्ठौ दस्तानित्यां 
The phrase occurs in all the dynastic epigraphs from the time of Vijayaditya onwards (App. A, Nos. 70-129).

190. विष्णु प्रकोपमराजकमुसरायन,

VSMV, 1966, p. 34 and EI, Vol. XXV, p. 21f. As this incident occurred prior to the issue of the Kasar-Sirasi Plates of the first regnal year of the ruler, so the crown prince Vikramaditya II probably was not mature enough to look after the kingdom during the captivity of his father. Hence there was kinglessness in the empire. EHD, Vol. I, p. 226; CA, p. 246; HK, p. 103; KTA, p. 209.

191. Soon after his triumph over the Sakalottarapathanatha, Vinayaditya died and the successor to the throne Vijayaditya was probably away at that crucial time from the Chalukyan metropolis.
Meanwhile, it is recorded in the epigraphs of Vijayāditya and his successors that the fleeing enemies somehow took him prisoner, as ill-luck would have it, but the circumstances behind this incident are nowhere recorded. It is, however, mentioned that he managed to set himself free through his own prowess and intelligence without anyone’s help, unlike king Vatsarāja who freed himself with the help of his minister and Vāsavadattā. Either Vinayāditya died while he was returning to the capital. Vijayāditya was away and Vinayāditya expired. This resulted in chaos in the empire. Soon after escaping from captivity Vijayāditya took over the reins of government. In the beginning it was not smooth sailing for him and he had to move in a diplomatic manner to tide over the changed political situation. EHD, Vol. I, p. 226; KTA, p. 209; DKD, p. 371; EHDB, p. 66; HK, p. 103; CA, p. 246.

192. The dynastic records do not provide any clue to ascertaining the identity of the ruler who had taken Vijayāditya prisoner. According to Sastri, he was the Pāṇḍya ruler but this seems untenable for two reasons, firstly, the time of the campaign in the South, and secondly, its leader who was undoubtedly Vijayāditya’s son, the crown prince Vikramāditya II.
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224. Vikramāditya II was crowned prince in A.D. 710, as is evident from the Satara Plates of Vijayāditya and he ascended the throne in A.D. 733-34, hence he had occasion to serve as heir-apparent for more than 23 years (*EI*, Vol. XXVI, p. 322 and Vol. XVII, p. 125f).
227. "हेमगिरि वर्गी गिया महादेवी
उमाभागवतः इव लोकमायाया-
स्थानिव भवानेष प्राताद री-
लोकेवर भद्दरकर स्त्रेयातर
दिमागाईशी लोकमहादेवयाया
सौदर्य केनियसी भजनी श्री
विक्रमादेवस्वर गिया राज्जी स्वरित
कौटिपरम संरक्षण श्री पृथ्वी-
वल्लभाराजाघिरज रंगेवर
भद्दरकर श्री नृषम्ल राजस्य
जनमी श्री विलोकनमहादेवयायः"
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253. According to this inscription, Vikramaditya II returned from Kāñcī in a.D. 731 after defeating Pallava Paramesvaravarman (evidently, Paramesvaravarman II A.D. 722 to 730) probably with the help of the Gaṅga prince, Durnātīa Eryappa, whom he rewarded with the territories of Pariyala and Ulachala. What necessitated the heir-apparent to take such action is nowhere recorded but it is clear that the Chālukyas stood aggressive and forced the Pallava ruler to pay tribute. However, it seems that after purchasing peace with the Chālukyas at a heavy price, the Pallava ruler wanted to settle matters with the Gaṅga Śrīpurusha, which proved suicidal. He was killed at Vilande by Gaṅga Śrīpurusha. This action was taken with the backing of the Chālukyas, resulting in the kinglessness in Pallava kingdom as Paramesvaravarman died issueless. \textit{ARIE}, 1943-44, p. 90; \textit{DKD (BG, Vol. I)}, p. 374; \textit{HSI}, p. 154; \textit{EHD}, Vol. I, p. 226; \textit{CA}, p. 246; \textit{HK}, p. 103; \textit{HPK}, pp. 121-22.

262. It is also narrated in the record that festivities were observed in the kingdom and in celebration of it Lokamahādevi constructed a temple at Paṭṭaṇakal. \textit{IA}, Vol. X, pp. 164-65.
269. The graphic description in the
Narwan, Kendur and Vakkalera Plates of the conquest of Kāṅchi makes it clear that Vikramāditya II was not only the aggressor on this occasion but he also avenged the disgrace fallen on his predecessors by capturing the enemy metropolis. *EI*, Vol. XXVII, p. 125f, Vol. IX, p. 200f, Vol. I, p. 200f.


278. "श्रीराम शासन किंवदंती-प्रतापबल चोर केरल कन्नम


281. It is narrated in the aforesaid records that to commemorate his victory and celebrate his great fame which had spread to the Southern ocean, he (Vikramāditya II) erected a pillar of victory to mark the occasion. It is nowhere recorded where this column of supreme sovereignty was set up. *EI*, Vol. XXVII, p. 125f.

282. "स्वकुलार्मिक काळिनोपलेनि
प्रतापय यात्रा प्रेतियमपनम

283. The Kendur and Vakkalera Plates narrate that the Pallava ruler, unable to face the Chālukyan invader (Kirttivarman II, the heir-apparent) in the open, took refuge behind the walls of his fort, where he was pressed until he lost his strength. *EI*, Vol. IX, p. 200f, Vol. V, p. 200f; *DKD*, p. 377; *EHD*, Vol. I, p. 229; *CA*, p. 248.


VII

The Decline of Chalukyan Power

Kirttivarman II

Vikramaditya II was succeeded by his favourite son (priya-
sunuh) Kirttivarman II.¹ He was the son of Queen Trailokya
Mahadevi since the latter is described as the mother of the lion
among the kings, i.e., Kirttivarman II in the Patadakal Inscrip-
tion.² Queen Trailokya Mahadevi was the uterine sister of Loka-
mahadevi—the chief queen of Vikramaditya II and belonged
to the Haihaya lineage.³ Her son Kirttivarman was proclaimed
yuvaraja during the life-time of his father, and he was associated
with the administration of the kingdom in the above capacity.⁴
He led an important expedition against the Pallavas before he
ascended the throne.

The dynastic records bestow on him the imperial titles of
Maharajadhiraja, Paramesvara, Rajadhira and Bhattarakaraka, be-
sides the dynastic epithets of Sriprihitivallabha, Vallabha or
Srivallabha and Satyasraya.⁵ He is also described as a paramount
soverign.⁶ A few Kannada records of his time call him Bhatta-
rar, a Kannada corruption of Sanskrit term Bhattarakaraka.⁷ A few
more titles are also accorded to this ruler, as, for instance, the
Patadakal Inscription confers on him the viruda Nrpasiñha,
i.e., ‘the lion among kings’.⁸ The Peddapeṭa epigraph attributes
the title of Anivīrita to this Chalukyan monarch.⁹ The Kannada
word ‘arasa’ meaning ‘king’ is also added to his name.¹⁰ The
Chadan Stone Inscription mentions him as *Vikramaditya Satyashraya Sriprithivivallabha Maharajadhiraja Paramesvara Kirtivarma-Bhatara*, in a pure South Indian style of giving the name of the individual with the name of his father, indicating that Kirttivarman II was the son of Vikramaditya II.

**The Date of Accession**

According to Fleet, Kirttivarman II ascended the throne in A.D. 746 or 747. Evidently, his suggestion is based on the Vakkaleri Plates of Kirttivarman II, dated on the full moon *tithi* of *Bhadrapada*, Saka year 679, falling in the king’s eleventh regnal year. Since this date is given in the expired Saka year, so it would correspond to Friday, 2nd September, A.D. 757. Counting backwards from this date, the first regnal year of the king would fall in A.D. 746-47. However, with the publication of the Kendur Plates, the above-mentioned view needs reconsideration. These plates are dated on the full moon day of *Vaisakha*, solar eclipse, Saka year 672 (expired) falling in the 6th regnal year of the king. According to the Indian Ephemeris, the English calendar equivalent of it would be Sunday, 26th April, A.D. 750. Now, counting backwards from this date, the first regnal year of Kirttivarman II would fall in A.D. 644-45. Thus, we find a difference of two years between these two dates of the same king. As already stated, we find a difference of two to three years between the dates given in Saka era and regnal years. The last known date of Vikramaditya II is 21st December, A.D. 742 from the Narwan Plates, thus making it evident that Kirttivarman II became ruler after this date, which might be any time upto A.D. 745. Nandimatha, however, believes that this Chalukyan monarch ascended the throne in A.D. 746. It, however, appears more plausible to believe that Kirttivarman II was crowned as the Chalukyan monarch in A.D. 745.

**Inscriptions**

There are in all nine records of his time. The first record is the Ainuli Plates referring to the fourth regnal year of the king. This fragmentary epigraph records the presence of the king in a victorious camp on the banks of the river Bhima.
The first record in chronological order is the Kendur Plates dated in the Śaka year 672 falling in Kṛttivarman’s sixth regnal year. It registers the gift of the village Bepatī in Velvolā Vishaya in favour of Rāmaśarman at the request of the chief queen. At the time of issuing these plates, Kṛttivarman II was stationed at Raktađura. This record helps us in determining its date of accession. The next one, also referring to the 6th regnal year, was discovered at Anṇigere. Its object is to record the construction of a Chediya (Chaitya) by Kaliyamma, who was the headman of Jebulageri in the time of Kṛttivarman II.

A set of copper plates were discovered at Vakkaleri in the Kolar district of Karnataka issued by Kṛttivarman II from his victorious camp at Bhandāragāvittā village on the north bank of the river Bhimarathī, on the full moon day of Bhādrapada of the Śaka year 679 corresponding to the 11th regnal year of the monarch. These plates record the gift of the village Sulliyūr together with Nengiyūr and Nandivalli, situated in Pānuṅgal Vishaya in favour of Mādhavaśarman at the request of Dosi-rāja. The next record is the Paṭṭadaḷakal Pillar Inscription which refers to the building of temples by Lokamahādevī and Trailokyamahādevī in honour of Śiva—named after them as ‘Lokeśvara’ and ‘Trailokyasvarama’ respectively. This record points to the Śaivite leanings of the later Chālukya kings of Badami.

The last four inscriptions are undated, discovered at Peḍḍapeṭa, Chāndan village in Anantpur and Koṇrapāḍu and Ādūr, respectively, situated in Cuddapah and Dharwar districts. The Ādūr record is a Jain epigraph, recording the grant of 25 nivartanas of land for the promotion of Jinālaya and an alms-house constructed by Dharmagāmunda. The tablet bearing the record was set up by Śripāla, the grandson of Dharmagāmunda and disciple of Prabhā(chandra), a Jain monk of repute. The second part of this record refers to this Chālukyan monarch and his feudatory Mādhavatti-arasa, with whose permission the Gāmundaśas and Karanās donated land to Prabhāchandra Gurava belonging to Chediya of Paralūra. The Koṇrapāḍu ceiling Slab Inscription registers a gift of four maruttu of land at Malavuru by Per-Bāṇadhirāju to Āditya-Bhaṭṭa. The Bāna chief was a subordinate of Kṛttivarman II. The Chāndana
Stone Inscription records a gift of land to Kanavadī (Gaṇapati) by Dharaṇappan, son of Irigaṅga of Tagadur, while he was ruling over Cheṅjona with his subordinate Bānarāja governing the Suramara Vishaya, during the reign of Kīrttivarman II. The Peṇḍāpeṭa Stone Inscription registers a gift of 25 maṟṟuṭṭu of land at Kuḍaluru to a Brāhmaṇa named Duggiya of Vegi by Ranavijaya. Another undated Kannada record engraved on a broken pillar from Niluru in Anantpur district refers to the reign of the monarch, who remitted certain taxes due from some gāmunḍas. A Slab Inscription from Kurukundī refers to him and registers a land gift. Thus all these records not only refer to the Bānas as feudatories of the Chālukyas, but also provide us information about the existence of religious sects of Gaṇapati, Āditya, and Jina.

Important Events of his Reign

Kīrttivarman II, as an heir-apparent, had occasion to distinguish himself as a warrior when he prevailed upon his father to let him conduct a military expedition against the Pallavas, with a view to exterminating them. He was successful in conquering the Pallava ruler Nandivarman II both in open fight and in his fort. The expedition was equally successful in his collecting a vast amount of booty and war elephants which he no doubt presented to his father Vikramāditya II. This added to his qualification as a military general in his capacity as crown prince. His military talents are also recorded in inscriptions and he is said to have attained proficiency both in arms and learning since his childhood. This Chālukyan monarch had a number of feudatories at his command whose services could be utilised for military ventures. The Kendur and Vakkaleri Plates contain evidence of this ruler's military achievements, but other sources, however, specify some specific events of his reign, which may now be enumerated.

Clash with the Pāṇḍya King

The Pāṇḍya king Māravarman Rājasimha had probably formed an alliance with Vikramāditya II, when the latter invaded the territory of the Pallavas, espousing the cause of Chitra-
māya as the claimant to the royal throne after the death of Parameśvaravarman in A.D. 730. During his time, the Pāṇḍya kingdom included some parts of the Koṅgu country impinging on the territory of the Gaṅgas, who were feudatories of the Chālukyas. Hostilities thus developed between the Gaṅga ruler Śrīpurusha and the Pāṇḍyan king Rājasimha I, who wanted further to extend his dominion beyond the Koṅgu country. As such, a clash occurred between the Gaṅgas and the Chālukya king Kīrttivarman II. and the Pāṇḍya ruler, who actually crossed the river Kaveri and captured the territory of Malakoṅgam situated between Tiruchirapalli and Tanjore districts. The Chālukyan king with his feudatory was defeated at the battle of Venbai and peace was concluded as a result of which a Gaṅga princess was given in marriage to the Pāṇḍya ruler Rājasimha’s son. Prof Nilakanta Sastri is inclined to place this event in A.D. 750, but it would be more proper to fix its date as A.D. 748 or so because according to the Ainuli Plates, the Chālukyan king was in his camp near the river Bhīmā in his 4th regnal year. The Kendur Plates were issued by him in the 6th regnal year from Raktapura, which also suggests his presence in the Northern portion of his kingdom at that time. As such, the clash between Kīrttivarman II and his Gaṅga ally against the Pāṇḍyas seems to have taken place earlier than the two dates, i.e., before A.D. 749. The victory of the Pāṇḍyas against the joint forces did not in any way affect Kīrttivarman II’s position or loss of any territory.

The Rise of the Rāśṭrakūṭas

The rise of the Rāśṭrakūṭas is generally supposed to begin with Dantidurga, who was the founder of the imperial dynasty. There are, however, references to several Rāśṭrakūṭa families before his time. Thus, we find Govindarāja, son of Svāmirāja, ruling in the Satara-Ratnagiri region as the feudatory of Vikramāditya II, recorded in the Narwaṅ Plates. Another Rāśṭrakūṭa family was that of Nannaraja which was ruling in the Vidarbha region in A.D. 640, probably as the feudatory of Pulakesin II, with headquarters at Ellichpur in Amaravati district in Maharashtra State. It seems that during the Pallava-Chālukya hostilities in the reign of Vikramāditya II,
these families became powerful because of the preoccupation of the Chalukyan monarch in the South. While the two families were owing allegiance to the Chalukyas, they were not slow to avail themselves of any opportunity to attain independence.

The Raṣṭrakūta family which gave a blow to the Chalukyan fortunes was that of Berar, and its vassal ruler Indra was said to have been ambitious who ruled from A.D. 715 to 735. Evidently, he was the feudatory of the Chalukya Vijayāditya. Indra, the father of Dantidurga, was so bold as to marry a Chalukyan princess by the Rākshasa form by abducting her from the Svayamvara at Kaira, perhaps after defeating her father. According to Altekar, she was the daughter of either Manḍalarasa Vinayāditya or his younger brother Avanijanāśraya Pulakeśirāja of Lāta. This probably led to temporary estrangement between the Chalukyas of Lāta and the Raṣṭrakūtas. Two things, however, do not fit into the above episode; firstly, the Chalukyan overlord at Badami would have not slept over the matter. He would certainly have interfered since the respect of a scion of the family was involved. Secondly, the venue of the Svayamvara should have been the capital of this Chalukyan ruler, somewhere in Lāta, and not at Kaira, in the territory of the Maitrakas of Vallabhi. It may thus be surmised that either there is no truth in the story of this form of marriage between a Raṣṭrakūta chieftain and a Chalukyan princess, or the Raṣṭrakūtas and the Chalukyas must have come to terms after some clash which was cemented with this matrimonial tie. At any rate, it points to the rise of the Raṣṭrakūtas as a political force in the first quarter of the eighth century A.D.

Whatever might have been the facts, it is no doubt certain that Indra I had married a Chalukyan princess named Bhavaṇāgā or Bhavaṇā and he ruled up to A.D. 735. He was succeeded by his son, from the Chalukyan princess, named Dantidurga, who founded the imperial Raṣṭrakūta dynasty of Malakhed. Dantidurga was not only a distinguished warrior but also an accomplished diplomat. Being the blood relative of the Chalukyas, he was in their good books, and probably accompanied Vikramāditya II on his campaign against the Pallavas and other rulers. As an insider, he could ferret out the secrets of the Chalukyan army which were helpful
to him in later times against the Chālukyas themselves. It appears that Dantidurga could not realise his ambitious designs against the Chālukyas in the life-time of the strong Chālukyan ruler, Vikramāditya II. He was content as a feudatory with the title of Prithivivallabha accorded to him in the Ellora Plates. It was only during the time of Kṛttivarman II, who was engaged in the Southern campaigns for a long time, that Dantidurga availed himself of the opportunity to throw off the mask of the Chālukyan overlordship. The occasion was, therefore, ripe when the Chālukyan monarch in his clash with the Pāṇḍyas had a severe jolt as a result of his defeat. By that time, Dantidurga had mustered enough strength with his successful campaigns in Central India in the region watered by the Māhī, the Narmadā, and the Mahānadi. The strength of the Chālukyas of Lāṭa was dissipated, consequent to the Arab inroads. As such, Dantidurga had no difficulty in humbling the Chālukyas of Lāṭa and he also conquered and annexed the Gurjāra territory which at that time formed a part of the kingdom of Lāṭa.

The Rāśtrakūṭas and the Imperial Chālukyas of Badami were thus the only two powerful forces left in the Deccan to measure their strength against each other. Kṛttivarman II after suffering a rebuff in the Southern campaign against the Pāṇḍyas had to consolidate his forces, before taking up the cudgels against the Rāśtrakūṭas. In the mean time Dantidurga had conquered Lāṭa, Sindha, Mālavā and Southern Kosāla, and proved a much stronger force to be reckoned with. The Chālukyan ruler of Badami had, therefore, to mark time strengthening his forces and reestablishing his lost image before he could take the initiative against his adversaries both to the North and to the South of his empire.

Defeat of Kṛttivarman II

The clash between the Chālukyan monarch Kṛttivarman II and the Rāśtrakūṭa feudatory Dantidurga could not be postponed for long. Dantidurga, after consolidating his hold over the neighbouring kingdoms comprising the present Maharashtra and some parts of Madhya Pradesh and Gujarat, was only waiting for a suitable opportunity to throw off not only the
Chalukyan overlordship but even eliminating the Chalukyas altogether. Another reason which might have been the cause of the friction between Kirttivarman II and Dantidurga was the latter’s aggressive policy towards the Chalukyan scion of Lata, whose country was conquered and annexed by him.\(^{63}\) The Chalukyan overlord was interested in reinstating his scion in his lost kingdom\(^{76}\) Kirttivarman II, could not pocket the insult offered by his feudatory after the fall of the Lata kingdom of his collateral. He was interested in consolidating his hold over the north and equally reinstating his relation at Lata. By the time Dantidurga had consolidated his hold after conquering the neighbouring kingdoms and clashed with the overlord, as is evident from the Samangarh Plates.\(^{67}\)

It seems that some time after his 4th or 6th regnal year in A.D. 650-51,\(^{68}\) Kirttivarman II tried to contain Dantidurga and his activities. A battle was fought in which Kirttivarman II lost heavily. The northern portion of Maharashtra and his territories in Gujarat and Madhya Pradesh were lost to the Rashttrakutas.\(^{69}\) His defeat is recorded in verses of the Samangarh Plates of Dantidurga from the Kolhapur region dated A.D. 753.\(^{70}\) The Chalukyan records of his time are, however, silent on this point, but we do have information from the Samangarh and Ellora Plates about the clash between the Chalukyas and the Rashttrakutas and the extinction of the former.\(^{71}\) As recorded in these verses of the Samangarh Plates, the mighty Karnataka army, which had earlier vanquished the king of Kanchi, the Kerala, Pandy and Chola rulers of the South, Sri Harsha of Kanauj and Vajrata, was easily routed by the forces of Dantidurga.\(^{72}\) The second verse, however, refers to the Chalukyan lord (Vallabha) easily succumbing without offering resistance.\(^{73}\) The later Chalukya records also notice the decline of the Chalukyas during the time of this ruler.\(^{74}\) Thus, Kirttivarman II had to face defeat both in the North and in the South, which proved disastrous to the existence of the line of the Chalukyas of Badami. It is, however, evident from the Rashttrakuta records that Dantidurga had made adequate preparations for a showdown with the Chalukyan monarch and the latter could not muster enough courage and strength to face his adversary.\(^{75}\)
Despite the two defeats, the Chalukyan ruler continued to hold his capital Badami and the Karnataka area of his empire. It is evident from the Vakkaleri Plates that Kirttivarman II did reign till A.D. 757. The grant records the gift of a village in the Hangal area of Dharwar to Brähmanas from his camp at Bhandāragavattige on the banks of the Bhīmā. It seems that the Chalukyan king did not lose heart, and as soon as Dantidurga died in A.D. 756, he tried to retrieve the fallen fortune of his family. He had, however, to face an equally strong Rāṣṭrakūṭa ruler named Krishna I, the uncle and successor of Dantidurga. This Rāṣṭrakūṭa king dealt a strong blow to the Chalukyan monarch by overthrowing and murdering him. This is evident from the Rāṣṭrakūṭa as well as Chalukya inscriptions. The Rāṣṭrakūṭa records narrate that Krishna I forcibly “carried away the fortune of the Chalukya family, wearing the garlands of waving pālidhvajas”. He is also said to have transformed the great Varāha (Chalukyan crest) into a she-deer. Moreover, a few Rāṣṭrakūṭa records describe that Krishna I achieved supreme sovereignty resplendent with numerous pālidhvajas by defeating Rāhapa. The reference to supreme sovereignty and pālidhvajas probably indicated his identity with Kirttivarman II. In addition to the above facts, the later Chalukya records of Kalyāṇi also affirm that the Rājaśrī of the Chalukyas disappeared from the earth during the reign of Kirttivarman II, thus confirming the claim of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas as recorded in their inscriptions.

Kirttivarman II after ruling for about eleven years, i.e., up to A.D. 757, probably lost his life and empire in his clash with the Rāṣṭrakūṭas. Probably he did not leave any successor. His death thus marks the end of the rule of the Early Chalukyas, who dominated the political scene of India in general and the South in particular for more than a century. His feudatories, namely, the Sendrakas, Bānas, Alūpas, and the Gaṅgas, however, remained loyal to him till his death. Kirttivarman II was not only a distinguished warrior, but also a patron of letters and he was equally interested in monumental activities. The inscriptions from Āḍūr and Anṅigere mention the erection of and endowment to the Jain temples at the above places.
Causes of Downfall

As regards the factors responsible for the downfall of the Chālukyas of Badami, it would be interesting to note that these were several. A bird’s-eye view of their history reveals a few immediate causes of their ouster from the political scene of India. Certain policy-decisions were equally responsible for it. Their involvement in the far South with a view to exterminating the Pallavas was also responsible for their debacle at the hands of their own feudatory, i.e., the Rāṣṭrakūṭa Dantidurga. These causes could be enumerated as follows: an extensive empire, weak successors, Southern incursions, the Arab invasion, the establishment of collateral branches, the rise of new political powers in the North and the South, and the rebellion of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa Dantidurga.

Extensive Empire

Right from the time of Pulakeśin II down to the end of the dynasty, except for a period of 12 years after the death of the above-mentioned monarch, the Chālukyas ruled over an extensive empire stretching up to the river Narmadā, Māhī and Kim in the North and up to the border of Pallava territory in the South. This extensive empire appeared to be unmanageable from the centre alone. It had to be parcelled out into manageable units. In those days of difficult communications, it was physically impossible to control the far-flung portions of their empire from the metropolis or by setting any Skandhāvāra or administrative camp at key points in the vast dominions. As such we find that the Chālukyan monarchs were sometimes helpless spectators to the sad drama of their decay and decline of their power and influence with the break-up of their far-flung dominion.

The Weak Successors

The next factor adding to the list of causes of loss of the Chālukyan power was the weakness of Kṛttivarman II, the last Chālukyan monarch. He lacked foresight, and unnecessarily entangled himself with the Pāṇḍyas, which provided an oppor-
tunity to Dantidurga to create trouble in the North. If he had acted promptly after the ouster of his scion of the Lāṭa dynasty, probably he would have saved himself from the catastrophe that followed as a result of his lethargy, lack of foresight, and weak policy. He dissipated his energy in the Southern campaign which proved abortive. He failed equally in the North and, having been unsuccessful in the South, he could not face the Rāṣṭrakūtas. Thus, he was to a great extent, responsible for the collapse of Chālukyan power.

Southern Incursions

The Southern campaigns have always proved unproductive for any ruler. Even in earlier times, we hardly find instances of permanent domination of this region by a Northern power. There were only temporary eclipses of its independence. As such the Chālukyas should have assessed their strength properly before pushing their arms in that direction in the light of these historical factors. The Chālukyas from Pulakesin onwards had perpetual clashes with the Pallavas and the _trairājya_. The Chālukyan monarch Pulakesin II, too, despite his success in other directions, lost his life and crown as a result of his bold enterprise in the extreme South. His own capital Badami was plundered in retaliation by the combined forces of the Southern powers. Vikramāditya II, despite his success in capturing Kāñchi, could not subjugate the Pallavas completely. Kirtti-varman II had to pay a heavy price for repeating the experiment of his predecessors in this direction. The expeditions proved costly not only in terms of money and resources but these also encouraged the feudatories in the North to strive for their independence.

The Arab Invasion

Another factor responsible for the decadence of Chālukyan power was the Arab invasion. It took place at a time when the Chālukyan overlord was busy in the South against the traditional foes, the Pallavas. The Arabs, who according to the Navsari Plates, had conquered the Chāpas, Mauryas, Karchchhelas, and Gurjaras, finally intruded into the Chālukyan king-
dom and reached Navsari, the provincial headquarters. The local scion faced them bravely and compelled them to retreat from the Indian territory adjoining the kingdoms of Lāṭa and Gurjara. While there was no repetition of aggression by the Tājika forces in the time of the Chālukyas, the latter had become very weak and could not effectively control and contain the Rāṣṭrakūṭas on the North-West side. The Arab invasion, as such, indirectly contributed to the weakening of the Chālukyan authority.

The Establishment of Collateral Branches

A close analysis of Chālukyan history from A.D. 543 to 757 shows that one of the major reasons for the decline of the Chālukyas were the emergence of collateral lines and the civil war in the kingdom. We know that Maṅgalesa’s refusal to part with power in favour of Pulakeśin II, the rightful claimant, resulted in a civil war between the two. Even after Pulakeśin’s victory and his accession to power, the domestic forces had to be contained and the ruler’s own brother was appeased by the grant of some territory, leading to the setting up of a new dynasty at Veṅgi. Vishnuvardhana and his successors did not fall in line with the main Chālukyan branch, and did not offer any help to the parent body at the critical time of Southern incursions led by the Pallava Narasimha-varman. The other family of Lāṭa, which was at first very cooperative with the main line, participating in the campaigns against Vajrata, Sakalottarāpathanātha and the Tājika army, seems to have lost interest in the Badami family against the Rāṣṭrakūṭas. The Chālukyan offshoots became introvert, ever ready to protect their interests rather than join hands with the main line. Thus, the dissipation of the Chālukyan family into several branches proved baneful not only for the main line of Badami but also for others. It only helped the Rāṣṭrakūṭas, at one time feudatories to Badami, to have an upper hand; and they finally succeeded. The setting up of collateral branches was thus not a wise step, since this led to many troubles in the end. If Vinayāditya Maṅgalarasa, the founder of the feudatory Chālukya house of Vemulavādā, is the Vinayāditya Maṅgalarasa, a Chālukya scion ruling in the Thana and Lāṭa
area, as is evident from the Manor, Dive-Āgar, Bulsara and Kollipārā Plates,\textsuperscript{101} we have to conclude that this policy of appeasement adopted by the Imperial Chālukyas of Badami to accommodate their kith and kin eventually proved dangerous, and contributed a good deal to the decline of the Chālukyas.

\textit{The Rise of Political Forces in the North and the South}

Several princely families emerged from obscurity at the beginning of the eighth century A.D. It was the age of strong rulers like Lalitāditya of Kashmir and Yaśovarman of an unknown lineage in Northern India.\textsuperscript{102} The Rāṣṭrakūṭas had mustered enough strength and were marking time to improve their lot and aspire for suzerainty. The Gurjara-Pratihāras and the Kalachuris, besides the Paramāras and other Rajput families, were waiting for their turn for political recognition. Equally so, in the South there was a general feeling of opposition against the Chālukyas due to their several devastating expeditions in that direction. The Cholas and the Pāṇḍyas together with the Cheras had mustered strength against the Chālukyas. These political forces emerging in the North and the South had tilted the balance of power. During their rule of about 200 years, the Chālukyas had to face new situations. The old enemy forces sometimes joined against them as, for instance, in the South, the Chālukyas had to fight in several directions, jointly and severally. Alignments also were not permanent. The Southern powers proved too strong for the Chālukyas to establish a permanent base in this territory. Even the Pāṇḍyas defeated the Gaṅgas and the Chālukyas too,\textsuperscript{104} thus establishing their superiority. The supremacy of the Chālukyas was finally lost in the time of Kṛttivarsan II.\textsuperscript{105}

\textit{The Rebellion of Dantidurga—The Final Blow}

As pointed out earlier, the final blow to Chālukyan power was dealt by Dantidurga, the Rāṣṭrakūṭa, at one time the feudatory of the Chālukyas, and also related to them through the Lāṭa house.\textsuperscript{106} While in the time of Vikramāditya II he had actively participated in the Southern campaign against the Cholas, Pāṇḍyas and Keralas,\textsuperscript{107} later on in the time of Kṛtti-
varman II he became their worst enemy, ever anxious to overthrow them. It is quite likely that the Rāshtrakūṭa feudatory now made his plans, in a treacherous manner without inviting suspicions of his Chāluksyan overlord, and when the latter sensed it, it was too late to retrieve the fast deteriorating situation, which ended the Chāluksyan dynasty.

Thus it may safely be suggested that the end of this line of the Badami Chāluksyas came due to several factors as enumerated above, each in its way contributing to it. It is, of course, certain that the emergence of the Rāshtrakūtas as a political force was the immediate cause of their decline.
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VIII

General Administration

The official records of the early Chālukyas shed light on the polity and administration of the period. Since these records were issued by the reigning monarchs, they carry several details of the day-to-day functioning of the government of the Chālukyas. All the information supplied by these epigraphs, pieced together, presents a vivid picture of their administration. Undoubtedly, the Chālukyan monarchy was influenced by the model prescriptions of the Smṛtis and texts on polity; and the many forms of local government in the Chālukyan dominions functioning with royal sanction provided avenues for people's participation in the tasks of government.¹

Kingship

According to political thinkers of ancient India, the State consists of seven prakṛtis or constituent elements: Svāmī (King), Amātya (Ministry), Deśa or Rāṣṭra (territory), Dūrga (Fort), Kośa (Treasury), Bala (Army) and Mitra (ally).² The Svāmī or the king is the first and foremost among them, but it cannot exist in the absence of the six other constituent elements. The king received support from all these six constituents, but was always above them in his absolute power.³ All these elements were present in the Chālukyan polity. The Chālukyan monarchy was hereditary. The system gave birth
to a hereditary aristocracy, which was a factor in the Chālu-
yan scheme of administration. The succession was governed
by the law of primogeniture.⁴

The doctrine of the divinity of kings continued to influence
the minds of the masses. The king was regarded as a divine
protector.⁵ The Chālukeyan ruler enjoyed the highest position
in the scheme of administration and was the sole repository of
sovereignty. The epigraphs bear testimony to the fact that he
was not a mere reigning sovereign or figurehead, but a supreme
executive and head of state, paying individual attention to
important matters concerning the state and the people.⁶ He
was commander-in-chief of the royal forces, and was the
ultimate dispenser of justice.⁷

Order of Succession

As prescribed in the ancient law books, succession to the
throne was hereditary among the Chālukeyas.⁸ The eldest son
succeeded his father after a requisite training in Śāstras and
Śāstras.⁹ We, however, notice an instance in Chālukeyan genea-
logy of the denial of this right to the legal claimant.¹⁰ We
know that Kṛttivarman I was succeeded by his brother Maṅ-
galeśa, despite the presence of the former’s sons, the rightful
heirs. In the absence of any definite evidence, it is presumed
that Pulakeśin II was a minor at the time of his father’s
death; and Maṅgaleśa became the ruler as the guardian of the
royal children.¹¹ When Pulakeśin II attained majority, Maṅ-
galeśa refused to make room for him, and probably tried to
ensure a line of succession for his own progeny. Pulakeśin II
with public opinion on his side overthrew him after a civil war.¹²
This South Indian monarch was not probably succeeded by
his son Vikramāditya I, as is hitherto believed.¹³ He was not
the eldest son.¹⁴ The latter had most probably three elder
brothers, namely, Ādityavarman, Chandrāditya and Ranarā-
gavarman. In all probability, Ādityavarman succeeded Pula-
keśin II immediately after his death.¹⁵ Vikramāditya I ascended
the throne when all his elder brothers were dead. Significantly,
we notice an instance in early Chālukeyan history, where a
brother is described as heir-apparent.¹⁶ The Satara Plates de-
scribe Vishnūvardhana as an heir-apparent during the 8th regnal
year of Mahārāja, identified with Pulakeśin II.

The events prior to accession and after the death of Pulakeśin II made it essential for the Chālukyas to ponder over this question seriously. As a result, there grew the convention of nominating the Yuvarāja, i.e., the heir-apparent. The considerations of ability to rule also obliged them to train the heir-apparent in the art of administration by sharing executive and military functions with the king. Thus, it became the duty of the reigning sovereign to train his successor, which also provided him with an opportunity to judge the prince’s ability to rule before appointing him Yuvarāja. In short, succession to the throne was a hereditary right, and a prince’s ability to rule was the prime consideration in determining the order of succession.

Royal Consecration

It seems that before being proclaimed as king and occupying the throne, the ceremony of royal consecration or rājya-bhīshaka was performed according to Vedic traditions. Royal princes, vassals and notable representatives of the masses participated in the ceremony, of which the details are not given in any records. An inscription of dubious authenticity, however, speaks of this ceremony. The Pali Plates refer to Paṭtabandhotsava, i.e., coronation ceremony. The dynastic records are dated in regnal years, a practice followed by ancient rulers of several Indian dynasties. The regnal year begins with the date of the coronation. The Badami inscription of the Śaka year 500 refers to royal consecration. The Hyderabad Plates of Pulakeśin II count the regnal years of the king from his coronation. The Narwan Plates of Vikramāditya II not only refer to this ceremony, but also add that Sāmājya Lakṣmī had wedded him of her own accord, though festivities followed after some time. The Kendur and Vakkaleri Plates of Kṛttīvarman II confirm the above-mentioned statements. The coronation ceremony seems to be incumbent for the king-designate and its non-performance meant denial of legal status to him.

Regency Administration: The regency system seems to have been prevalent during the rule of the Chālukyas of Badami. There are two instances in Chālukyan history, when regents
ruled during the minority period of the legitimate heir. After Kṛttivarman I, Mangalesa ruled over the Chālukya empire. Kṛttivarman I had not died issueless. He had at least two sons, viz., Pulakesin II and Vishnuvardhana, who were his legal successors.26 They, however, did not succeed him probably because they were minors at that time, and Maṅgalesa took over the administration27 and finally usurped the throne. He was, however, dislodged by Pulakeśin II after a civil war, as suggested by the Aihole Praśasti.28

The next occasion for regency probably arose after the death of king Chandrāditya, who died leaving a minor son as his legal successor. The date of the Nerur Grant, being in Vijayabhaṭṭārikā’s regnal year,19 unmistakably suggests that she was ruling evidently as the regent of her minor son. She reigned in that capacity for at least five years, as is evident from the Nerur Grant of Vijayamahādevī.50 The language of the grant in question suggests that she was actually reigning.31 The testimony of the Nerur and Kochare Grants of his chief queen32 and the Kuknur Inscription of Vikramāditya I33 are conclusive on this point. No doubt, Vikramāditya I figures prominently in the inscriptions of Vijayabhaṭṭārikā, but he is neither called king nor given any royal title.34 It may, however, be suggested that he functioned as the supreme power on behalf of the lady regent, till he took over the kingship both as a de-facto and regular ruler.

These two instances provide evidence for the regency system which on several occasions resulted in the usurpation of authority by the regents themselves. There were frequent protracted civil wars, resulting in great loss to the treasury and dissipation of fighting forces on both sides.25

The King and his Place in Administration

The king was the main pivot of the administration and the strength and durability of the kingdom depended on his personality. The fundamental characteristics of the ideal king were diligence, learning and courage, combined with the proficiency of high-order in war and diplomacy.86 The majority of the Chālukyan epigraphs do refer to the excellent qualities of kings.57 These statements may not be true in every individual
case, but they certainly give us an idea of what people expected of their rulers. The qualities most stressed are virtue, pleasing conduct, learning, sharp intelligence, proficiency in arts and sciences,38 knowledge of Smṛtis, Purāṇas, Itihāsa and the Mahābhārata,39 truthfulness, mercy, liberality, devotion to dharma,40 political insight (naya), statesmanship (nīti), toleration11 and, above all, efficient leadership and personal valour.42 We find comparisons between individual kings and certain deities or epic and mythological heroes, such as Bṛhaspati,43 Surya, Indra, Rāma, Vāsudeva, Vishnu, Śivi, Yudhishthira, Arjuna, Uṣīnara, Nṛga, Nahusha, Māndhātā, etc.,41 to emphasize the above virtues. The dynastic records describe the Chālukya kings as purified having taken the avabhṛtha bath after performing the agnistoma vāja pēya and aśvamedha sacrifices.45 There are also references to moral qualities in rulers as, for instance, the Mahākāta Pillar Inscription refers to Pulakeśin I as Vṛdbhopadeśagrāhi (i.e., one who heeds the counsel of elders) and Brāhmaṇya,46 i.e., the follower of the Brahmānic traditions. The same epigraph describes Kṛttivarman I as one who respects deva and dvīja, while the Maruturu Inscription describes Pulakeśin II as one who remembers the performers of good deeds and forgets the wicked ones.47 The Satara Grant of Vishṇuvardhana calls him dharmajñā (well versed in dharma), kṛtajñā and valorous like Pārtha.48 The Kopparam Plates call Pulakeśin II one who pays due reverence to deva, dvīja, guru and vṛddha.49 The Aihol Praṣasti also states that the king should not covet others’ wives.50 Thus, in a nutshell, the Chālukyan king was thought to be the abode of learning, lustre, prudence, sportiveness, profundity, highmindedness, valour, renown and delicacy.

As true Kshatriyas,51 the Chālukyan rulers were conscious of their primary obligation of protecting their subjects from aggression and of being equally interested in their welfare. They provided opportunities to their talented subjects through employment at the Court. The rulers were efficient both as administrators and as commanders and were equally gifted with artistic instincts, patronising learned men and artists and men of other academic pursuits. King Pulakeśin II had a court poet Ravi-kīrtti, who compared himself with the poets of the repute of Kālidāsa and Bhāravi.52 Similarly, Vikramāditya II and mem-
bers of the royal family, including his queen and sister, gave a helping hand to several architects and sculptors of the period, as evinced from the inscriptions discovered at Paṭṭadakal. Thus the Chālukyan king had a vision for the upliftment of his people. We find many Chālukyan kings desirous of conquering more kingdoms and territories. The Copper Plates of Vija-

Education of the Princes

Before being nominated as heir-apparent, the prince had to train himself in the art of warfare besides acquiring knowledge of the Śāstras, Epics, Purāṇas, Politics and the sacred laws. The Chālukyan records bear testimony to the fact that the education and training of the princes were properly organised. The Chālukya kings are described as conversant with Manusmṛti, Purāṇas, Rāmāyaṇa, the Mahābhārata, and Itiḥāsa. A Chālukya king is described as having a mind trained by the study of all the Śāstras. The Mahākūta Pillar Inscription praises Maṅgaleśa as one who was extremely proficient in diplomacy. The Kopparam Plate describes Pulakeśin II as proficient in the laws. The Hyderabad Copper Plate inscription describes him as well versed in ‘Naya’ and ‘Vinaya’. While Alṭem Plates mention Pulakeśin I as proficient in aya, naya and vinaya. The records belonging to the reigns of Vinayāditya, Vijayāditya and Vikramāditya II, credit them with epithets like prajñātana layasya (well-versed in politics) khaḍgamātra sahāyasya, indicating proper training and education before being appointed as heir-apparants. The inscriptions of Kṛttivarman II tell us that he had received training in Śāstras (holy scriptures) and Šastras (weapons) during his childhood.

The heir-apparent participated in administrative affairs with the ruler. Vikramāditya I associated his son Vinayāditya and grandson Vijayāditya actively with the administration during his life-time, and thus established a precedent followed by the
later Chālukyan rulers of Badami. The heir-apparent was vested with several administrative powers, though the details are nowhere available. Probably these varied according to the whims and caprices of the ruler. In the Chālukyan administrative set-up, the heir-apparent had the right to issue grants. Vishnuvardhana, who describes himself as Yuvarāja, issued the Satara Plates, gifting land to five Brāhmaṇas.⁶¹ Yuvarāja Śrīyāśraya Śilādityya, the heir-apparent of Jayasiṃha, the younger brother and subordinate of Vikramāditya I, also issued two grants registering some gifts.⁶⁵ They sometimes represented the crown as well. In the settlement arrived at between the mahājanas of Lakshmeśvar and the reigning monarch Vijayāditya, we find prince Vikramāditya II representing the crown and confirming settlements between the above-mentioned parties.⁶⁶ The princes generally accompanied the ruling sovereigns on their military campaigns, which gave them an opportunity to have actual training in warfare. Vinayāditya and Vijayāditya accompanied Vikramāditya I on his campaigns against the Southern powers.⁶⁷ Vikramāditya II commanded the Chālukyan army against the Pallavas while he was heir-apparent.⁶⁸ Kṛttivarman II headed the last expedition of the Chālukyas against the Pallavas.⁶⁹ These numerous instances make it evident that for imparting training in war and handling of weapons, the princes actually participated in battles.

Royal Titles and their Significance

The rulers of this dynasty assumed many titles and epithets of considerable importance. We notice that in the early dynastic records, Jayasiṃha, Ranaṛāga and Pulakeśīna I did not have any significant titles. The Badami inscription of the Śaka year 465 simply calls Pulakeśīna I Vallabha,⁷⁰ later on which became Prithivivallabha, and this was adopted by all Chālukyan kings.⁷¹ The later kings of the dynasty assumed imperial titles from Pulakeśīna II onwards.⁷² This indicates that the use of so many epithets was in consonance with their rising regal status. In the celebration of his victory over Harsha, Pulakeśīna II adopted the epithet of Parameśvara, i.e., the greatest lord.⁷³ The Hyderabad Plates bestow this epithet on Pulakeśīna II as early as A.D. 612 or 613.⁷⁴ In the dynastic epigraphs from Vikramā-
ditya I onwards, the higher titles of paramountcy, i.e., Mahā-
rājādhirāja and Bhāttāraka, are added to the existing epithets, raising
the full appellation to Satyāśrava Śrīprithivivallabha Mahārājādhirāja Paramesvara Bhāttāraka, meaning thereby the
refuge of truth, the lord of the earth, the king of kings, the
great lord.75 The complete set of epithets was not always used
and was often shortened by omitting one or more titles contain-
ed in it. Sometimes these titles have substituted the names of
the kings. The title Satyāśrava has been used to denote Pulakeśin II76 on several occasions though it has also been used for
Pulakeśin I.77 The feudatories were not allowed to adopt titles
of imperial significance but the early Chālukyan rulers of Lāta,
the feudatories of the main branch, broke this tradition at a
later stage.78

A few religious epithets, such as Paramabhāgavata, Parama-
māheśvara and Dharmanamahārāja,79 are used for the rulers of
this dynasty. These indicate the devotion of the monarchs to-
wards Vishnu and Śiva. According to Sastrī, the title of Dhar-
manamahārāja indicated their active promotion of the Vedic
dharma in preference to Buddhism and Jainism.80 A few signifi-

cant virudas have also been attributed to certain kings of this
dynasty, which are suggestive of their praiseworthy deeds and
acts of valour. Pulakeśin I is bestowed the title of Ranavik-
rama indicating his valour in the battle-field.81 Kīrttivarman I
enjoyed the epithet of ‘Pururāṇa-Parākrama’ in the same
fashion.82 Maṅgaleśa took the viruda ‘Ranavikrānta’ and Urura-
navikrānta,83 signifying his valour and prowess on the battle-
field. Vikramāditya I enjoyed the titles Raṇarasika, Anivārīta
and Rājamalla.84 The last epithet was given to him after he
had dealt a crushing defeat to the Pallavas, the traditional
family foes.85 Vinayāditya is adorned with the epithets of
Rājāśraya and Yuddhamalla.86 As he had given shelter even
to kings, he adopted the appellation of Rājāśraya, the refuge
of kings. The epithet Yuddhamalla points to his valour in the
battle-field. This might have been adopted on the lines of titles
like ‘Rājamalla’ and ‘Mahāmalla’, signifying his victory over
the Pallavas.

Besides the greater imperial titles of Mahārājādhirāja,
Paramabhattāraka and Paramesvara, Vijayāditya also bore a
new viruda of Samastabhuvanāśraya.87 The epithet Samastabhu-
vanāśraya means the refuge of all the world, which, despite its blatant exaggeration, indicates the growth of his authority. He had become Mahābhattāraka, signifying his increased royal status. The Bagalkot Copper Plate Inscription calls him a chakravartin. Thus, these titles and virudas point to the status, religious faith, military exploits and other achievements of the kings.

Powers and Functions of Rulers

The Chalukyan epigraphs tell us that the king performed the essential duties of prajārakshana, prajāpālana, prajārañjana and varnāśramadharmā pratipālana as enjoined by the writers on ancient Indian polity. The Chalukyan ruler had an enlightened conception of his duties and responsibilities, being the chief functionary of the state. The primary function of the king was to protect his subjects from internal disorders and foreign invasions. A strong army and a police force were essential for preserving law and order. A few epigraphs refer to police officials like the daṇḍapāśikas, chaurādhikaranas, chātas and bhataś, indicating the existence of a police force to maintain law and order. The Chiplū Plates of Pulakesin II call him the exterminator of wicked persons and defender of learned people.

The Chalukyan rulers sincerely strove for the welfare and happiness of their people. Though kings had unbridled authority, they could not have behaved like tyrants for that would have provoked rebellion. The lofty ideals of charity, impartiality, self-restraint, a liberal attitude towards learning and the learned and respect for religion were constantly in their minds. While being princes, their education was so planned as to make them self-controlled, learned and brave.

The Smṛti texts enjoin upon the kings the duty of prajānurañjana. These point out that the king can become a successful ruler only if he follows the precepts of the elders, studies the art of government, cultivates piety and protects his subjects efficiently. The Goḍachi Plates of Kaṭṭi-arasa, i.e., Kṛtti-varman I, tell us that he dispensed justice to his people and ensured their contentment. The Chalukyan kings are described as performers of several sacrifices, which provided oppor-
tunities to distribute charity in the form of gold, grain and land to the learned in accordance with the traditions of prajānuraṅ-

jana. The Chālukyan epigraphs register several land gifts in favour of the Brāhmaṇas, religious institutions, sects and other individuals, indicating their sincere efforts in this direction.100

The king had to uphold the established social order based on the Smṛtis and other sacred lores.101 For achieving this, the king had to preserve the dharma, which was the main basis of social organisation. The king always acted as the secular arm of dharma, and not as a sectarian head. The kings were devoted to the performance of religious sacrifices and felt delighted in defending Varnāśrama.102 The Alṭem Plates describe Pula-

keśin I as protecting Varnāśrama and Sarvadharma.103

There is no denying the fact that the ruler had basically little control over social and religious institutions of the period, unless matters of dispute relating to them were brought before him or to his court for having his verdict. The Satara Grant describes Vishṇuvardhana as dharmajña101 probably suggesting this aspect of kingly duties. A few Chālukyan kings are credited with the viruda of ‘dharmamahārāja’ which further confirms that varnāśramadharma pratipālana was one of their objectives.105

The king appointed viceroys, governors, ministers and other important civil and military officials106 who were answerable to him. It seems that these were sometimes transferred from one province to another, as and when considered necessary. Bāna-
rāja, for instance, one of the vassals ruling under the Chālukyas, is described as ruling over Gaṅga-Renadu, Turumāra and Gananūru provinces in different inscriptions.107 Vikramāditya I appointed his younger brother Jayasimha to govern the Gujarat and Nasik regions108 but entrusted to Svāmichandra of the Harischandra family the administration of the whole Purī-Koṅkaṇa.109 Pulakeśin II appointed his younger brother governor of Velvola and later on transferred him as governor of the newly conquered territory of Veṅgi.110 Buddhavarasarājā, an uncle of Vikramāditya I, was ruling over the areas around Amvaranta Vishaya as the subordinate of his nephew.111 Thus it seems reasonable to believe that members of the royal family assisted the king in administration, function-
ing as his deputies in the provinces and in the army.
During the days of peace, the king used to spend most of his working time in court, meeting people and looking after general administration. He wielded control over every organ of the administration. His name as a ruler figured in the records of his vassals as a token of his authority. Satyāśraya Dhruvarāja Indravarman could grant a village named Karellikā only after seeking prior sanction of his overlord as evinced by the Goa Grant. Several land grants make it plain that royal consent was necessary for the transfer of the state property. The king also conferred titles and distinctions on his feudatories for meritorious services. King Vikramāditya II had conferred the titles of Chāllukikulādhāra, Prthivivallabha, Anivaritayitri and Dakshināpathasādhāra on Pulakeśirāja in appreciation of his service for repulsing the Tājikas.

The Copper Plate Inscriptions registering many land gifts and civil orders issued from different places of encampment indicate that the king undertook frequent tours of inspection, accompanied by civil and military officials, who conveyed his orders while on tour. This enabled him to gauge the real conditions of his people and remove grievances on the spot. It also enabled him to assess the performance and evaluation of the work of his officials stationed in different parts of the kingdom.

The Chālukyan king was also the supreme judge of the realm. The Chālukyan king Maṅgaleśa is described as nyāyā-ruvarti. The Goḍachi Plates of Kaṭṭi-arasa (Kīrttivarman I) call him one who is happy in dispensing justice to the people. It seems that justice was ensured by the king’s officials at the village, district, division and provincial headquarters. The king was, however, the final court of appeal. It is difficult to say whether judicial officials were separately appointed, or administrative officers were vested with judicial functions as well.

The dynastic epigraphs do not throw much light on the judicial powers of the king. Pulakeśin II has been described as well-versed in law and many Chālukyan rulers are mentioned as proficient in the Smṛtitis, Śrutis and other ancient treatises on polity. These references make it evident that these powers were vested in the king. The Chālukyan kings took pride in stating in their records that they studied these works and implicitly followed their teaching in respect of judicial administration.
The Chālukyan king was also the commander-in-chief of his forces. During the war he himself led the army on the battle-field. We know that probably Pulakeśin II was defeated and killed by the Pallava ruler Narasiṃhavarman on the battle-field, while he was commanding his forces. Vikramāditya I had stormed Kāñchī, while he himself was leading his army. Vikramāditya II had headed the Chālukyan forces, which invaded Kāñchī thrice. In times of war and calamity, the king marched with his army for boosting the morale of his troops and directing the operative strategy of war. The Chālukyan epigraphs describe kings of this dynasty as brave, gallant and anxious to perform heroic deeds. A few kings are referred to as having valour like that of Purṣurāma and Pārtha. The kings supervised military affairs with the help of the minister for peace and war and officials named balādhikṛta or mahā-balādhikṛta.

Members of the Royal Family

The dynastic records reveal that the king was assisted in his administration and cultural activities by the members of the royal family. Sastri thinks that “important members of the kingly family formed a commission to help the emperor in the administration.” Though there is no evidence to sustain such a supposition, it cannot be denied that the king utilised the services of capable and loyal members of the royal family by appointing them to suitable administrative posts in the kingdom. The members of the royal family served the king in various capacities, including those of governors and commanders. It depended entirely on the whim and caprice of the sovereign, as the practice involved many risks to the very existence of kingly authority. Sometimes it resulted in fratricidal wars and the establishment of collateral branches. The Chālukyan dynasty also suffered on this account. This practice, however, had some good results as well. The chances of rebellions and insurrections were considerably reduced as the king’s family members were less likely to revolt against the authority of the head of state. The sovereigns of this dynasty followed the policy of appointing their family members to important positions in different parts of their empire.
even allowed the vanquished rulers of once independent states to administer their own kingdoms.\textsuperscript{131}

The Role of the Queen

The Chālukyan records refer to queen-consorts of the ruling monarchs. Either they figure as donating land for acquiring religious merit,\textsuperscript{132} or as providing help for the betterment of public institutions.\textsuperscript{133} A queen of this dynasty, Vijayamahādevī, had the opportunity of ruling over the kingdom after the death of her husband Chandrāditya, most probably as the regent of her minor son.\textsuperscript{134} She assumed the titles of Bhāttārīkā and Mahādevī, which are suggestive of her being the ruler.\textsuperscript{135} The Kūrākōṭi undated Stone Slab Inscription refers to Lokatinimmadi governing Kuruttakumte.\textsuperscript{136} Sastri considers the name as identical with Vijayāditya’s daughter-in-law Lokamahādevī, a Haihaya princess, since the name sounds feminine.\textsuperscript{137} This seems to suggest that sometimes queens of reigning monarchs or princesses were entrusted with administrative duties.

The queens were also devoted to learning and charity. The Poona Grant of Vinayāditya was issued at the instance of the chief queen Vinayavati, for gifting some land for Kanyādharmārtha.\textsuperscript{138} The same queen figures as rājamātā in the Badami Pillar Inscription of the time of Vijayāditya, which records the installation of the images of the Hindu Trinity at Badami with the concurrence of her son, the ruling sovereign.\textsuperscript{139} The Gadval Plates\textsuperscript{140} of Vikramāditya I were issued at the request of Gaṅga-Mahādevī, who was a Chālukyan princess. The Bagalkot Copper Plate Inscription\textsuperscript{141} records a gift by the king Vijayāditya at the request of his sister Kuṃkumadevi,\textsuperscript{142} who was also responsible for the construction of a Jain monastery at Puligere, as is evident from the Shiggaon Plates of Vijayāditya.\textsuperscript{143}

The early Chālukya records engraved in the temples at Paṭṭaḍakal speak of two queens of king Vikramāditya II, Lokamahādevī and Trailokyamahādevī. The Paṭṭaḍakal inscriptions of Lokamahādevī\textsuperscript{144} record the re-admission into his caste of Sutraddhāri, an architect of the temple of god Lokesvara constructed by queen Lokamahādevī in celebration of the three
successive victories of her husband over Kāñchī. This inscription shows that state-wide festivities followed the Chālukyan conquests which also included the construction of temples. She confirmed the gift of her father-in-law Vijayāditya in favour of some singers, as gathered from another inscription at Patṭaḍakal reflecting her artistic interests and patronage to musicians. Another record at Patṭaḍakal mentions the construction of the Lokeśvara temple by Lokamahādevī, and the Trailokeśvara temple by Trailokyamahādevī, both named after the donors.

The chief queen (Mahādevī) of Kīrttivarman II, the last Chālukyan monarch, also figures in connection with a gift, which was given at her request by the king from his military camp at Raktapura, suggesting her presence on tour along with the ruler. All these references suggest that the queen helped the monarch in administrative matters.

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATION

Ministers, their Designations, Powers and Functions

The king used to look after important policy matters of government, while the routine business of administration was transacted by his ministers. The Smṛtis ordain that he should govern the people with the counsel of his ministers. The dynastic epigraphs do not throw much light on this point. The family records are equally silent about the formal council of ministers. The Eastern Chālukyan records, however, refer to ‘mantri’ and ‘pradēhāna’, besides a few other ministers. Mahalingam says that sufficient evidence is available to show that ministerial councils existed in the Deccan during the time of the Chālukyas, the Rāṣāhrakūtas and the Yādavas. On the other hand, Sastri suggests that “there are many indications that the entire administration of the State was treated as more or less vested in a commission in the whole royal family, and of the ruling sovereign's readiness to employ all capable and loyal members of that family in suitable administrative posts in the kingdom”. All official records of the Chālukyas were drafted and written by the Sāndhivigrāhika or Mahāśāndhivigrāhika, i.e., the minister for foreign affairs or the minister for
external affairs.\textsuperscript{153} Thus we have clear proof of the existence of a royal minister who was the adviser to the king in matters relating to peace and war. Therefore, we cannot deny the existence of the ministry. It might be pointed out that a few members of the royal family were also included in the ministry. The faith reposed by the reigning monarchs in Maṅgaleśa and Vishnuparvahana proved disastrous for the dynasty.

The records do not give us any idea of the number of the ministers in the State. The \textit{Smṛtis} refer to the importance of ministers and recommend the appointment of three, five or seven ministers.\textsuperscript{154} Divergent views are held by the authors of the \textit{Smṛtis}. The departments entrusted to the ministers were those of revenue, expenditure, protection of the king's person and army,\textsuperscript{155} but the only ministerial department referred to in the records of the Chālukyas is that of peace and war. We have no definite evidence to suggest the office of Prime Minister. The term \textit{Mahābrāhmaṇa} mentioned in the Godaḍa plates might, however, refer to him.\textsuperscript{156} This is almost confirmed by the epithets 'rājayasarvasva' and 'dhurandhara' bestowed upon him in the records.\textsuperscript{157}

In all the official records of the Chālukyas, the minister for peace and war figures as the drafter and writer of official records, indicating his impact on the administrative machinery of the Chālukyas. The ministers were probably appointed directly by the king and heredity was the prime consideration in such appointments as it ensured allegiance and loyalty.\textsuperscript{158} The office of minister was a very important and responsible one, and consequently it seemed that only experienced and qualified persons, noted for their noble lineage, virtuous conduct, truthfulness, generosity, devotion to duty, learning, valour and keen insight, with capacity to keep official secrets, were appointed to it.\textsuperscript{159}

As indicated earlier, the Chālukyan records refer to only one minister, i.e., \textit{sāndhivigrahika}, the minister for peace and war, or minister for foreign affairs. The literal meaning of the term indicates that he was the counsellor of the king on matters of \textit{sandhi} (peace) and \textit{vigraha} (war). The term \textit{conductor} of war and peace.\textsuperscript{160} Significantly, the \textit{Mānasolāsa}, a literary work of the time of the Later Chālukyas, includes among the qualifications of a \textit{sāndhivigrahika} a good acquaintance with
several languages and scripts and outstanding tact and skill in
dealing with feudatories and vassals. He should be, besides,
an expert in diplomacy and finance.\textsuperscript{161} This seems to indicate
that his duties were of the highest political importance, and
that they spread over the whole range of administrative responsi-
bilities, both internal and external. Thus, probably the
$s\text{\=a}ndhivigrahika$ was the most influential member of the Ch\=aluk-
yan government. The Godachi Plates of K\=atti-arasa describe
a minister of K\=irtti\=varman I as bearing the burden of the
government; he is also described as $r\=Aj\=yas\=arvas\=a$.\textsuperscript{162} This
shows the status and position of the ministers in the eyes of
the king. We can have an idea of the outstanding achieve-
ments of the individual ministers from such statements. The
most important function of the ministers was to advise the
king on affairs of state. The ministers wielded considerable
power.\textsuperscript{163} In cases of emergency, they carried on the adminis-
tration of the state and placed their nominee from among the
princes on the throne. At the sudden death of Pulakes\=i\=n II,
probably his sons were enthroned by the ministers.

There does not appear to have been any clear-cut division
of civil and military functions of state officials and it was
possible for the civil officials to be charged with military respon-
sibilities as well. All the official Ch\=alukyan records issued
from the military camps were drafted by the $s\text{\=a}ndhivigrahikas
who always accompanied the rulers on their military cam-
paigns. A few records belonging to the feudatories of the
Ch\=alukyas are, however, drafted by $bala\=dhi\=k$\=a or $mah\=a\=bal\=a\=dhi-
$\=k$\=a and $bhogika$.\textsuperscript{164} An inscription of Vikrama\=ditya II
engraved on the walls of R\=ajasim\=hesvara temple at K\=a\=n\=chi
shows that the minister for peace and war was present at
K\=a\=n\=chi when it was conquered by the Ch\=alukyas.\textsuperscript{165}

Provision was made for plurality of offices. According to
the Manor Plates, the S\=andhivigrahika Bha\=t\=tha Rudran\=aga was
holding the three high offices of $aksha\text{\=p}at\=a\=l\=a\=dhi\=kara\text{\=n}\=a\=dhipati,
$divirapati$ and $s\text{\=a}ndhivigrahika$.\textsuperscript{166} A few epigraphs belonging
to the feudatories of the Ch\=alukyas are drafted by $Bal\=a\=dhi\=k$\=a
or $Mah\=a\=bal\=a\=dhi\=k$\=a indicating that sometimes they replaced
the minister for peace and war.\textsuperscript{167} The Ch\=alukyan $S\text{\=a}ndhivigra-
$hikas$ belonged to the $Pu\text{\=n}yavallabha$ lineage.\textsuperscript{168} The ministers
of the $Pu\text{\=n}yavallabha$ family are also accorded the title of
Niravadya. Bhaṭṭa Rudranāga, son of Kumāraswāmi Dikshita, who figured as the drafter of the Manor Plates, is also described as Niravadya Paramesvara. (Since Rudranāga was a brāhmin, so it seems that Puṇyavallabhas were also Brāhmaṇa by caste.) The epithet niravadya and family name Puṇyavallabha appear to be related to Jainism. Nothing can, however, be said definitely on this point, till we get fuller evidence. However, a minister of Kṛttivara (Kṛttivarma I) mentioned in the Godachi Plates is described as mahā-brāhmaṇa. Thus, it could be presumed that Brāhmaṇas were preferred for ministerships by the rulers of this dynasty.

Further, we find that all the sāndhivigrāhikas referred to in the records of the Chālukyas were related to one another. During the reign of Vikramāditya I, Jayasena or Jayatasena was the Mahāsāndhivigrāhika. He was the father-in-law of the succeeding sāndhivigrāhika Puṇyavallabha or Śrīrāma Puṇyavallabha, who served as a minister for peace and war during the reigns of Vinayāditya and Vijayāditya. In the later part of the reign of Vijayāditya, Nīravadya Puṇyavallabha became the minister for peace and war. In the reign of Vikramāditya II Anivārita Puṇyavallabha entrusted with this office was from the Puṇyavallabha family. Dhanaṅjaya Puṇyavallabha served as Sāndhivigrāhika during the reign of the last Chālukyan monarch Kṛttivarma II. Thus, it is quite apparent that all these persons belonged to the family of Puṇyavallabha and were the successors of their predecessors. So it seems that the office of the minister for foreign affairs was hereditary, probably with the sanction and approval of the crown.

Some type of administrative machinery under the routine supervision of the ministers was existing at Vāṭāpi, the Chālukyan capital, to keep the realm of the vast territories in the hands of the king. The chief secretariat of the empire functioned under the Divirapati, i.e., the chief of the secretariat. The Manor Copper Plates describe the drafter of the record, Bhaṭṭa Rudranāga, as Sāndhivigrāhika, divirapati and akṣapaṭalādhikaraṇaḍhīpati equivalent to the present minister for revenue, peace and war, and ‘chief of the secretariat’ or the chief secretary. We know that the akṣapaṭalika was an officer of the revenue department and divirapati the chief
of *diviras* (clerks). Even if we do not agree with the assumption of Kṛṣṇadeva, this goes to prove that there were at least three departments in the central secretariat of the Chālukyas, viz., war and peace, revenue and records and general administration headed by a *divirapati*. The supposition makes it evident that the *Śāndhivigrāhika* was a very influential man in the Central Government and that is why he used to accompany the king on tours and military campaigns.

No information is available with regard to the working of the ministers at the capital. On the basis of epigraphic evidence, it is also not possible to work out their emoluments and functions. Probably, the emoluments were paid both in cash and in kind. The supposition becomes more probable because taxes were realised by the Chālukyas both in cash and in kind. Important services to the crown were rewarded with gifts of land and valuables as well as with titles of distinction.

**Administrative Divisions**

Thus the Altēm Copper Plate Inscription of Pulakeśin I describes him as the lord (*Īśvara*) of *Madhyavartideśa* and the Chālukya kingdom under him as an empire. The Badami Inscription of Śaka 500 refers to the Chālukyan empire as the earth (*avyani*) extended upto the four oceans. In the Nerūr Plates of Mangalarāja, the term “*rāṣṭra*” denotes the empire of the Chālukya king Maṅgaleśa, while the Aihole *Praśasti* of Pulakeśin II mentions that he was the lord of three *Mahārāṣṭras*, consisting of 99000 villages and the empire was bounded by two oceans. However, a Chālukyan inscription refers to a Chālukya *Vishaya* but its context in the inscription makes us believe that it does not connote the Chālukyan empire but a division of the Chālukyan territories.

The Chālukyan empire was divided into different administrative divisions varying in size. We do not notice any uniform system in this regard for all the parts of the empire after many conquests in different directions from their capital. The older political units were probably made a province of the empire. The nomenclature of the provincial divisions differed according to the regions, as is evidenced by the dynastic epigraphs discovered in the Lāṭa region and in Mahārāṣṭra. The
Chalukyan empire had several revenue units without any regard to size and population. The following administrative units are referred to in the dynastic records of the Early Chalukyas and their subordinates.

Rāṣṭra: The term ‘rāṣṭra’ is of Vedic antiquity.\textsuperscript{185} The ‘rāṭhikas’ or ‘rāṣṭrikas’ do figure in the inscriptions of Asoka.\textsuperscript{186} Manu has used the term in relation to the State.\textsuperscript{187} According to the Amarakosa, the words \textit{deśa}, rāṣṭra, vishaya and \textit{janapada} are synonyms.\textsuperscript{188} In the Vākāṭaka inscriptions, the term ‘rāṣṭra’ occurs in the sense of a district, with villages forming part of it.\textsuperscript{189} In the dynastic epigraphs of the Chalukyas, the term rāṣṭra occurs with reference to the empire as well as corresponding to a district. The Nerūr Plates of Maṅgalarāja describe him as one who follows the course of justice in his rāṣṭra, indicating that the term rāṣṭra denotes the Chalukyan empire\textsuperscript{190} A few Chalukyan inscriptions mention some villages as situated in the rāṣṭra and also rāṣṭra as the division of a vishaya.\textsuperscript{191} We do not find uniformity of this term in the epigraphic usages.

However, it appears that the Chalukyan empire consisted of at least three great divisions, as is evident from the Aihole Praśasti of Pulakesin II.\textsuperscript{192} Hiuên-Tsang also calls him the ruler of Mo-ho-la-cha, i.e., Mahārāṣṭra.\textsuperscript{193} It plainly says that the term ‘Maharashtra’ does not connote the present Marathi-speaking area but probably it means three great divisions of Pulakesin’s empire. The Chalukyan epigraphs refer to certain other rāṣṭras connoting smaller territorial entities. The Kopparam Plates of Pulakesin II\textsuperscript{194} record the gift of some land in the village named Irubuli situated in Karṇmarāṣṭra. The Nāndgaon\textsuperscript{195} and Añjaneri\textsuperscript{196} Plates refer to Goparāṣṭra, in which the gifted villages were situated. Goparāṣṭra is also mentioned as one of the vishayas of Purī-Koṅkaṇa. These references stand in the way to equate the term rāṣṭra, denoting the provincial division of the empire.

Deśa: The other administrative units referred to in the records of the dynasty are deśa, nāḍu, maṇḍala, vishaya, bhoga, āhāra and grāma. The Chalukyan epigraphs refer to Challakideśa (Challumṅkideśa)\textsuperscript{197} and Kheṭahāradeśa.\textsuperscript{198} The villages named Jammalagrama and Karellikā are described as situated in the above-mentioned two deśas, respectively. The
reference to Challunikideśa is quite interesting. We know that deśa is among the seven prakṛitis of the state. According to Mirashi, deśa corresponds to the province. But the Tummeyanūri Plates of Pulakeśin II equate it with vishaya. Puri-Koṅkana—14000, referred to in the Añjanerī Plates of Samanta Bhogaśakti, is described as vishaya but it signifies a province (deśa) because Goparāśṭra is mentioned in the record as one of the Vishayas of Puri-Koṅkana consisting of 14000 villages. Except for Puri-Koṅkana, the official Chālukyan records do not state the extent of any other administrative unit. The above detailed references make it apparent that sometimes Vishaya was used as a synonym for deśa. The Goa Grant refers to Indravarman as the adhipati of four vishaya maṇḍalas who gifted a village situated in Khetahāra-deśa. This means that a ruler of four vishaya-maṇḍalas cannot donate a village situated in a deśa corresponding to a province, as he sought the prior sanction of his overlord. In this record, it appears to correspond to a vishaya. Most probably the term Challunikideśa does not signify Chālukyan territory but the original territory of the royal Chālukyan house of Badami, from where they came into prominence. As a village is described as situated in a deśa, it does not appear to be a larger unit than vishaya, i.e., district, but we find a reference to Choṭika vishaya in the Jejūri Plates. There it does not signify the Chola district, but stands for Chola territory. It appears that after crossing the land of the Cholas, the Chālukyas invaded the Pallava stronghold. The reference to it as a vishaya can only be due to the loose use of the term.

Nāḍu: The Chāṇḍan Stone Inscription of Vijayāditya Kaṭṭirāju registers a gift of some land, when Bānaraśa was ruling over Gaṅgarenāḍu. The Virarēḍḍipalle Stone Inscription of Vinayāditya Satyāśraya records the grant of some land when Bānaraśa was governing Vamganur-nāḍu. These two records notice an administrative division called nāḍu quite uncommon in the Deccan. According to Mahalingam, "The southern parts of the Tamil country appear to have been divided into units known as nāḍus. Probably they were independent political units originally and after their conquest by a greater power, they were retained as subordinate administrative units under the conquerors and were allowed to retain their original
names." Both the above-mentioned records were discovered in Anantpur district forming part of the area snatched by the Chāḷukyas after defeating the Pallavas and their allies. The way this unit is referred to in the Chāḷukyan epigraphs suggests it to be a small provincial division, once ruled by an independent ruler and later on becoming part of the Chāḷukyan empire. The term nāḍu most probably corresponds to the Sanskrit rāṣṭra. Though the terms rāṣṭra, deśa and nāḍu connote bigger areas than Vishaya, the records do not specify their limits.

Maṇḍala: As an administrative unit a maṇḍala rarely occurs in the records of the Chāḷukyas. It is, however, associated with a vishaya in a record of Satyāśraya Dhruvarāja Indravarman, who is described as the governor (adhipati) of four Vishaya-maṇḍalas. This makes it evident that Vishaya and maṇḍala were not synonyms as the phrase "Vishayamaṇḍala Chatusṭāvādhipatinā" occurs in the Goa Grant. The Harihara Plates of Vinayāditya record a gift of some land in a village, which is described as situated in Edevoḷal Bhoga under the maṇḍala of Vanavāsi. It indicates that a maṇḍala was a higher unit of administration as compared to a Vishaya. The Rājatarangini mentions Kashmir as a maṇḍala, though we know that it has always been a country or deśa. Moreover, on the basis of the Pratihāra records, Dr. Puri has proved that maṇḍala was the higher unit of administration than Vishaya, i.e., district. In all likelihood it corresponds to the present division.

Vishaya: The majority of the grants of the Chāḷukyas refer to the gift of villages and their situation in some Vishaya. Those mentioned include Chipuṇ, Cholika, Gaṅgavādi, Vamguravādi, Avaraṭikā, Uchchhasṛṅgī, Kuhundī, Puṇaka, Naḷavādi, Vanavāsi, Bāṇarājavishaya, Kaṇva Vishaya, Palasige, Talitāṭahāra and Karmaṇyaḥāra, etc. The administrative unit Vishaya usually corresponds to the present district of a varying size which includes many villages. The bigger ones noted in the records are Chāḷukya, Cholika and Puri-Koṅkaṇa—14000 Vishayas. These were certainly larger units of administration as Goparāṣṭra is described as one of the vishayas of Puri-Koṅkana. The vishaya in this context cannot be a district. It seems that while it has been used with some adjectives denoting the name of a dynasty, such as Cholika and Chāḷukya, it
appears to refer to the original territories of the related dynasties. The reference to these as vishayas can only be due to the loose use of the term. This is the only explanation that can be offered about such anomalies. Vishaya, janapada, desa and rāṣṭra are regarded as synonymous terms.214 We have an instance where a vishaya is described as situated in another vishaya. Goparāṣṭra Vishaya is also described as situated in Puri-Koṅkaṇa Vishaya.215 Thus, on the basis of dynastic records, it is difficult to determine the exact extent of the vishayas and their relative positions with regard to desa and rāṣṭra. Rāṣṭra and desa connote bigger geographical entities. A vishaya was administered by a Vishayapati (Desādhigārigala).216

Bhoga: The Chālukyan epigraphs refer to vishaya as a unit higher than a village, the lowest unit of Chālukyan administrative set-up. But the Jejūrī Plates of Vinayāditya mention a unit ‘bhoga’ between grāma and vishaya. The donated village ‘Vira’ is described as situated in Sātimāla bhoga, which was in Paḷayaṭṭhāna Vishaya.217 The bhoga probably corresponded to present taluka in the Deccan. It was probably administered by Bhogapati or Bhogika, who sometimes figured as one of the informants in the Chālukyan records218 or as a drafter of the record.

Āhāra: The Navsārī Plates of Śrīyāsraya Śilāditya mention that the donated village was situated in Kanhavala āhāra and included in Bāhirikā vishaya.219 Thus, it seems that the vishaya was divided into smaller units generally called āhāra in the Gujarat area of the Chālukyan empire and bhoga in Mahārāṣṭra. Some āhāras had the same name as the vishayas in which they were included and so the two technical terms are often combined, as is evidenced by the phrase ‘Kārmanyoḥāra-Vishaya-Treyamṇāhāra-Vishaya’ occurring in the Navsārī Grant. Mirashi considers it a mistake on the part of the scribe and regards the intended statement as ‘Karmanyoḥāra Treyamṇāhara Vishayāntargata’.220 The Mudgapadra Grant of Yuvarāja Śrīyāsraya Śilāditya refers to the village Mudgapadra, which was situated in Vichi-āhāra.221 Thus, it seems that āhāras or bhogas were the lower units of administration as compared to a vishaya. They seem to correspond to the present taluka in the Deccan. Under Sātavāhana supremacy, ‘āhāra’ corresponded to the present district.222 The Chālukyan epigraphs do not
furnish the nomenclature of the administrator of an āhāra.

**Grāma:** The lowest unit of the Chālukyan administration was *grāma*. Several villages referred to in the Chālukyan records were gifted to various Brāhmaṇas. The village as a unit was under the administrative control of gāmunda (gavunda), as mentioned in the Ādur and several other inscriptions. The other officials connected with village administration include *grāmabhogika* and *grāmakūta*. These officials were functioning in cooperation with the *mahattaras*.

**Pura-Nagara:** The Chālukyan kingdom included a number of cities and towns like Vāṭāpi, Vanavāsi, Pāṇḍipura, Raktapura, Tagara, Puḷikere (Lakshmēśvar) and Paṭṭada Kiṣu-voḷal. There must have been separate administrative units for these because the Ādur inscription mentions *Sindarasa* as governing the city of Pāṇḍipura. Probably the capital city (*adhisṛṣṭhaṇa*) of Vāṭāpi was under the Central administration, as Badami is described as a bride of Pulakeśin I. The same status seems to have been accorded to *Vanavāsi*, as both are described in the Aihole *Praśasti* in eloquent terms.

**Provincial Administration**

The system of provincial administration of the Chālukyas appears to be complicated. As already stated, the empire was divided into several units. Nothing definite is known about their nomenclature and extent, but these provinces certainly included a number of *vishayyas*. On the basis of the information gathered from the Chālukyan inscriptions, it seems that they were of three categories.

In the first category we can include those provinces, which were governed by members of the royal family. Actually, these princes were functioning as deputies of the king. To avoid confusion, they are referred to as viceroys. The Lāṭa, Nāsika and Veṅgi regions were such provinces of the Chālukyan empire. The second category included those provinces which were ruled by the governors appointed by the emperor on grounds of their allegiance. They comprised those persons who had earlier lost to the Chālukyas in war and had surrendered. The third category included the feudatories who were given a fief and were expected to provide some troops to the emperor.
when demanded. They gave annual tribute and presents on special occasions. Thus the provincial administration was carried through viceroys, governors and sāmantas. The viceroys of provinces were appointed by the emperor, who were responsible for the protection of their territories against external invasions and maintaining internal order. They were probably also assigned the job of helping the feudatories and were required to keep watch over their activities. As a rule, only members of the royal family were appointed to this office. The crown prince Vishnudevadana was appointed viceroy of the newly conquered territories of Veṅgi by king Pulakesin II. Vikramaditya I appointed his younger brother Dhārāśrāya Jayasimha as viceroy of Goparāśṭra and Lāṭa. Pulakesirāja was administering the Lāṭa country as viceroy of Vikramaditya II. The Sāṅjan Copper Plate Inscription mentions Buddhavarasarāja, an uncle of the Chālukyan king Vikramaditya I, ruling over the Poona region as viceroy of his nephew. By promoting good government and public confidence, they strengthened the foundation of the empire. Probably they were vested with the power of appointing their subordinate officers as is evidenced from the inscriptions of Jayasimha, Śrīśrāya Śilāditya, Vinayāditya Māṅgalarasa and Pulakesirāja from the Lāṭa region. It seems that all the departments that existed at the imperial capital had their replicas in the provincial headquarters, but details are lacking.

Governors: Among the informants of the Chālukyan grants, we are introduced to sāmantas and rājasāmantas. It seems that the sāmantas were the feudatories and the rājasāmantas were the governors of the provinces appointed by the emperor. Satyāśrāya Dhruvarāja Indravarman of the Bappūra family was appointed governor of the four vishaya mandalas by Pṛthi-vivallabha Mahārāja (Maṅgaleśa). Svāmichandra of the Hariśchandra family was ruling over the entire Puri-Koṅkaṇa region as governor under Vikramaditya I, who treated the former as his own son. Bhogaśakti of the same family was administering Purī-Koṅkaṇa—14000 as governor of Vijayāditya, the contemporary Chālukyan overlord. It seems that persons of extremely high administrative calibre and unshakable loyalty were appointed governors of provinces. The governors adminis-
tered their charge on behalf of the emperor and were responsible to him. They were probably vested with the power to appoint their subordinate officials like vishayapatis, bhogikas and rāṣṭra-grāmakūtas. The office of governor was also hereditary. The Añjanerī Plates of Bhogaśakti mention that his grandfather was the governor of Purī-Koṅkaṇa during the reign of Vikramāditya I and his father Siṃharāja graced the same office during the reign of Vinayāditya.²⁴⁰ Bhogaśakti was the governor of Purī-Koṅkaṇa when Vijayāditya was the Chālukyan overlord.

**Feudatories:** The Chālukyan rulers had a number of feudal lords of varying statuses and belonging to different dynasties. They were allowed to administer their territories in accordance with the ancient traditions and precepts. They accepted the overlordship of their paramount sovereign and paid periodical tributes.²⁴¹ They also followed the emperor with their troops during the military campaigns of the former. The feudal lords also enjoyed position and status in the court of the emperor.²⁴² The names of the territories annexed by the rulers were not changed, though the sūmantaś could be transferred from one region to another at the emperor's will.²⁴³ Such position under the Chālukyas was enjoyed by the Alūpas (Alūkas), Sindas, Sendrakas, Bāṇas, Gaṅgas, Telugu-Cholas, Nalas and others.²⁴⁴

**Local Administration**

The Chālukyan epigraphs furnish many interesting details regarding the local administration of cities and villages. This seems to suggest that the Chālukyas had not only promoted and patronised these ancient institutions but also liberalised their administrative set-up to a considerable extent. Among the informants of the Chālukyan grants we notice mahattaras, mahājanas, and mahattarādhikārins, who were probably village elders belonging to the important families who assisted the village headman in the administration of the village.²⁴⁵ The Lakshmesvar Inscription of prince Vikramāditya II refers to mahājanas, nagara and eighteen prakṛtis of the town of Puligere.²⁴⁶ Several guilds are also referred to in the Chālukyan records,²⁴⁷ which played an important role in the working of the village assemblies and municipalities.
Town Administration: A badly mutilated Stone Inscription from Lakshmesvar of the time of Vijayaditya refers to heir-apparent Vikramaditya II and the local set-up at Puligere. It records an ‘Āchāra Vyavasthe’ (charter of rights and duties) sanctioned by the heir-apparent, representing the crown, to the mahājanas, nagara and the eighteen prakṛtis (classes) of Porigere (Puligere), i.e., Lakshmesvar. The charter further specifies the position of royal officers and their relation to local bodies. The charter enjoins the officers to protect vacant houses, gifts, copper plates and also perform certain other duties. The revenue of these local bodies was derived from taxation. In this connection, the mahājanas were asked to pay a tax every year in the month of Vaiśākha to the desadhpati according to their status (the highest being ten paṇas and the lowest 3 paṇas). Middle-class householders were required to pay 5 paṇas and intermediates seven paṇas. Then it prescribes a tax to be paid by the people to a guild in the month of Kārttika. It also refers to the association of Pāṇdis and Setṭis but their exact functions are not referred to. The inscription associates the guilds of oilmen, braziers and others. It mentions the taxes to be paid by the people for some festival which might have been celebrated under the auspices of the above-mentioned local body. The occasion arose for the issue of the charter consequent to some dispute between the municipal councillors and the royal authorities. On the basis of this it could be concluded that the same type of local government was prevalent in other cities of the Chalukyan empire and mahājanas, the chiefs of the guilds, mahallakas and head of business communities constituted the assembly of a town.

Village Administration: The village has always been the lowest unit of administration. The village administration was carried on with the help of the mahājanas, mahattaras and mahattarādhikārins and gāmunḍas (village officials) who were probably appointed by the king or his representative. On the basis of the Chalukyan grants, it can be assumed that the boundaries of every village were properly demarcated. The social and economic affairs of the village were in the hands of the mahājanas (village elders), as evidenced by the Bannikop Inscription which describes Banniyyur as being governed by mahājanas. A Chalukyan Inscription mentions that prior
permission was obtained from the village mahājanas before a piece of land was transferred to the temple (Mahājana prajāsammatade-Koṭṭudu), i.e., given away with the assent of the subjects who were mahājanas.\textsuperscript{259} The village officers (gāmundas) are referred to in the Ādur inscriptions and Lakshmeśvar inscriptions of Vikramāditya II.\textsuperscript{260} According to Ghoshal, the mahattarās were the leading householders of the villages and mahattarādhikārins probably represented the executive body of the assembly of mahattaras.\textsuperscript{261} On the basis of the above details, we can say that the village assembly consisted of leading householders of the village, especially constituted to look after the social and economic aspects of village life. The gāmundas administered the villages in consultation with the mahattarādhikārin. The grāmabhogikas and grāmakūṭas were probably government officials related to the administration of the villages.\textsuperscript{262} The Ādur Inscription also refers to the Karanās (the village accountants).\textsuperscript{263} Probably these Karanās maintained the accounts of the proceeds of taxes charged from the householders of the village for the functioning of the assembly. In the absence of specific details, it is difficult to enumerate the rights and duties of village-officers and the mahattaras. The village assemblies were probably advisory bodies chiefly entrusted with the economic and social well-being of the residents.

Eighteen Prakṛtis: The Lakshmeśvar epigraph also mentions the eighteen Prakṛtis along with mahājanas and nagara. Due to its mutilated condition, it is not possible to work out the exact meaning and context of the term. Etymologically, the word prakṛti means the nature of one person towards another, habit or mode of behaviour.\textsuperscript{264} In the context of state, it means the eighteen constituents of the state. Kautilya has used this term in the official sense of eighteen tirthas—ministers.\textsuperscript{265} The Mahābhārata, the Pañcchatantra and the Rājatarangini refer to this term in the same sense.\textsuperscript{266} Occasionally, it refers to the ashta-daśa pradhāna.\textsuperscript{267} Sometimes prakṛti also means the subject. But all these meanings are not suitable in the present context of the term because yuvarāja Vikramāditya II had granted a constitution in favour of mahājanas, nagara and eighteen prakṛtis.\textsuperscript{268}

The division of population into eighteen classes is also known to us. Ashta-daśa jātis and eighteen samayas are also
referred to in the records. On the basis of above details, Barnett equates the term prakṛti with the class of people. It may be proposed that the prakṛtis connoted guilds or śrenīs forming separate vocational guilds. They have been associated with the administration from the period of the jātakas. The present record, therefore, suggests that along with the Panḍis and Setṭis, the eighteen Śreshṭhis or leaders of guilds actively participated, though in an advisory capacity as non-official members in local administration.

Administrative Officials

The administration of the vast empire was carried on with the help of various officials who were in charge of different administrative units of the Chālukyan realm. The royal officials in general were known as rājapurṣhā or rājapurusha. A few officials figured among the informants of the Chālukyan grants, while some are mentioned as drafters, writers or messengers of the royal commands. The Satara Grant of Vishnuvardhana is addressed to Vishayapati, Sāmanta, grāmabhogika and mahattara while the informants of the Manor Plates include vishayapatis, bhogikas, rāṣṭra, grāmakūta, deśallikas and mahattaras. It was drafted by Bhaṭṭa Rudranāga, who was divirapati, akshapalādhikaraṇādhikṛta and mahāśāndhivigrahadhyaśka. The Navsāri plates of Śrīyāṣraya Śilāditya add vāsavaka, āyukta and viṇiukta in the list of the Chālukyan administrative officials. A few epigraphs refer to balādhikṛta or mahābalādhikṛta, dātaka, gāmūṇḍa (gāvūṇḍa), lekhaka and karaṇas. The grants specially mention that gifted property should not be visited by Chāṭas and Bhaṭṭas. The Bagumara and Kasare Plates of Allāsakti refer to daṇḍapāśikas, gāmāgamikas and chaṇḍhikaraṇas. An official named bhogapati figures in the Navsāri grant. Goa Grant of Satyāśraya Dhruvarāja Indravarman calls him the adhipati of four Vishayamaṇḍalas and refers to an official named durgapati who had drafted the grant. The Lakshmesvar Inscription of Yuvarāja Vikramaśitya II refers to an official named deśādhhipatigala probably corresponding to Sanskrit deśādhhipati.

Divirapati: The Manor Plates of Vinayāditya Maṅgalarasa refer to this high officer of the Chālukyas. Bhaṭṭa
Rudranāga, who had drafted the grant, was holding the offices of divirapati, akshapaṭalādhikaraṇādhikṛta and mahāsāndhivigraha-
hdhyakṣa. He is further styled as niravadya parameśvara.282 This official is also referred to in the inscriptions of the
Maitrakas.283 As the name suggests, he was the head of
diviras (clerks).284 According to Kṛishnadeva, divirapati means
the chief of the secretariat.285 Since Rudranāga was also holding
the high offices of the minister for peace and war and
revenue minister, it seems probable that this post was equivalent
to the post of the present Chief Secretary.

Akshapaṭalādhikaraṇādhikṛta: This official was fairly well-
known in ancient India. He figures in the Gupta inscrip-
tions and is also mentioned with the high appellation of mahā
in the records of the rulers of the Deccan.286 His functions
are not uniformly defined. According to Kauṭilya, he was
in charge of the accounts department.287 While editing the
Gupta inscriptions, Fleet considered him to be the chief record-
keeper288 but the term assigned to the keeper of records was
pustapāla and Altekar, therefore, presumed that he was the
assistant record-keeper.289 According to Mirashi mahākshapa-
ṭalika was the head of the Records Department.290 This
official is also associated with the drafting of the inscriptions
of Harsha.291 Incidentally, Bāna refers to grāmākshapaṭalika or
the village notary in his Harsha-Charita, signifying that this
official was associated at different levels of administration.292

As regards the higher appellation of mahākshapaṭalādhikara-
ṇādhikṛta, which occurs in the inscriptions, Dr. Puri opines
that the mahākshapaṭalika, despite the higher appellation,
should be no more than a chief accounts officer dealing
with financial matters and figures.293 It may, therefore, be
suggested that this official both at the lower and the higher
levels was connected with records and accounts. In the Chāluk-
kyan administration, this official seems to have been compara-
tively elevated, although one is not certain about it. The Manor
Plate Inscription of Vinayāditya Maṅgalarasa confers on him
two additional titles—sāndhivigrahakādhyakṣa and divirapati.294
It is presumed by Kṛishnadeva, who edited the record, that he
was the revenue minister.295 This may be confirmed by the
information from the Maitraka records calling this official
mahāsāndhivigrahakaraṇapaṭalādhipati.296 Thus Kṛishnadeva's
assumption stands corroborated about this officer who was in charge of accounts and records and could rise to a higher position in the Chalukyan administrative hierarchy.

Desadhhipati: The Lakshmesvar Inscription of Prince Vikramaditya II refers to this official. He was probably the administrative officer of the territorial unit called deśa. His functions are nowhere recorded but the Lakshmesvar Inscription mentions that periodical taxes were to be paid to the desadhhipati. However, Satyāśraya Dhrurājā Indravarman is mentioned as the adhipati or head of the four vishayamanḍalas. The Desadhhipati was also in charge of collection of revenue in the provinces which also included the local areas. He might have been in charge of law and order in his area as well.

Desillakas: Among the informants of the Manor Plates of Vinayaditya Mangalarasa, we are introduced to a so far unknown official named desillaka. He figures in the record along with rāṣṭrakūṭa, grāmakūṭa and mahattaras. Krishnadeva thinks that this hitherto unknown functionary desillaka appears to be connected with the administration of deśa, a district or a subdivision. Unless new evidence comes to light, nothing definite can be said about this official, although it is quite likely that this term is synonymous with desadhhipati (desadhigārigal of the Kannada records).

Vishayapati: The Satara, Manor, Navsārī and few other inscriptions of the Chalukyas speak of this official. He is mentioned in the list of officials to whom the royal grants were conveyed. He was the head of the administrative unit Vishaya. In the records he figures along with officials like bhogika, grāmabhogika and rāṣṭrāgrāmakūṭa. The Chalukyan epigraphs are silent about his duties. Most probably he was charged with the responsibility of maintaining law and order, collecting royal taxes and realising revenue on behalf of the state. His jurisdiction was limited to the vishaya. It seems that he was assisted in his duties by a few subordinate officials. He corresponds to the present-day district officer. This official figures in the epigraphs of the Guptas and the later dynasties of the North and the Deccan. According to Sastri, vishayapatis are called desadhigārigal in the Kannada language. As head of the local unit, the vishayapati probably
represented the central authority over the area under his control.

Bhogika: The Lohner Plates of Pulakesin II, the Nasik Plates of Dharaśraya Jayasimha and the Manor Plates of Vinayāditya Maṅgalarasa refer to this official. Among the informants of the Chalukyan royal grants, we also notice an official named grāmabhogika. He is equated with the chief of villages. The meaning is in accordance with the term grāmabhogika, although bhogika seems to be higher in status than the village chief. The term bhogika stands for the technical official connected with a territorial division called bhoga. Sometimes the same official is referred to as bhogapati. It seems that he administered the area corresponding to the taluka in the Deccan. Some records also refer to a tax named bhoga. The official assigned with the task of realizing it may also be called bhogika. Nothing can definitely be said about his administrative functions, but his duties certainly included writing or engraving royal charters.

Rāṣṭrakūṭa: Incidentally, this term meaning the head of a rāṣṭra or kingdom occurs only once separately but it is generally associated with the village chief in the records; probably it suggests its lower status in the administrative hierarchy. The term Rāṣṭrakūṭa has a long history and the official holding this title was an important personality. According to Fleet, Rāṣṭrakūṭa means the head of a rāṣṭra or a vishaya or a province. In the Chalukyan records, this term always occurs along with grāmakūṭas, i.e., village officials. So he does not appear to be a high official. In the Vakataka inscriptions, the rāṣṭra denotes a district, as villages are said to be situated in the rāṣṭra. So it appears that the official named rāṣṭrakūṭa was the administrator of the unit known as rāṣṭra.

Grāmakūṭa: Among the informants of the royal grant, grāmakūṭa is also mentioned. As the word suggests, he was an official related to the administration of a grāma, i.e., a village. Ghoshal takes it as a village headman. He was probably the chief of bigger villages. The records immediately refer to the mahattaras in the royal charters, so they seem to be village officials probably serving as an administrative link between bhogika and mahattaras, i.e., the elders of the village.

Gāmuṇḍas: This official is referred to in two Ādur Ins-
criptions and the Lakshmesvar Inscription of the heir-apparent Vikramādiya II. He was governing the lowest unit of the Chālukyan administrative set-up. This officer served as the emperor’s representative in the village and worked as a link between the village assembly and royal officials. He being the village officer was probably responsible for law and order in the village. The gāvundās or gāmundas were appointed by the king’s government to restrict the power of the mahājanas for exercising control over them. Nothing can, however, definitely be said about their routine functions.

Grāmabhogika: In the Satara Grant of Vishnuvardhana grāmabhogikas are included among the informants of the royal grant bestowed by Vishnuvardhana. As the name suggests, he was the village official. The lexicons describe him as the “Chief of the Village”. Probably he was lower in rank than the bhogika or bhogapati. He could be identified with gāmundā (the village officer) mentioned in the Adur Inscription, but this surmise is doubtful.

Karanaś: The Adur Inscription mentions the karanas, who had joined the gāmundas to request to MādHAVATTHARASA to secure the latter’s permission for the grant of some land to the temple of Jinendra. Karaṇa also means clerk or village accountant. The karanas, as mentioned in an inscription from the South, were assigned the main task of looking after state funds. The expenditure and revenue of the local bodies were looked after by them under the Chālukyas.

Balādhikrta or Mahābalādhikrta: The Surat Plates of Śrīśrāya Silāditya and Navsārī Plates of Pulakeśirāja refer to this official. The Navsārī Plates describe that the grant was written by Mahāsāndhivigrahika Bappabhaṭṭi, who was also holding the office of Mahābalādhikrta. In the Surat Plates, two Balādhikritas named Ammagopa and Chella are referred to but the latter is also described as a ṍūtaka. This officer figures in several records and in literature. He is generally equated with Chief Commander. Dr. Puri suggests that he was an officer attached to the secretariat for handling the military department. The place of occurrence in the Chālukyan records suggests that he was an army officer also assigned with a few civil jobs in the administration.

Dūtaka: This official is usually equated with messenger or
ambassador, entrusted with conveyance of the royal grants in a few Chālukyan epigraphs. Generally, mahābalādhikṛta, balādhikṛta or sāndhivigrahika is assigned the job of a dūtaka. This association suggests the importance and status of this office. As regards his duties, Fleet remarks that the dūtaka's office was to carry not the actual charter itself, for delivery into the hands of the grantees, but the king's sanction and order to the local officials, whose duty it was then to have the charter drawn up and delivered. Durgapati: The Goa Grant of Satyāśraya Dhruvarāja Indravarman refers to Vijayarāja who is described as Durgapati. It means the officer-in-charge of the fort. The Chālukyan epigraphs speak about a few forts and mention the fortification of the capital city of Badami. Probably he was identical with Koṭṭapāla of the inscriptions These forts were the strongholds of the Chālukyan army and the durgapati was entrusted with the responsibility of administration of a durga or fort. In the present state of our knowledge, it is difficult to say whether he was appointed by the crown or by the provincial chiefs. There is also nothing definite about his responsibilities and functions.

Dānapāṣika: The Kasare Plates of Allāṣakti, a feudatory of the Chālukyas, notice this official but he is not mentioned in the official Chāluṅyan records. Several inscriptions of the North Indian royal dynasties also refer to this official. As the prefix dāṇḍa suggests, he was an official who dealt with crime and punishment. So it seems that this official looked after the apprehension of criminals and punishing them.

Chaurādhikaraṇa: In the above referred Plates of Allāṣakti, an official named Chaurādhikaraṇa also figures in the list of informants of the charter. The same official is also mentioned in the records of the Gupta kings and other North Indian rulers. He was probably an officer of the criminal investigation department appointed to apprehend culprits and produce them before the law courts. However, nothing can be stated definitely about his functions and duties.

Chāṭas and Bhāṭas: Several Chālukyan grants mention these officials and record that gifted property should not be visited by the Chāṭas and Bhāṭas. A bhāṭa means a soldier and a chāṭa probably means policeman. Some scholars regard them as
signifying armed troops, while others equate them with regular and irregular soldiers. Probably the chātas and bhaṭas were the policemen working under the supervision of police officials like dandaśikas and chaṭṭhabhikaraṇas. They were ordinary members of the police force. Their duties included keeping watch over habitual criminals and apprehending them.

Vāsavaka: The Navsāri Plates of Avanījanāśraya Pulakesi-rāja include this official among the informants of the grant. The Kaira Plates of Vijayarāja also refer to an officer named vāsapaka. According to Mirashi, he was apparently an officer whose duty was to arrange for the residence of the touring official and strangers. Nothing can be said definitely about his other functions.

Vinayuktaka: The Vinayuktaka or āyuktaka literally means appointed by the king. These officials also figure in the inscriptions of the Gupta and other North Indian dynasties. In the Chālukyan epigraphs, these are used in reference to court announcing the ratnas received by the king. Āyukta also figures among the informants of the grant. So he seems to be a subordinate officer either attached to the court or the revenue department.

Gomāgamika: The Kasare Grant of Allāṣakti refers to this officer among the informants of the royal grant. According to Mirashi, he superintended the egress and ingress of travellers and was the inspector of passports. He appears to be the same official whom Kurūtīya calls mudrādhyakaśa.

Judicial Administration

The Chālukyan king as usual was the supreme court of justice. He was most fitted to the task, being well-versed in the smṛtis and dharmaśāstras. He seems to have been assisted by the administrative officials. This does not mean that there were no law courts below him. He was the highest appellate court in civil matters and could equally take cognizance of complaints of a criminal nature. Besides the court at the centre, there were also probably the lower courts for administering justice in several units of administration, known as bhoga, vishaya, rāṣṭra and deśa. Probably their heads served as highest judicial authority in their respective domains.
An inscription belonging to a Chālukyan feudatory refers to the commitment of offences and punishment prescribed for them. There were elders in the village and towns whose help and assistance was sought in these matters. They seem to have been associated with the village pañchāyats or people's courts. The Chālukyan records, however, refer to some police officials and prescribe fines for certain crimes. This could be possible only through some legal agency which naturally must have been the court of justice, where the criminals were brought by police officials for purposes of trial.

Crime and Punishment

The purpose of these trials and punishment was both deterrent and retributive to prevent further commitment of crime by the same person and to reform him into a good citizen. It was necessary in this context to have some regulated code of procedure on which the inscriptions are silent. The Chālukyan records refer to fines imposed for commission of certain crimes. The Lakshmēśvar Inscription of Vikramāditya II refers to fines for theft and other minor offences numbering ten. It is not certain if the money so realised was paid into the royal treasury or to some local guilds. The same fact could be traced in the Añjanerī Plates of Bhogaśakti, a feudatory of the Chālukyas. It also refers to a fine of 108 rūpakas for violence against an unmarried woman and 80 rūpakas for adultery and 16 for grievous hurt and 4 rūpakas for minor head injury. It is interesting to find the rule of law prevalent in the administration of justice. Thus, an affluent merchant having illegal relations with a labour woman was fined as highly as 108 rūpakas or whatever was fixed by eight or sixteen mahallakas of the town.

A few records discovered at Paṭṭaḍakal reveal that offenders were punished with ex-communication and loss of caste and the forfeiture of the property of the accused. There could be certain exceptions for skilful persons who were outcast, who could as well be readmitted into the original caste. Hiuen-Tsang, referring to the soldiers, says, if one of the champions meets a man and kills him, the laws of the country do not punish him. It indirectly makes it evident that murder was
punishable with capital punishment but immunity was granted to soldiers. A Badami Inscription refers to the penalty for breach of contract. It is narrated that two-thousand-membered mahāchaturavidyā samudāya of Vātāpi had remitted the spoils of the cobblers of the place in favour of Nidiyamara. A breach of this order is threatened with penalty. This is what we could gather from the records about a few crimes and penalties prescribed for them. Significantly enough, the dynastic records do not mention anything about the apprehension of criminals and the procedure by which culprits and defaulters were charged and finally punished.

Inter-State Relations

In ancient times, the country was divided into a number of states and these occasionally clashed with one another for supremacy. The ancient political thinkers in this context propounded the mandala theory for regulating the relations between the neighbouring and distant states with a view to maintaining some sort of a balance of power in the country. This theory ordains that two neighbouring states are natural enemies of each other, whereas the states on either side of the enemy state are natural friends. The truth of this maxim is noticed in the history of the Chalukyas as well. The relations between the Chalukyas and their immediate neighbours, both to the North and the South, were usually hostile. But they tried to maintain friendly relations with distant powers like Iran, Simhala and China and the Cholas, Pāṇḍyas and Keralas in the South.

The Chalukyas as such were not living in isolation. They had evolved a foreign policy in their relationship with their neighbours. This is evident from the reference to the minister for peace and war in every important decision taken by the crown. Such a policy was calculated to take the administration into confidence and also to deprive the enemy of any support which he could expect against the native ruler. An instance of this policy might be traced in the establishment of diplomatic relations between the Chalukyan ruler Pulakesin II and his Persian contemporary against Harsha of the North. This incident is confirmed by the writings of the Persian historian.
Tabari, who mentions that in the 35th year of the reign of Khusru Perviz II (A.D. 625-26), an Indian king ‘Pharmish’ or ‘Parameśa’ sent an ambassador carrying letters and presents to the monarch and his sons. The return embassy to the Chālukyan court is probably depicted in Ajantā Cave No. 1. The envoy might have taken the sea-route to avoid going through the kingdom of Harsha. This event, according to Saleto, might be dated in the year A.D. 626. We come across statements in the Chālukyan records that Vinayāditya extracted tributes from the rulers of Kamera (or Kaver), Pārasika and Sinhala. It is quite possible that the Ceylonese princes might have received some sort of help from the Pallavas, Pāṇḍyas, with the acknowledgement and support of the Chālukyas. We can presume that Vinayāditya might have intervened in the affairs of Ceylon. It is possible, as suggested by Saleto, that it involved indirect suzerainty of the Chālukyas over Ceylon during this period. The reference to the levying of tribute by king Vinayāditya from the island-dwellers called Pārasikas and Ceylon points to the oceanic enterprise of that monarch, and hints towards the continuity of the relations between the peoples of India and Persia. Saleto proposes that Kamera is to be understood as the Kannada rendering of Khmer, a part of Cambodia in Indo-China. He also proposes that after subduing a lord of Uttarāpatha, Vinayāditya might have gone to Cambodia by the sea-route. But in the absence of definite evidence at our disposal, the conquest of such a distant kingdom is not free from doubt. He conjectures that it is not unlikely that Vinayāditya might have sent an embassy to China through Funān or Cambodia.

Ma-Twan-Lin refers to an Indian ruler named Tche-Leou-K’I-Pa-Lo (Chi-lu-khi-pa-lo), who had sent an ambassador to the court of the Chinese emperor Kao-Tsung. Chavannes identified this Indian king with the Chālukya Vallabha and assigned A.D. 692 as the date of the embassy from Western India. This falls in the reign of Vinayāditya and this provides an interesting detail about the political and cultural contacts between the Chālukyas and the external powers. It therefore suggests that Vinayāditya maintained diplomatic relations with the rulers of China. Another point worth mentioning in this context is the role of matrimonial relations in cementing diplomatic ties. The
Chālukyas strove in this direction with zeal and earnestness. In fact, it might be quoted here as, for example, the Honnur Copper Plates of Vikramāditya I inform us that the daughter of Vikramāditya’s elder brother Raṇarāgavarman was married to a Kadamba prince, thus establishing closer ties with a Southern power. Other instances are those of Pulakeśin I who had married a Batpura princess named Durlabhadevi. Kīrttivarman I’s spouse was a Sendraka princess. The queens of Vikramāditya II named Lokamahādevi and Trailokyamahādevi belonged to the Haihaya family. These relations were always helpful in times of need, as we find king Durvinita of the Gaṅga family helping Vikramāditya I in restoring the fallen fortunes of the Chālukyas.

Besides establishing matrimonial relations, the Chālukyas were equally particular in making friends with contemporary powers for political gains. According to the Aihole Prasasti, Pulakeśin II crossed the Kāveri after defeating the Pallavas, entered into friendly relations with the Cholas, Pāṇḍyas and Keralas to contain the influence of the Pallavas. Geographical factors, however, were not helpful in this regard, as we find the Chālukyas losing their established ground. The Chālukyas also seem to have resorted to espionage both in their domain and in the territories of the enemies to gain useful information. The inscriptions of the Later Chālukyas of Kalyāṇi provide considerable information on this point, but there is nothing definite in the absence of information from the Chālukyan records.
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