CHAPTER FOURTEEN

THE GANGAS, KADAMBAS, BĀNAS AND OTHER CONTEMPORARY DYNASTIES

I. THE GANGAS

The dynastic name of Gaṅgas was borne by two distinct royal families, one ruling in Gaṅgavādī (East Mysore country) from about A.D. 400 and the other in Kaliṅga from A.D. 500 or a little later. The Gaṅgas of Kaliṅga claim kinship with those of Mysore, though in fact the origin of both the lines is involved in much obscurity. Late and contradictory legends dating from the eleventh century are of little value to history, and we need not linger over the details of the Mysore legends which trace the line to an Ikshvāku origin, speak of the migration of its founders from Ujjain, their arrival at Gaṅga Pērūr in Cuddapah district, their encounter with the Jaina ascetic Simhanandi, and their final settlement at Kuvalālapura (Kolār); or the legends of Kaliṅga tracing descent ultimately from the kings of the lunar line named Yavāti and Turvasu, and more proximately from the Gaṅgas of Kolār. It is also uncertain whether the two lines of kings had any connection with the Ganganarīdae of the Greek writers who seem to have used the term to describe the people of the lower Ganges and not to a ruling dynasty, though Pliny the Elder seems to connect a branch of the tribe with Kaliṅga. All legends agree in interposing Gaṅga somewhere in the genealogy in its mythical part. The Gaṅga crest was the elephant.

Early Gaṅga history has suffered much from the existence of many obviously spurious copper-plate grants with unusually early Śaka dates, ranging from 169 to 388, which has cast a suspicion on the other records also, and it is possible that even some genuine records were thrown overboard by critical students of Gaṅga history like Fleet. An undoubtedly early and genuine record, the Penugonda plates of Mādhava-varman, was discovered in 1915, as Fleet himself acknowledged. Since then the whole position has been reconsidered and fresh copper-plates have gained admission into the rank of authentic records of early Gaṅga history. There is, however, still room for differences on the genealogy of the early Gaṅgas, and the following account of the Gaṅgas of Mysore, the Western Gaṅgas as they are sometimes called, is based, for the early period, only on
these records which contain no legendary matter whatever, not even
the fairly early legend of the founder of the line cutting a stone pillar
into two by a lusty blow of his sword. The chronology, which is
tentative, rests on the palaeography of the genuine records corrobo-
rated by general probabilities of history.¹ All the early inscriptions of
the line are in the Sanskrit language.

Konkanivarman (c. A.D. 400-25), the first ruler of the Jāhnaveya Kula,
is said to have belonged to the Kāṇḍāvana gotra, to have been adorned
by wounds received in the suppression of fierce enemies, and to
have created a kingdom inhabited by a noble population (sujana
janapada) by the victorious progress of his arms. He is also called
Dharmamahādhirāja, possibly an index of his independent status.²
Late and doubtful records mention his initiation into the Jaina
doctrine (Syādvāda) by Simhanandi at the Pārśvanātha basadi in
Sravana Belgola;³ but this is in direct contradiction to the invocation
to Vishnu with which the early records of a genuine character begin.
The Udayéndiram plates of Prithivipati II say that Koikani was
anointed for the conquest of the Bānamandala,⁴ and other records
describe him as ‘a wild fire to the Bāna stubble’.⁵ But the statements
are vague; we do not hear for instance who anointed Koikani for
the conquest of the Bānamandala; and though we hear of Kadamba
Mayūrasarman levying tribute from the Brhad Bānas about the mid-
dle of the fourth century, and the Gaṅgas and Bānas are often found
fighting one another in later times, the silence of the early records
on such an important event may justify the suspicion that we have
here an instance of the early history of the dynasty being revised
in the light of later events. It must be admitted, however, that from
eye times both these lines of rulers lay claim to lordship of the
Nandi hills (Nandagarinātha) and of the area round about Kolār
(Kuvalālapura). The Koṅgudēśa Rājakkal, a compilation of the early
nineteenth century made in response to Col. Mackenzie’s demand
for historical literature, seeks to explain the name Koikani by attribut-
ing to him rule over the Koṅgu country, a mere guess, no more
entitled to credence than the more modern surmise of Jayaswal that
the king got the name ‘for having come recently from Koṅkaṇa’.⁶

² Śasanaikōta, EI. XXIV. 234, Penugonda, EI. XIV, 332.
³ EC. II, 67 which gives the esoteric meaning of the miracle of the stone pillar.
⁵ EC. IX, Db. 67 (Mallolahili)
⁶ History of India a.d. 150-350, p. 198.
at Talakāḍ, on the Kāveri, nearer the hostile frontier of the Kadambas against whom they waged war under their suzerains, the Pallavas.

The genealogy of the early Gaṅgas is quite definite in the early and genuine records, though some scholars hesitate, rather unaccountably, to follow this clear line. The view that a branch of the Gaṅgas ruled at Parigi in the Anantapur district has no more support for it than the location in Paru Vishaya of the properties granted in the Sāsana-kotā and Penugonda plates.

Koṅkaṇi was succeeded by his son Mādhava I (A.D. 425-50) who issued the Sāsana-kotā plates in the first year of his reign and the Kandasala grant in the ninth. He is said to have inherited the great qualities of his father, and possessed a well cultivated mind proficient in all śāstras, particularly nitiśāstra (politics). The righteous rule over his subjects was, we learn, the sole aim of his having taken charge of the kingdom. He was a great patron of learning and poetry. Later tradition attributes to him a vṛitti (gloss) on Dattakasūtra by which may be meant either the work on erotics which, according to Vatsyāyana, Dattaka composed at the request of the heaer of Pāṭaliputra, or possibly a sūtra on adoption. Mādhava I was followed on the throne by his son Ārva-varman (c. 450-70), a great warrior and scholar, who was anointed duly by the Pallava king Siṅha-varman, most probably the first ruler of that name who ruled at Kāṇchi. The occasion for Pallava intervention can only be guessed as it is nowhere stated clearly. We find another son of Mādhava I by name (Vijaya) Krishṇa-varman issuing two grants in his first and second regnal years, and it seems probable that a dispute between the two brothers was settled by the Pallava monarch. Another possibility is that the relations between the Gaṅgas and Kadambas became strained, and in order to secure the support of the Pallavas, Ārya-varman entered into a subordinate alliance with them. Later grants of the line which call him Hari-varman and state that he removed the Gaṅga capital to Talakāḍ lend some support to the second hypothesis. In any case, both Ārva-varman and his brother Krishṇa-varman were allied to the Pallava Siṅha-varman, and named their sons after him. Siṅha-varman, the son of Krishṇa-varman, is known from the Chukuttir grant in which he calls himself mahādhirāja and makes a grant of land on his birth-day as a memorial gift after the death of Yuvarāja Viṣṇu-varman, his younger brother and an unparalleled warrior.

7 See, e.g., MAR, 1930, notes to No. 3.
8 MAR, 1925, No. 115.
9 Vidhiṇi in Kudlur, MAR, 1930, No. 88, L, 5, and yathārthah in Penugonda pl.
11 MAR, 1924, p. 79.
According to the genuine records Ārya-varman was followed by his son Mādhava II alias Siṁha-varman. Later records introduce at this point a certain Vishnugopa as the son of Harivarman, and make Mādhava the son of Vishnugopa. Rice, while editing the Penugonda plates thought that Vishnugopa was omitted in that record by mistake; but the discovery of the Kūḍlūr grant which confirms the Penugonda genealogy shows that the mistake is on the side of the later records which introduce Vishnugopa, another Pallava name, into the early Gaṅga genealogy. The correct view of early Gaṅga history therefore seems to be that after Mādhava I, the line divided into two for a time and sought the alliance of the Pallavas, both events probably due to one and the same reason—fear of the Kadambas. Ārya-varman ruled from Talakāl, and Krishṇa-varman from Kolār. The same arrangement continued under their sons Mādhava II and Siṁha-varman. Mādhava II was crowned by the Pallava Skanda-varman as we learn from the Penugonda and Kūḍlūr records. But some time later, there came about two important changes. Siṁha-varman of Kolār apparently died soon after his younger brother Yuvarāja Vira-varman without an heir, and the Gaṅga kingdom became united again under Mādhava II, called Taḍāṅgāla Mādhava in later records. Secondly, the tension between the Kadambas and Gaṅgas ceased as a result of the policy of dynastic alliances pursued by Kadamba Kākustha-varman who brought joy into many royal households including that of the Guptas by bestowing his daughters on them. One of these princesses, a sister of Krishṇa-varman I, was married to Mādhava II, and the child of this union was Avinīta who was anointed as king in his mother’s lap (c. a.D. 520.) The alliance between the Gaṅgas and Kadambas meant perhaps the termination of the Pallava overlordship over the Gaṅgas; but Pallava history becomes very obscure about this time. Avinīta (undisciplined) is a curious name and is explained in a record of Śrīpursha’s reign as ‘Avinīta only in respect of the hosts of ill-behaved kings’.12 He had a long reign but no events of any importance, either during his minority or later, are recorded. His chief queen was a princess of Punnāta, Jyesṭhā by name, daughter of one Skanda-varman. The Hosakote plates purport to record a gift to a Jaina temple set up by the mother of Siṁhavishnu in the twelfth year of Avinīta’s reign,13 but it is not free from suspicion and might well be a modern fake calculated to support the evidence of the Avanti-Sundari-Kathāsāra on the contemporaneity of Vishnuvardhana, Durviniita, and Siṁhavishnu which has been received with great reserve by critical scholars. In view of the legend that Avinīta was proclaimed by a

12 MAR. 1920, p. 23 Narasiṁharājapura.
13 MAR. 1938, pp. 80-84.
heavenly voice to be a śatajñā,\textsuperscript{14} a declaration which he proved by successfully crossing the Kāverī in full flood, we may take it that his reign lasted till A.D. 605 when he was succeeded by his son Durvinīta (ill-behaved), a name even more curious than that of his father and explained in a similar way by the late inscription already noted. His real name was Mādhava-varman, and he had a dispute with an unnamed half-brother who had been appointed to the throne by his father. In a civil war marked by several battles at Andari, Ālattur and other places he came out victorious and celebrated the victory by the performance of hiranjagarbha.\textsuperscript{15} Durvinīta had to make his peace with the rising power of the Chālukyas of Bādāmi. The Aihole inscription of Pulakeśin II only says that the Gaṅga and the Ālupa were constant attendants of Pulakeśin II; but a later Gaṅga inscription gives more details of Durvinīta’s relations with the Chālukyas. It says that having captured the Kāduveṭṭi who was disturbing the peace of the world like Rāvana, Durvinīta established his own daughter’s son in the hereditary kingdom of Jayasiṃhavallabha, and thus became formidable in the world. This is obviously a reference to the recovery of the Bādāmi throne by Vikramāditya I, the son of Pulakeśin II, after the confusion caused by the invasion of the Bādāmi kingdom by Pallava Narasiṃha I. We thus see that Durvinīta gave one of his daughters in marriage to Pulakeśin II, and after his tragic death (A.D. 642) in the siege of Bādāmi, Durvinīta supported his grandson Vikramāditya in the task of clearing the kingdom of the Pallava invaders and restoring its unity (A.D. 655). This was one of the last acts of Durvinīta.\textsuperscript{17} Earlier he had succeeded to the Punnāta kingdom whence his mother came, and he took the title ‘lord of Punnāta’ some time before his twentieth regnal year; this must have been due to the failure of succession in Skanda-varman’s line. In the Kavirājāmārga of Nṛpatuniga (Amoghavarsha) Durvinīta is mentioned as a great prose writer in Kannada, and tradition credits him also with the authorship of a Sanskrit version of the Brihatkathā, a commentary on the fifteenth canto of Bhāravi’s Kirātārjunīya, and a Śabdāvatāra.

The reigns of Mushkara (Mokkara) and Śrīvākrama were uneventful. The son of Śrīvākrama, by name Bhūvākrama, ruled from 665-79 and assisted the Chālukya Vikramāditya I in his war against the Pallava Paramēśvara-varman I. Paramēśvara’s attempt to arrest the invasion, which advanced by way of the Gaṅga country, failed, and at the battle of Vīlande in the Tumkur district, Bhūvākrama seized from the Pallava a precious necklace containing a famous gem called ‘Ugro-

\textsuperscript{14} EC, VIII, No. 35; VII, Sh. 4 & 64.
\textsuperscript{15} MAR. 1924 Nallala gr., and 1942 Pennaur gr.
\textsuperscript{16} EC, VIII Nagar, 35.
\textsuperscript{17} Triveni, I, 112-20.
daya'. Bhūvikrama was succeeded by his younger brother Śivamāra I (679-725) whose reign was evidently peaceful.

He was followed on the throne by his grandson Śrīpurusha, as his son Eregāṇa seems to have predeceased him. Śrīpurusha was one of the ablest monarchs of the line and enjoyed a long reign of well over fifty years. He had princes of Bāṇa origin serving as his feudatories in Kalbapunāḍu 1700 near Śravaṇa Belgola. Śrīpurusha cooperated with his Chālukya suzerains in their wars against the Pallavas. An inscription from Uḷchala in the Kurnool district (A.D. 730-31) states that yuvrāja Vikramādiya II levied tribute from the Pallava king Parameśvara-varman II after conquering Kāṇchī, and on his way back made a gift of two villages to Durvinita-Ereypa of the Koṅgūni family. The prince last named was doubtless the same as Duggamāra or Ereypa, a son of Śrīpurusha, and the gift recorded was clearly a reward earned by the Gaṅgas for their share in the conquest of Kāṇchī. Parameśvara-varman must have invaded Gaṅgavāḍi soon after the Gaṅga and Chālukya forces withdrew from Kāṇchī and met his fate on the historic field of Vilandē where Śrīpurusha is said to have killed the Kāḍuvaṇṭī of Kāṇchī and seized the royal umbrella of the enemy together with the title of Perumāṇaḍi. The death of Parameśvara-varman was a serious disaster. He left no successor behind and there ensued the search for a king on the part of the officials and nobles of the Pallava kingdom and the installation of Nandi-varman II Pallavamalla (A.D. 732). Some years later, about 740, came the famous expedition of Vikramādiya II against Kāṇchī; the cooperation of Śrīpurusha in this expedition also seems to be attested by two undated and fragmentary stone inscriptions from Mysore. When Nandi-varman II had surmounted his troubles and stabilized his position, he remembered the hostile act of Śrīpurusha and invaded Gaṅgavāḍi. The Pallava was aided on this occasion by his Bāṇa feudatory Jayanandi-varman. The date of the expedition is indicated by a vīrakal (hero-stone) inscription dated in the fifty-second year of Nandi-varman’s reign (A.D. 784). We learn from the Tāṇḍantottam plates of Nandi-varman dated six years later that he defeated the Gaṅga king and compelled him to surrender the necklace containing the gem ugrodaya which had been seized by Bhūvikrama from

18 IA, XIV, 229; MAR, 1924 No. 80; 1925, No. 105; 1927, No. 118.
19 EC, III, Md. 113.
20 EC, IV, Ng. 85.
21 MAR, 1927, No. 118.
22 Ancient India, No. 5, p. 54.
23 Ed. VIII Nagar 35 (A.D. 1077), pp. 251 (text) and 135 (trm.).
24 MAR, 1939, No. 23; 1941, No. 45.
25 EI, XXII, 113.
Parameśvara-varman I at Vilandē. We may infer from the Bāna records of the time that Śripurusha had to surrender some of his territory to the Pallava conqueror who handed it over to his Bāna adjutant Jayanandi-varman.

Earlier, Śripurusha attempted to curb the aggression of Pāṇḍya Rājasīhīna I in the Koṅgu country and sought the aid of Chālukya Kṛiti-varman II in the task. But the allies sustained a defeat in the battle of Venbāi (c. 750) and Śripurusha had to make his peace with the Pāṇḍya king by offering the hand of his daughter to the son of Rājasīhīna. Some years later Śripurusha had to face an invasion by the newly established rulers of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa dynasty who, having displaced the Chālukyas, naturally sought to assert their supremacy over all the territory that had obeyed the Chālukyas. Kṛiṣṇa I invaded Gaṅgavāḍi from the north, and the resistance offered by Siyagalla, the son of Śripurusha, could not prevent Kṛiṣṇa from occupying Maṇne-nagara in the heart of the Gaṅga territory. The Gaṅga had to submit and, according to contemporary practice, was left in charge of his kingdom on acknowledging the suzerainty of the invader. Two records, bearing Saka dates 710 and 720 (A.D. 788 and 798), apparently refer themselves to the reign of Śripurusha; but as Śripurusha’s records are generally dated in his regnal years, as the last inscription so dated mentions only his fiftieth year, and the evidence of the records of his successors leaves no room for any doubt that Śripurusha’s reign came to an end soon after 775 and certainly before 780, we have to ignore the two inscriptions with the Saka dates whatever their true explanation may be.

Śripurusha’s reign witnessed great changes in the neighbouring kingdoms. The failure of heirs in the direct line of Siṅhavishnu led to a period of uncertainty and confusion in the Pallava kingdom which was ended by the choice of a young prince from a collateral line, Nandi-varman II Pallavamalla, to the throne (c. A.D. 732). In the north there came some time later the political revolution by which the Rāṣṭrakūṭa Dantidurgā overthrew the Chālukya Kṛiti-varman II and established his own dynasty in power (A.D. 754). Śripurusha was not slow to take advantage of these opportunities and extend his rule over Koṅgu in the south and the Sinda country in the north which we find mentioned in some of his records. Though he had to

26 SII, II, 557.
27 India Antiqua, 254-56.
28 MAR, 1910 (Hirugundagal inscription), and EC, XII, Mi. 99, Telagaon plates of Kṛiṣṇa I—El. XIII, 275-82.
29 MAR, 1918, p. 42 (Haikar); 1933 (Baśavaṭṭi)
29a This date is a disputed point. V. V. Mirashi pushes back the date to 715 (POC, XV) while Nilakanta Sastri puts it as 752 or 753 (History of South India, p. 150) (Editor).
acknowledge the suzerainty of the Pallavas and the Rāśṭrākūṭas when they invaded his territory, we find that he was the first Gaṅga monarch to assume imperial titles, his full style being: Königavivarman Dharma Mahārajadhīrāja Paramesvara Śrīpurusha Mahārāja.30 In the records of the reign Śrīpurusha is credited with the authorship of a treatise on elephant lore (gaṇḍāstra).

After a war of succession between Śivamāra II and Duggamāra Ereyappa, two sons of Śrīpurusha, the former was crowned (A.D. 778) king by Govinda II and Pallavamalla. But very soon he incurred the hostility of Dhruva for his part in supporting Govinda II in a war against Dhruva, and this resulted in a long period of captivity for him in a Rāśṭrākūṭa prison. During this period another brother of Śivamāra, by name Vijayāditya, administered the country loyally for his brother like Bharata ruling Ayodhyā during the exile of Raṇa,31 but a Rāśṭrākūṭa viceroy was imposed over him; this was Kaṁbha Raṇāvaloka, the eldest son of Dhruva. Śivamāra was released from prison by Govinda III when he succeeded Dhruva as emperor, but Śivamāra made common cause with Kaṁbha who rebelled against the new emperor (A.D. 793-94). The victorious Govinda consigned Śivamāra once more to prison, though Kaṁbha was restored to his viceroyalty of Gaṅga country. Set free once more by Amogavarsha I soon after his accession (A.D. 813), Śivamāra accepted the position of a feudatory under the Rāśṭrākūṭa and fought the wars of his suzerain against the Eastern Chālukya Vijayāditya II Narendra Mrigarāja. Śivamāra was succeeded in 817 by his brother Vijayāditya’s son Rājamalla I, his own elder son Mārasiṁha having predeceased him. Śivamāra was celebrated as a scholar and yogī by his contemporaries; he was a patron of poets and scholars.

The younger son of Śivamāra known as Prithivipati I got some part of the country in the south including König with Talakād as capital to rule as separate charge, and he became the founder of a collateral line which acknowledged Pallava supremacy at first and then passed under the Cholas, while the main Gaṅga kingdom continued under Rājamalla and his successors in subordinate alliance with the Rāśṭrākūṭas. But Rājamalla I himself (817-35) and his son Nītimārga began with wars against Amoghavarsha I, an untired boy at the time of his accession to the Rāśṭrākūṭa throne. Prithivipati I appears to have made common cause with Nītimārga (A.D. 837-70) as the Udayēndirām grant of his grandson states that he gave protection to Iriga against the anger of Amoghavarsha;32 this incident was doubtless connected with the campaigns of the Rāśṭrākūṭa general

30 EC, IV, Hg. 4. 31 EC, IV, Yd. 60; XII, Nj. 269. 32 SI, II, 383, v. 16.
Baṅkeśa in the Gaṅga country (Chapter XVI). It seems probable that Baṅkeśa first encountered Nītimārga in his capital Maṇṇenagara and then proceeded against Prīthivīpati in his capital Talakāḍ. To this campaign also belongs the battle of Vaimbahuli, in which Prīthivīpati displayed his heroism by wielding his sword with great effect and cutting off a piece of bone from his own body and throwing it into the river. As a feudatory of the Pallavas, Prīthivīpati took part in Aparājita's war against the Pāṇḍya king Varaguna II and fought and fell in the battle of Śrī Purambiyam (A.D. 880) after securing the victory for his suzerain. A daughter of Prīthivīpati I, by name Kundavai, became the queen of Bāna Vidyādhara Vikramādiya I Jayameru, also a Pallava feudatory. Prīthivīpati's son Mārasimha seems to have predeceased his father, leaving his son Prīthivīpati II (880-940) to become king after his grandfather. The early years of his reign witnessed the downfall of Pallava power before the onslaught of Chola Āditya I and the consequent transfer of his allegiance to the Chola conqueror. Soon after the accession of Parāntaka I to the Chola throne (A.D. 907), the Rāṣṭrakūṭa Krishṇa II invaded the Chola dominions with the aid of the Bāṇas and Vaidūrības, as he wished to support the claims of his grandson Kannaradeva, a half-brother of Parāntaka, to the Chola throne; in the battle of Vailāla (Tiruvallam) in the Bāna country (N. Arcot) that followed (A.D. 911-12) Prīthivīpati II greatly distinguished himself, and his success against the invaders was rewarded by his grateful suzerain who bestowed the Bāna country on him together with the title of Bāṇādhirāja. Prīthivīpati II, also called Hastimalla, continued to rule as a loyal subordinate of Parāntaka until his death about 940. After Prīthivīpati's death troubles fell thick on Parāntaka who lost a half of his dominions to Rāṣṭrakūṭa Krishṇa III after the battle of Takkolam (A.D. 949). Prīthivīpati's son and successor Nanniya Gāṇga had to face a Nolamba-Rāṣṭrakūṭa invasion of his territory, and acknowledge Nolamba suzerainty. He died fighting against the Sāntaras on behalf of the Nolamba about A.D. 955. That was the end of the collateral Gaṅga line of Talakāḍ.

Rājamalla's records show two starting points for his reign, one in A.D. 817 and another two years later; the former was the date when he became yuvārāja, ruling the kingdom for his father Vijayāditya, the latter, the date of his kingship in his own right after his father's demise. Though there seems to be no reason to suppose, as has been done by some, that Rājamalla and Prīthivīpati I fell out and

33 Ibid., v, 17.
34 Ibid., v, 18.
35 SII, III, 99.
36 Manne grant MAR, 1910, and Perjarāṇgī grant, MAR, 1942.
fought a civil war, we find them ranged on opposite sides in the conflicts of minor princes—the former supporting the Nolambas and Telugu-Chōdas, and the latter taking the side of the Bānas and Vaiduṇbas, round about A.D. 825, when an important engagement at Soremaḍī (modern Cholemari in the Penugonda taluk of the Anantapur district), after which the advantage lay with the party supported by Pṛthivipati, as will be seen in more detail in the section on the Bānas. Rājamalla’s hostility to the Bānas led to the invasion of their country by his son-in-law Polaḷchola Nolamba (825-75) who advanced up to Vallimalai near Tiruvallam in the heart of the Bāna country, if not up to Kāṇchi, as the inscription of Rājamalla claims. A record of Rājamalla at Vallimalai mentions the excavation of a Jaina cave on the hill under his orders. The name of the agrahāras called after Rājamalla, Śrīpurusha and Raṇavikrama in the same neighbourhood may also be taken to commemorate this expedition. Hostilities appear to have been continued by Rājamalla’s son Nītimārga who claims a victory against the Bānas at Murggėpāḍi in the Kolār district. But the Bānas soon regained their independence under Vikramāditya I, the ablest prince of the line.

The main event of Rājamalla’s reign was his effort to throw off the Rāshṭrakūṭa yoke with the assistance of the Nolambas with whom he had dynastic connections. The effort was successful for a time. The sphere of the Rāshṭrakūṭa viceroyalty of Gaṅgavāḍi became much restricted, and a new era of political freedom seemed to dawn on the Gaṅga country which was marked by the assumption of the titles Satyavākya and Nītimārga alternately by successive rulers, Rājamalla being the first Satyavākya and his son Eṛgaṇga Raṇavikrama the first Nītimārga. The fruits of Rājamalla’s contumacy were, however, reaped by his son who had to face a strong invasion led by Bāṅkeśa, the Rāshṭrakūṭa general. Nītimārga was defeated in battle and his fortresses captured; Pṛthivipati who joined the rebellion also suffered and had to face the enemy in the battle of Vaimbalgulī as we have seen. But Bāṅkeśa was recalled by Amoghavarsha before he could complete his campaign in Gaṅga-vāḍi which was taken over by the Eastern Chāluḵya Gaṅga Vijayarāḍitya III, who had become a loyal vassal of the Rāshṭrakūṭa emperor after initial hostilities with him. Gaṅga invaded the Gaṅga country through Nolambavāḍi after having killed its ruler Polaḷchola (Maṅgi) in battle; the Gaṅga charters mention many battles includ-

37 EC, X, Bp. 86; EI, IV, 141.
38 9 of 1889; 6 of 1895.
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41 EC, XII, Sira 24, 38; MAR, 1918-19, pp. 28-30.
ing a major engagement at Rājarāmaḍu, though they do not enable us to follow the course of the campaign. In the end Nītimārga made his peace with Amoghavarsha, agreeing to become his vassal and accepting the hand of his daughter Abbalabha for his son Būtuga I. But this did not prevent him and his vassal Mahendra Nolamba, who had succeeded Polāchola, from falling upon the Bānas who had aided the Rāshtrakūṭas in the late war. The decisive engagement occurred at Murggepāḍi as already noted, and Mahendra took the title Mahābalikula-Vidhvamsana, and became governor of the newly conquered territory. A rude but interesting bas-relief at Doḍḍahunḍi depicts the death of Nītimārga (A.D. 869) who was succeeded by his son Rājamalla II.

Rājamalla II (A.D. 870-907) was ably assisted by his younger brother Būtuga I and nephew Nītimārga II. Būtuga became yuvrāja in the very first year of Rājamalla’s reign and, after his death fifteen years later in the Nolamba war with Mahendra, his son Nītimārga II took his place (886). Some time about 878 Mahendra set up the standard of revolt, and Būtuga I had to oppose his invasion of Gaṅgavāḍi on many fields of battle like Biryūr, Sūrūr and Sāmiya, places not identified so far. Būtuga died in the war, and Mahendra evidently had his own way for a time and overran enough of Gaṅga-manāḍala to proclaim himself lord of that country. But Nītimārga II, eager to avenge his father’s death, reversed the fortune of Mahendra in a series of engagements at Miḍigesi, Gaṅgūru and Uttaralige, and after confining him within the walls of his capital Heṅjeru (Peṅjuru or Hemāvati) took its fortress by assault and killed Mahendra himself. Nītimārga thereupon assumed the proud title Mahendrāṇtaka and the Nolamba war came to an end in 897.

Nītimārga II (907-35), who became king after a long apprenticeship as yuvrāja, had to face the hostility of Ayyapa, the son of Mahendra; Ayyappa won several battles against Gaṅga forces. Some time after his death, his son Anniga renewed the contest with Rājamalla III (A.D. 935-38), son and successor of Nītimārga II, who defeated him in a battle at Kottanāgala (938) and made the Nolambas definitely
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subject to the Gaṅgas. But Rājamalla was dethroned and perhaps killed by his brother Būtuga who received the aid of his wife’s brother, the Rāṣṭrakūṭa Kṛṣṇa III, and aided him in return in his war against a usurper by name Lalléya (A.D. 940) and against the Chola Parāntaka I whose territories were invaded by Kṛṣṇa III (c. A.D. 949). The reign of Būtuga II Jagaduttaraṅga (938-61) is notable for the increasing influence of the Gaṅgas in the Rāṣṭrakūṭa empire; vast territories were made over to Būtuga’s rule by the partiality of Kṛṣṇa III for him, and this position of vantage continued under his sons. Even Maruladeva (A.D. 961-62), who had a very short reign, is said to have obtained from Kṛṣṇa a state umbrella called Madanāvatāra never obtained by any other king, and his brother Māraśinīha II (962-74) ushered in the last and brightest chapter of Gaṅga history.

Inheritor of a vast empire comprising the whole of the Mysore table-land and the adjoining parts of the Madras and Bombay States, Māraśinīha was a great warrior, statesman, and scholar. He was crowned by Kṛṣṇa III on the eve of his northern expedition in which Māraśinīha had a prominent part and earned the title ‘king of the Gurjaras’ for himself, and ‘Ujjayinī-Bhujaṅgas’ for his generals, evidently for distinctions won in a campaign against the Paramāra Harsha Siyaka of Malwa. After the death of Kṛṣṇa, difficulties fell thick on his successors, Khoṭṭiga and Karka, and it became necessary for Māraśinīha to defend the interests of his suzerains with all his might. He restored the fortunes of Khoṭṭiga after the disastrous Paramāra invasion and occupation of Māṇyaṅka, though he was unable to stop the effete Karka from falling a prey to the ambition of Taila II who was bent on restoring Chālukya supremacy in western Deccan (973). He made a belated attempt to set up Indra IV, his sister’s son and a grandson of Kṛṣṇa III, on the Rāṣṭrakūṭa throne, but the Chālukya revolution ran its course and both Māraśinīha and Indra IV chose to die by the Jain rite of sāllekhanā (starvation unto death), the former in 974 and the latter some years afterwards. Among the minor wars of Māraśinīha was one against the Nolambas at the end of which he took the title Nolamba-Kulāntaka. Māraśinīha II was succeeded by his sons Rājamalla IV (974-83) and Rakkasa Gaṅga (985-1024). The famous general and author Chāmundaṅgarāya served Rājamalla with devotion and inflicted decisive defeats on vassals who aimed at independence like Pāṃchāladeva and Mudu-Rāchayva, the latter being killed in open combat. Chāmundaṅgarāya erected the famous monolithic colossus of Gommaṭa at Śravaṇa Belgola. The Chālukya
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Rājāditya of Uchchaṅgi and the Nolambas also felt the weight of Chāmuṇḍa’s arm. Chāmuṇḍa was a great scholar and writer in Kannada and a patron of scholars. Gaṅga rule came to an end in the reign of Rakkasa Gaṅga by the Chola conquest of Gaṅgavāḍi under the great Chola ruler Rājarāja I.

II. THE KADAMBAS

The Kadambas were a Brahmin family of the Mānavaya gotra claiming descent from Hārīṭa. According to the Tālguṇḍa pillar inscription which records their early history their name was derived from a unique Kadamba tree near their dwelling which they tended with great care as it was sacred to their tutelary deity Svāmī Mahāsenā (Kārttikeya).

Mayūraśarman of the family went over to the Pallava capital Kāṇchī for completing his studies in the renowned ghatikā there, but an unfortunate quarrel with a Pallava horseman in the city resulted in Mayūraśarman becoming a soldier sworn to enmity with the Pallavas. He entrenched himself in the northern marches of the Pallava kingdom, in the forest country round about Śrīparvata in the Kumool district, and levying tribute from the Brihad-Bāṇas and other vassals of the Pallavas, he harassed the Pallava forces sent against him, avoiding an open battle. At last the Pallavas decided to convert their intrepid opponent into a friend, and crowned him with their own hands making him ruler of the territory between the western sea and Preharā, which may have been either the Malaprabhā or the Tūṅga-bhadradā river. This was the beginning of the Kadamba kingdom (C. A.D. 350). It is possible that the unsettlement in the south that followed the raid of Samudra-gupta, among others, favoured the rise of Mayūraśarman. The earliest Kadamba inscription known is in the Prākrit language, and engraved below a short Chuṭu record on a pillar at Malavallī. It does not give the name of the Kadamba ruler, but may well be assigned to Mayūraśarman himself. It confirms and amplifies an earlier gift of Śivaskanda-varman, ruler of Vaijayantī, obviously a Chuṭu king. A shorter Prākrit record from Chandravalli contains the name of Mayūraśarman and attributes to him conquests in Traikūṭa, Ābhira, Pallava, Pariyāṭrika, Sakasthāna, Sayindaka, Punāṭa and Mokari and stops rather abruptly; the record cannot be accepted as genuine till it receives corroboration, as the Tālguṇḍa inscription has nothing to say of these extensive conquests. Mayūraśarman, as mediaeval records call him, was believed in later times to have performed eighteen aśvamedhas (horse-sacrifices) and

51 El, VIII, 24-36. 52 EC, VII, Sk. 264; IA, XLVI, 154-55. 53 MAR, 1929, No. i, pp. 50 ff.
distributed 144 villages among the 32,000 Brahmans of the anādi agrahāra Sthānakunḍūra (Tālgunḍa). Yuvarāja Kakustha-varman, the great-grandson of Mayūraśārman, dates a record in the eightieth saṁvatsara, a reckoning dating most probably from the accession of Mayūraśārman. The son and grandson of Mayūraśārman were named respectively Kaṅga-varman (360-85) and Bhagiratha (385-410). The former had to face the invasion of Kuntala by the Vākāṭaka Vindhyaśakti of the Basīm branch, and Bhagiratha might have been the ruler of Kuntala to whose court Kālidāsa was deputed as ambassador by Chandra-gupta II Vikramāditya, an event attested by rather late literary evidence, such as the works of Bhoja and Kshemendra. Bhagiratha was succeeded by his elder son Raghu (410-25) with his younger brother Kakustha-varman as his yuvarāja holding his court at Pālasikā (Hālsi). Raghu died childless and Kakustha became king (425-50). He had a prosperous reign marked by the construction of several palaces adorned with towers. He is said to have given his daughters in marriage to many royal families including the Guptas. One of these daughters became the queen of Vākāṭaka Narendrasena and mother of Priyavīrshaṇa II. Kakustha made a fresh-water lake within the Siva temple of Tālgunḍa as recorded on the celebrated pillar erected by his son and successor Sānti-varman (450-75).

Under Sānti-varman there was perhaps some accession of fresh territory to the kingdom, as he is said to have won three crowns (patṭatraya) and a record of his son avers that Sānti dragged to himself by main force Lakṣmī from the palaces of his enemies. He seems, however, to have had to face much hostility from the Pallavas and met the situation by constituting the southern part of the kingdom into a separate charge under his younger brother Krishna-varman I who is said to have performed a horse sacrifice. In spite of the pretension to independent status, Krishna-varman seems to have lost his life in war with the Pallavas which also ruined the principality of the Kekayas, the homeland of his queen. The result was that the Pallavas claimed the allegiance of his son Vishnu-varman who had to accept investiture at their hands, so that a part of Kadamba territory, with Triparvata (Halebid?) as centre, and a branch of the royal family, passed for a time under
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Pallava suzerainty. The Pallava rulers are named Nānakāsa and Śānti-vara, names otherwise unknown. Śānti-vara’s son and successor Mṛigeśa-varman is known from several records as having ruled from Vaijāyantī (Banavāsi) with Pālāśikā also under his control. In his Hālsī plates of the eighth regnal year, he is called destroyer of the Gaṅgas and destructive fire to the Pallavas, but no details are forthcoming. His scholarship and soldierly qualities are highly praised in the Devagiri plates of the fourth year. He built and endowed a Jaina temple at Hālsī in memory of his father. His queen was Prabhāvatī of the Kekaya family, already mentioned, and she was the mother of Ravi-varman (500-38), during whose minority the kingdom was ruled by Māndhātri-varman (488-500), perhaps a first cousin of Mṛigeśa. Ravi-varman has left many records ranging from the fifth to the thirty-fifth year of his reign. A stone inscription records that his queen became a satī at his death. There are two undated records of Ravi from Hālsī. One of them relates to the institution of a Jain festival; the other states that Ravi-varman killed Vishṇu-varman and others in battle and occupied Pālāśikā after having driven out Chaṇḍadanaḍa, the lord of Kāṇchī. The identity of Chaṇḍadanaḍa cannot be established, and in spite of his title connecting him with Kāṇchī, which might have been merely a memento of his Pallava origin, he may have belonged, not to the Kāṇchī line of rulers, but to the less known branch of Śānti-vara who anointed Vishṇu-varman. It is clear in any event that Ravi-varman renewed the conflict with the Pallavas and gained important successes. Possibly the war was forced on Ravi by the Pallava and his vassal Vishṇu-varman invading the Banavāsi kingdom and penetrating into it as far as Pālāśikā (Hālsī). The result was that the ruler of the collateral line of Kadambas lost his life and the unity of the kingdom was re-established. If the Multagi and Malkāvu villages, granted to a Brahmin by Ravi-varman in his fifth year, were situated very near Talakād, it seems probable that the Gaṅgas also joined the confederacy against Ravi-varman and paid for it by having to acknowledge his suzerainty for a time. Ravi-varman was followed by his son Hari-varman (538-50) who ruled from Vaijavantī (Banavāsi) in peace until Krishṇa-varman II, the grandson of Vishṇu-varman, led an
expedition against Vaijayantī, put an end to Hari-varman’s rule and made himself master of the entire kingdom. Kṛṣṇa-varman (550-65) and his son Aja-varman felt the impact of the rising power of the Chāluṅka-vaśas of Bādāmi. Pulakeśin I deprived the Kadambas of their northern marches and established himself at Bādāmi which he fortified as a strong fortress (A.D. 545); his son Kṛiti-varman I put an end to Vaijayantī as an independent kingdom. But Aja-varman (565-600) himself or his son Bhogi-varman took advantage of the confusion and civil war due to Māṅgaleśa’s attempt to keep Pulakeśin II out of the throne, and once more proclaimed the independence of Vaijayantī for some time. But when Pulakeśin II gained the throne at the end of the war (A.D. 609) it was one of his first tasks to reduce the Kadamba kingdom. A picturesque verse in the Aihole inscription describes his siege of Banavāsi and says that the land fortress of that city took on the appearance of a fortress in the midst of water when it was surrounded by the ocean of Pulakeśin’s army. It is possible that Bhogi-varman and his son, Vishṇu-varman, perished in the fight; in any case, the Kadamba kingdom passed definitely to the Chāluṅka empire (c. A.D. 610). If Hiuan Tsang’s Kung-kan-na-pu-to (Koukansa-pura) may be identified with the Banavāsi kingdom, it is easy to understand why the pilgrim who visited it about A.D. 641 makes no mention of its king, though he notes the existence of 100 Buddhist monasteries and 10,000 monks, a tiara of prince Siddhārtha, a sandalwood image of Maitreya made by the arhat Sroṇaviniśatikoṭi and a forest of tāla trees to the north of the capital.

Strav inscriptions contain the names of other early Kadamba princes whose relation to the main line is not known; they are of no interest to general history. The later Kadambas of Hāṅgal and Goa did not rise to power until about the end of the period covered by this volume and their history will be dealt with in the next.

III. THE BĀNAS

The Bānas were an important feudatory dynasty of rulers who had a long history which is, however, as yet traceable only in parts. They claimed descent from the Asura Mahābali Vairochana of legendary fame who is said to have granted the earth as a sacrifice to Krishna—a reference to the avatāra of Vāmana (dwarf). Bali’s son Bāṇa, a devotee of Siva, is said to have ruled from his capital Sōṅita-
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pura, which is often called Sonagaram in Tamil, a name applied to the coastal town of Markanam in S. Arcot. The dynasty takes its name from him. On the strength of an oft-repeated epithet in the inscriptions, Bana is usually said to have been the door-keeper of Siva; but Rice cites Kannada sources to reverse the relation and make Siva the door-keeper of Bana. The dynasty had the bull for its crest, the black buck on its banner, and had the paishacha drum among its insignia. The Chola queen Sirtti, mentioned in the Manimekalai as the mother of Udayakumaran, is said to have been a Bana princess, but this is only legend. The Mudiyvanur copper-plate dated Saka 261 (A.D. 338) is clearly a spurious record, and no reliance can be placed on data drawn from it. It mentions a king Nandivarma of the time of the Danava chief Mahabali, and his son Vijayaditya; it then speaks of Vijayaditya's son Malladeva Nandi-varman who had the title Srivadhuvallabha, who resembled a Bodhisattva in his concern for the beings in all the three worlds and who is described as the lord of a seven-and-a-half lac country got by means of the 12,000 villages in the Andhra-mandala. Neither the date of the record nor its muddled contents are of interest to genuine history. The genuine inscriptions describe the region ruled over by the Banas as a 12,000 country to the west of the Andhrapatha; they are also called rulers of Gaiga 6,000, lords of Nandagiri (Nandi Hills) and of Paruvipura. Andhrapatha obviously means Andhra country, like Dakshinapatha, southern country, and not, as is sometimes stated, the road leading to the Andhra country. The Mayidavolu plates mention Danнакада as its capital. So the official description of the Bana territory was that it lay to the west of the Andhra. Parivi is doubtless Parigi in the Hindapur taluk of the Anantapur district; and this region has the best claim to be considered the original home of the Banas. In later times we find them ruling over territory to the south-east of this region, called Perumbanaippadi, the great Bana country, extending roughly from Pune and Kolar in the west to Kalahasti and Sholingur in the east with the Palar as its southern boundary. The idea that the original home of the Banas lay in the region of Srисailam whence they were dislodged by the Chalukyas in the seventh century seems to be the result of reading too much into the Tālgunda inscription of Kakustha-varman which says that his ancestor Mayurasarman overpowered the frontier
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guards of the Pallavas in battle and made his home in the impene-
trable forests of Śrīparvata before he proceeded to levy tribute on
the Bṛhad-Bāna and other kings.\textsuperscript{80} This mention of Bṛhad-Bāna
as the contemporary of the first Kadamba king in the middle of the
fourth century A.D. is perhaps the earliest mention of the Bānas in
authentic historical records. An inscription of the tenth century
states that the first Gaṅga ruler Koṅgani-varman was appointed for the
conquest of Bānāmandaḍala;\textsuperscript{81} the statement has not yet received cor-
roboration from any authentic earlier document; if we accept it,
we may conclude that the early Bānas had to face the opposition
of the Gaṅgas as well as of the Kadambas.

The powerful Chāluṅka ruler of Bādami, Pulakeṣīn II, is said to
have subjugated the Bāna-rāja-vishaya and levied an impost in gold
(tere-pon) from every village in the area.\textsuperscript{82} A little later we find
Bāna chieftains, calling themselves scions of the Perbānavaṁśa,
ruling as feudatories of the Chāluṅkas over Turmmara-vishaya,
roughly the region of Gooty and Jammalamaḍugu taluks on the Pen-
nār. They had two important cities in this region—Chitracheṇḍu and
Pāṁbuliggi (Hāmbulige or Hāvalige). Three generations of them are
mentioned in the inscriptions—Balikulatilaka Narasiṁha Bāṇādhirāja,
his son Vikramādiṭya Bali Indra Bānaraśa, and his son not named. The
inscriptions mentioning them are dated in the 22nd and 23rd years
of Chāluṅka Vijayādiṭya, i.e. A.D. 718-19.\textsuperscript{83} Towards the close of the
reign of Chāluṅka Kirti-varman II, c. A.D. 757, the unnamed son of
Bāna Vikramādiṭya invaded and occupied the Telugu-Choda country
of Rēṇāḍu as we know from an inscription at Chilamkūru in the
heart of that region.\textsuperscript{84} But soon after, the tables were turned on the
Bānas by the Telugu-Chodas, who, under Vijayādiṭya, not only re-
covered Rēṇāḍu but forced the Bānas to acknowledge their suzerainty;
after the Chāluṅkas had quitted the stage and the Rāṣhtrakūṭas had
not yet become a force; we find a new Bāna chieftain Perbāna Bhū-
jaṅgaḍi Bhūpaḍiṭya in this new position of subordination to the
Telugu-Chodas.\textsuperscript{85} We then lose sight of this branch, though relatively
late inscriptions from the Anantapur and Cuddapah districts attest the
presence of Bāna chieftains in the region. We hear of a Dhavalevarasa
of the Mahābalikula in an inscription of A.D. 885 (S. 807) from Poṭṭi-
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padu in Jammalamadugu taluk of the Cuddapah district. Much later, in Chalukya-Vikrama year 12 (A.D. 1088), there was Chikkarasa of Hambulige claiming to be a Bana and still continuing allegiance to the Telugu-Choda family represented at the time by Ballaya-Choda Maharaja.

A Bana king of Kalbappunadu 1,700, named Dindigalar, figures as a subordinate of Ganga Sripurusha in the undated Kovalaveetu plates. He obtained the permission of his overlord to make a gift of land. A king named Dindigaraja is said in an inscription at Sravana Belgola to have been present at the time of a Jaina guru's death on Katavapra hill which is called Kalbappu in Kannada. That inscription, also undated, has been provisionally assigned to the middle of the seventh century on paleographical grounds. But the present grant shows that king Dindiga belonged to the eighth century, as Sripurusha's reign extended from A.D. 726 to 778. Again, the Udayendiram plates of Prithivipati II state that a son of king Dindi was saved by Prithivipati I from the Rashtrakuta king Amoghavarsha I. As Amoghavarsha's wars in the Ganga country were waged round about A.D. 850 we must take it that Dindiga lived towards the close of Sripurusha's reign.

It is, however, of the Banas of the Perumbannapadi that we get most information. Omitting the stray references such as the battle of Koyattur between a Madhava Muttarasa and a Mahavali Banaرسa (c. A.D. 725), we are able to trace the fortunes of the family for eight generations continuously with a fairly definite chronology for them. The succession list supplied by the Gudimallam and Udayendiram plates is as follows:

Jayanandivarman (A.D. 770-95)
Vijayaditya I (796-835)
Malladeva alias Jagadekamalla (835-50)
Vikramaditya I Jayameru (850-95) Banaavidyadhara
Vijayaditya II Prabhumera (895-910) Virachulaman
Vijayaditya III, Pugalvippavarga
Vikramaditya III, Vijayabahu (965)
The contemporaneity of this line with the Pallavas of Kaṁchi from the time of Nandi-varman II Pallavamalla (A.D. 731-96) is well attested by a series of inscriptions in which the Bāna feudatories cite the regnal years of their Pallava suzerains. 91 Nandi-varman II Pallavamalla led an expedition into Gangavāḍi and after defeating Śṛipuruṣa in battle, seized from him the royal necklace containing the gem Ugrodaya. This was about A.D. 775. It is quite probable that Bāna Jayanandi-varman assisted his Pallava suzerain in this expedition and was rewarded by the gift of some territory from the Gaṅgas, for we find him and his immediate successors laying claim to the rule of Gaṅga 6,000. 92 We find Jayanandi-varman calling himself Māvali-Vanarāya and acknowledging the suzerainty of Pallavamalla in a record dated in the sixty-second year (A.D. 793) of the latter. 93

Of Vijayāditya I we have little information. He is described in the Guḍimallam plates as proficient in the discharge of royal duties (daṁma-kṣatra-bhṛtām varah), and he figures as a feudatory of Pallava Danti-varman in his forty-ninth regnal year (c. A.D. 834), 94 when he made a gift of land to provide for the periodical deepening of an irrigation tank called Vellēri, in the neighbourhood of Guḍimallam. The next ruler Malladeva is described as the tilaka of the Bāna-vaiśa (Guḍimallam plates) and given the title Jagadekamalla in the Udayendiram plates. The title Nandi-varman is given for him in the spurious Muḍiyanūr plates and may imply his subordination to Nandi-varman III, which is even otherwise probable. His name occurs in a Kannada inscription from Chippili, Chittoor district. 95 Malladeva found occasion to expand the Bāna power at the expense of the Telugu-Choḍas in the north. About A.D. 825, there was a big trial of strength between the Bānas, Vaidumbas and Gaṅga Prthivipati I on one side, and the Nolambas, Telugu-Choḍas and Rājamalla I on the other. It cannot be said definitely whether the dispute started among the minor powers and the two branches of the Gaṅgas favoured the opposite sides in that quarrel, or the dispute was primarily one between the two branches of the Gaṅgas in which the minor powers took part, some on one side and some on the other. The Vaidumbas, it may be noted by the way, make their first appearance in the Madanapalle taluk which was part of the Telugu-Choḍa country of Rēṇāḍu, and most of their records are in the Telugu language. Their records
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give no more account of their origin than just to say that they won the goddess of fortune by victories won on many a battle-field. They founded their own capital Vaidumbavrolu, and captured Chippili in the neighbourhood, one of the important seats of the Telugu-Chōdas, thus challenging them to conflict. Inscriptions of the time of Gaṇḍa Sankali (c. A.D. 800) record the death of soldiers including a brother-in-law of his in the war with the Chōdas. The war of 825 was started by Gaṇḍa Triṇeta Virā Mahārāja allied with the Bāna and Perumanadī (Prithivīpati I) laying siege to the fortress of Soremaṇḍi, modern Cholemari in the Penukaṇḍa taluk of the Anantapur district. The records state that when it was invested, Soremaṇḍi was defended by the Telugu-Chōda Mayindadī (i.e. Mahendra-vikrama) who was allied with the Nolamba, with Rājamalla and others. Soremaṇḍi was situated strategically at the entrance into the Nolamba dominions, subject at this time to the hegemony of Rājamalla I, and its capture would be of great value to his enemies. It would enable the Bāṇas and Vaidumbas to aggrandize themselves at the expense of the Telugu-Chōdas. In fact judging from the course of the war and its actual results, one can hardly resist the feeling that the interests of the allies of the Gaṅgas rather than of the Gaṅga princes themselves dominated the war. Another battle is mentioned as fought between the same parties at Māndāvuda, probably Mānde, eight miles east of Cholemari. It is not known if the battle preceded or followed the siege of Soremaṇḍi. The results of the war can only be inferred as they are nowhere stated clearly. There is no reference to the war in the records of the Telugu-Chōdas and the Nolambas, or even of Rājamalla I. But if the main object of the war was to dislodge Rājamalla I from his kingdom and get it under Prithivīpati I, that object was not attained, and Rājamalla kept his throne and transmitted it to his descendants. But, perhaps, the main protagonists were the Bāṇas and Vaidumbas aided by Prithivīpati, and possibly the Bāṇas were the prime movers. They entered into dynastic alliance with Prithivīpati I, and his daughter Kundavai was married to prince Vikramāditya, the son and heir of Malladeva. So strengthened, he joined the Vaidumba in an attack on the Telugu-Chōda kingdom, and Rājamalla and his feudatory, the Nolamba, went to the aid of that kingdom. The Vaidumba gained large parts of Rēṇādu and the Bāṇa captured Chippili, the
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Telugu-Choda capital, and even encroached further into Telugu-Choda region and founded Vānavolu near Budili.\textsuperscript{103} Ganda Trinētra claimed the Kiṟutore (i.e. Pennār) as the northern boundary of his kingdom and assumed the title Lord of Rēṇādu 7,000.\textsuperscript{104}

Rājamalla’s hostility to the Bānas soon found expression in an invasion of the Bāna country carried out with the aid of his able feudatory and son-in-law Polachola Nolambādhirāja (825-75). This resulted in the loss of Gaṅgarusāsira\textsuperscript{105} followed by an advance up to Vallimalai near Tiruvallam in the heart of the Bāna country, if not up to Kāṅchī, as an inscription of Rājamalla claims. A record of Rājamalla at Vallamalai mentions the excavation of a Jaina cave on the hill under his orders.\textsuperscript{106} The names of the agrahāras called after Rājamalla, Sṛipurusha, and Raṇavikrama in the same neighbourhood may also be taken to commemorate this expedition which must have taken place at the end of Malladeva’s reign or early in that of his son Vikramādityya I. Hostilities appear to have been continued by Rājamalla’s son Nītimārga who claims a victory against the Bānas at Murggepāḍī in the Kolar district.\textsuperscript{106a} But Vikramādityya I was perhaps the ablest king of Bāna line, and he soon recovered his independent status and control over Gaṅgarusāsira.\textsuperscript{107}

Vikramādityya I Jayameru of the Gudimallam plates is described in the Udayendiram grant as Bāna Vidyādhara. His queen Kundavai,\textsuperscript{108} is mentioned as endowing twenty kalanjū of gold for ghce for a lamp in the temple of Tiruvallam and depositing the sum with the sahā of that place. He figures as a feudatory of Nandi-varman III in two inscriptions, and of his son and successor Nṛipatuniga in a third. In the seventeenth year\textsuperscript{109} of Nandi-varman III (c. A.D. 853) he combines three villages together under the name Viḍēlvidugu Vikramādityya Chaturvēdimaṅgalam, placing his suzerain’s title before his own name, and makes a gift of the reconstituted township to the Śiva temple at Tikkālivallam, i.e. the Bilvanāthesvara temple of Tiruvallam. The conditions stipulated were that the sahā should pay 2,000 kāḍi of paddy and twenty kalanjū of gold to the temple for the maintenance of Śiva-brāhmaṇas (priests), the drummers and other temple servants, including the singers of Tiruppadiyam, as well as for lamps,
anointment of idols, temple repairs and other allied purposes. This is, it may be noted in passing, one of the earliest references to the singing of Tamil hymns of the Dévāram in temples. Another record from Guḍimallam, dated the 23rd year of Nandi-varman III, mentions Vikramādiyā’s rule in Vaḍugavali-mērkku and records the gift, after purchase (vilai śrācanai), of land for the maintenance of a lamp before Mahādeva of the Paraśurāmīśvara temple; the donor was a member of the executive (āluṅgaṇam) of the ār, and the sabhā took charge of the land and promised to arrange for the lamp being lighted regularly. In the twenty-fourth year of Nṛipatunīga (c. A.D. 879), another record also from Guḍimallam gives the full Bāṇa prasasti and mentions Vikramādiyā’s reign over Vaḍugavali-mērkku. Towards the end of Vikramādiyā’s reign there was a Rāṣṭrakūṭa invasion of Bāṇa territory which evidently forced them to transfer their allegiance to the Rāṣṭrakūṭas in place of the Pallavas. About this time the Pallavas were hard pressed by the hostility of the Pandyas and the growing power of their vassals, particularly the Cholas. The victory of Śrīpūrambiyam in A.D. 880 against Pāṇḍya Varaguna II was achieved only with the active aid of Chola Aditya I and Gaṅga Prithivīpati who lost his life on the field of battle. Aditya entertained schemes of reviving the past glory of the Cholas and was embarking on a career of aggression which Nṛipatunīga and his associate kings Aparājīta and Kampa-varman were finding it increasingly difficult to check. In fact it ended in the overthrow of the Pallavas and the death of Aparājīta about A.D. 898. Under these conditions it was no wonder that the Rāṣṭrakūṭas sought to extend the sphere of their control, and the Pallavas were unable to go to the aid of the Bāṇas.

The story of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa successes against the Bāṇas, in which the Vaidumbas were also fellow-sufferers, is to be gathered from their records and a small number of stone inscriptions in the Chittoor district. On the very day of his coronation in A.D. 915 Indra III claims credit for two achievements (1) an easy victory over Meru followed by (2) a success against Upendra who had captured Govardhana.

The Meru mentioned above was no other than Bāṇa Vikramādiyā I Jayamēru. An inscription from Kappalle (Chittoor dist.) states that while Jayamēruprahlādu was ruling over Vaḍugavali 12,000 and Gaṅga 6,000 a certain Mahārāja raided the village of Chemmagūru for cattle lifting and records a gift of land to the memory of a warrior who
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fell in the fight. Two other undated records\footnote{113} from the same place of the reign of Kannaradeva (Rāṣṭrakūṭa Krishṇa II) also mention an attack made by him on Chemmagūru and relate the death of two warriors who fell fighting. All these records doubtless refer to the war in which Chemmagūru suffered a raid. Other inscriptions are also connected with the war. A record of Vaidumba Pallo-arasa, a son of Manuja Trinçatra, with dates contemporary with those of Krishṇa II, also refers to incidents in the same struggle, mentioning an attack on Kappalle itself.\footnote{114} Lastly Mahendrādhirāja Nolamba, a feudatory of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas, states in a record of ś. 815 (A.D. 893) that he was ruling the earth after destroying the race of Mahabali—Śrī Mahabalikula-vidhvamsanam geyudu prithivi-rājyam geyuttire.\footnote{115} This is perhaps chronologically the earliest reference to the hostilities from the Rāṣṭrakūṭa side aided by the Vaidumbas against the Bānas which developed in the course of the succeeding years and led ultimately to the Bānas becoming the feudatories of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas. It must have been after this that Vikramāditya found occasion to go to N.E. Deccan in the company of Rāṣṭrakūṭa forces and build a temple at Pali, twelve miles north of Ratanpur.\footnote{116} He gets the title Bāna-kandarpa in some records of his son’s time.

The inscriptions of Vijayāditya II Prabhumeru range from ś. 820 to 831 (A.D. 898-909). Their dates in the Saka era and not in the regnal years of monarchs of other lines may be accepted as an indication of a spell of independence for the Bānas. In 898 his queen Mahādevi Adigal endowed 30 kalaṇju of gold for lights and offerings at sandhyā-kāla in the temple of Guḍimallam.\footnote{117} Another inscription dated seven years later records a private endowment of 20 kalaṇju of gold for a lamp in the same temple.\footnote{118} This inscription gives some very interesting economic data. The rate of interest was 4 maṇjadi per kalaṇju per annum, the maṇjadi was one-twentith of kalaṇju, and the rate of interest was 20 per cent per annum. Again one kalaṇju of gold purchased 45 measures of ghee, the endowment being equal to 180 measures of ghee for a year of 360 days—half a measure of ghee being the daily requirement for burning a lamp.

A record from Puṇganūr\footnote{119} of Vijayāditya II Virachulāmani refers to a raid on Koyāṭṭur by Kāduveṭṭi Muttarasan, a general of the
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Nolamba Mahendra; another record\textsuperscript{120} from the same neighbourhood mentions a raid on Puli-nādu by the Nolamba king under the orders of Kōṅganiaraśar and the capture of Koyāṭṭūr; a third inscription\textsuperscript{121} gives more details. It states that under the orders of his suzerain, Permādi, the Nolambādhirāja (Mahendra) led a successful expedition against Talakādū, in the course of which he despatched two of his subordinate chiefs, Kāḍuveṭṭi and Maduru, against Puli-nādu. The latter captured and burnt the town of Permāvi. This roused the indignation of the Bāṇa king Vijayāditya Vīracūlāmaṇi Prabhumeru who dispersed the enemy forces and killed many chiefs in the conflict. Lastly there are Bāṇa records\textsuperscript{122} in the Kolar district mentioning gifts to soldiers who fell in fight at the command of Prabhumeru against the entire Kāḍuveṭṭi forces at Māvindanūr. But as one of these records begins with a verse mentioning Vikramāditya Jayamur, we have to postulate a somewhat long-drawn struggle. As the records stand, we have to assume that the engagement at Māvindanūr took place when Vikramāditya was still living, and his son fought for him as yuvarāja, and that the other incidents like the capture of Permāvi and the raid of Koyāṭṭūr represent later stages in the war which continued after the death of Vikramāditya. However that may be, we find that the alignment of forces which began at Soremaṇi was still being continued and that the Bāṇas and Nolambas were taking sides in the wars of the rival branches of the Gaṅgas.

The last date known for Vijayāditya is a.d. 909 which occurs in an inscription from the Kolār district.\textsuperscript{123} It was in the reign of his son Vikramāditya II that the Bāṇa dominion was extinguished by Chola Parāntaka I. At the commencement of his reign, Vikramāditya II seems to have aided Rāṣṭrakūṭa Krishna II in the campaign he undertook against Parāntaka I who, at his accession, had superseded the claims of his half-brother Aḍityan Kannaradeva, a grandson of Krishna II.\textsuperscript{124} In the battle of Vallāḷa (i.e. Tiruvallam in Bāṇa country) that followed (a.d. 911-12) the Gaṅga ally of Parāntaka greatly distinguished himself. Krishna II and the Bāṇa suffered defeat, and Parāntaka assumed the title of Vīra Chola. Parāntaka followed up his success in the next few years and uprooted two Bāṇa kings and conquered the Vaidumbas. One of the Bāṇa kings was doubtless Vikramāditya II; the other might have been his son Vijayāditya III. The Bāṇa kingdom was taken away by the Chola and handed over to his loyal feudatory Prithivipati II together with the title Bāṇāḍhirāja.
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This happened by about A.D. 916, the date of the Sholingur inscription which mentions the fact.\textsuperscript{125} What happened after the Chola conquest is very obscure. Possibly the ‘uprooting’ by Parāntaka meant no more than a defeat followed by submission, in which case Prithivipati II must have been imposed as a sort of intermediary between the Chola emperor and the Bāna; but it appears more likely that the Bānas actually lost their kingdom and had to seek refuge in the Rāshtrakūta court. The only other certain fact we get after the Chola conquest is that Vijayabāhu Vikramādiya III was a friend of Krishnarāja, i.e. Rāshtrakūta Krishna III. This is mentioned in the Udayendiram grant which records a gift of Vikramādiya III. The Guḍilimalā plates were issued by Vikramādiya II as yuvārāja with the consent of his father. There are no transactions on record either of his reign as king or of the reign of his son Vijayādiya III. We may legitimately infer that the Chola conquest suspended Bāna rule in Perumbāṇappāḍi, which was given over to Prithivipati II. It did not revive until the successful expedition of Krishna III into Tōṇḍaimaṇḍalam towards the close of the reign of Parāntaka I and the decisive battle of Takkolam A.D. 949-50 put Krishna in a position to restore his friend Vikramādiya III to the rule of his kingdom. Krishna’s political settlement of the northern part of the Chola empire lasted some years, and apparently even the Cholas had to recognise it for a while. There is a record of the ninth year of a Rājakesari\textsuperscript{126} mentioning Arikajaippirāṭṭiyār, a Bāna queen and daughter of prince Arikulakesari. If this Rājakesari was Sundara Chola II, as seems probable, the inscription would fall about A.D. 965, that is about the time when Sundara Chola was waging war in the north recovering territory lost to Krishna III by his grandfather Parāntaka I. As Arikulakesari is referred to as prince, he must have been a son of Sundara, and the Bāna queen the daughter of this son, the Bāna ruler being no other than Vikramādiya III himself. Even so Bāna rule did not long continue in this region after this, and as far as we know Vikramādiya III was the last ruler of the line.

Princes claiming Bāna connections continue to figure in various subordinate capacities for many centuries afterwards, but to trace them out systematically is hardly worth while.

\textbf{IV. PUNNĀTA}

The ancient principality of Punnāta is mentioned by Ptolemy under the name Pounnata as famous for its beryls. Padiyur in the Dhāhāpuram tāluk of the Coimbatore district, where beryl was found until early in the nineteenth century, doubtless formed part of that principality. An inscription of the kings of Punnāta states
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that the Kāverī and Kapinī rivers watered the country and that its
villages were full of wealthy people who possessed she-buffaloes,
cows, horses, woollen blankets, gems, gold, silver, pearl and coral,
besides annual crops of wheat, rice, barley and other grains. The
Jaina writer Harishepa in his Bṛihatkathākośa (A.D. 930) says that
Bhadrabāhu and his followers came and settled in the Punnāta coun-
try when they had to migrate from the North early in the third
century B.C. in order to escape a twelve years famine foretold by
the patriarch. There are Sanskrit inscriptions of the seventh century
A.D. purporting to record the story of the migration and what
followed.

Punnāta is described at different times as a province of 10,000 or
6,000 in early records, and was known as Haḍināḍ in the sixteenth
century. Its capital was Kiṭṭūr or Kirttipura on the Kapinī (Kabhanī)
river in the Heggaladevankote ātaluk. The Chandravalli stone inscrip-
tion of Kadamba Mayūrāsāman apparently includes Punnāta among
the countries conquered by him in the middle of the third century A.D.
The kings of Punnāta are known from two copper-plate charters. They
belonged to the Tāmra-Kāśyapakula and ruled for six gener-
tions in the third and fourth centuries A.D. The earliest king was
Vishnuḍāsa (c. A.D. 240) who is said to have had a retinue of con-
quered kings who carried out his behests and to have firmly estab-
lished dharma. His son Rāshtravarmā was well versed in the lore of
horses and other arts. He had three sons by his queen Prabhāvatī,
the eldest of whom, Prithivipati, acquainted with many sciences,
either ruled only for a short while or did not rule at all, and gave
place to his younger brother, Nāgadatta (c. A.D. 280). It is possible
that Mayūrāsāman’s conquest of Punnāta was effected in the reign
of the peaceful Prithivipati and led to his supersession by Nāgadatta.
Nāgadatta’s son was Nripaśri Bhujagādhirāja. The terms sṛi and
adhirāja in this name have been taken to indicate unusual prosperity
and a higher status for the king of Punnāta; but this seems to be
wrong, for adhirāja is here a part of the personal name and sṛi is
only the common honorific. Bhujaga’s son was Škandavarmā who
gave his daughter in marriage to the Gaṅga Avinīta. Ravidatta, the
brother of the princess married to Avinīta, is the last king of the line
so far known, and he must have ruled at the beginning of the fifth
century A.D. After him the Punnāta kingdom seems to have merged
in that of the Gaṅgas under Durvinīta, the son of Avinīta. Punnāta
survives in later records under that name and as Haḍināḍ, a well
known territorial unit.127

127 IC III, 303-17, gives a detailed discussion of the history of Punnāta with
full references to the sources.
V. THE ĀLUPAS

Another feudatory family of note were the Ālupas (lit. rulers) of North and South Kanara, and the Kaḍūr and Shimoga districts, all of which formed at one time the region of Ālupa rule, viz. Āluvakheḍa 6,000—a name which came in course of time to be restricted to the Tuluva country in South Kanara. There are clear references to the Ālupas from the seventh to the eleventh century A.D. in the inscriptions of Pulakeśin II and Vinayāditya, of Govinda III, and of Kadamba Jayakesin I of Goa, as well as in the poem of Bilhaṇa. They were an indigenous family of the Nāga race who ruled first from Udiyāvara, then from Bārakūr, and finally from Mangalore—all coastal cities in the South Kanara district. All their known records on stone are in archaic characters and in the Kannada language. Ptolemy seems to mention Āluvakheḍa (Eloikhora) as a separate unit in the second century A.D., and the Halmīdi stone inscription128 of the fifth century contains a general reference to Ālu, i.e. Ālupa country. We then hear of Māramma Āluvarasaṇ as contemporary with the Western Chālukya Kīrtivarman I, who began the conquest of the Ālupa and Kadamba countries which was completed by his successors. Māramma was followed by Sakala-sṛimāt Āluvarasār (c. 600), Kundavamarasa (c. 625), Ālu-Arasār Guṇasāgara (c. 650) and his son Chitravāhana I (c. 675-700), all of them feudatories of the contemporary Chālukya rulers of Bāḍāmi. After the reign of Chitravāhana, for close upon a century, Ālupa history is marked by civil wars and relatively short reigns, Raṇasāgara, Svetaśāhā, Prithivisāgara Ālupendra, Vijayāditya Ālupendra, and Chitravāhana II were among the kings who reigned successively till about A.D. 800 after which date there occurs a gap in Ālupa genealogy. We have the names of several rulers for the next two centuries, but we know little of their deeds or of their mutual relationship. Kundavamarasa II was noted for his effort to enforce prohibition.129 The Ālupas had their own council of ministers which is often mentioned in their inscriptions, and they recognized the autonomy of municipal corporations (nagara samāḥa) and district and village assemblies (deśa-purushas and the jagattu), the numbers of the assemblies varying according to the size and population of the area concerned.130

VI. THE CHĀLUKYAS OF VEMULAVĀDA131

The history of this branch of Chālukyas is to be gathered from three Sanskrit inscriptions they have left and from allusions to them in the
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Bhārata of the Kannaḍa poet Pampa. The line may be said to begin with Yuddhamalla I for whom we have a date in A.D. 731 and who is praised extravagantly for his heroism in war and for the extent of his conquests. In the Vemulavāḍa stone inscription he is said to have ruled the Sapādalaksha country and had many feudatories under him. He is also credited with the capture of the natural fortress of Chitrakūṭa and to have provided for regular oil-baths for his war-elephants in artificial tanks at Podana. Though we may not be quite definite about the origins of the line, we have good reason to assume tentatively that Yuddhamalla I was the youngest of the sons of Dharāśraya Jayasiṁhavarman of Lāṭa who owed his viceroyalty of the Lāṭa country to his elder brother Chālukya Vikramāditya I of Bāḍāmi. An ambitious and adventurous prince, Yuddhamalla found little scope for his energy in the home country, particularly as he was the youngest of a number of able sons of Jayasiṁhula. So he sought service under the rising Rāshṭrakūṭa prince Dantidurga and indeed the history of the Vemulavāḍa line of Chālukyas is best regarded as a footnote to that of the Rāshṭrakūṭas. Dantidurga’s early campaigns, it is well known, were conducted in the Madhyadeśa, and we must suppose that Yuddhamalla took part in the early wars of Dantidurga including the capture of Chitrakūṭa (Chitor) on the direct line between Lāṭa and Sapādalaksha (Samhīrān in E. Rājasthān) and a temporary mastery over the Sapādalaksha country itself. He was rewarded for his services with the grant of a fief nearer home in Bodhan (Podana) in the Nizamabad district in the northern part of the old Hyderabad State, and this became the base for the further achievements of his successors. Yuddhamalla had the title Vinayāditya.

The son of Yuddhamalla I was Arikesari, the donor of the Kollipāra plates which record a grant to a Śaiva ascetic of Eleśvara to the north of the celebrated mountain Śrīśaila in the Kurmool district. He is said to have been an adept in many subjects like grammar, law, elephant lore, logic, archery and medicine. In the reign of Dhruva Nirupama (A.D. 780-93) Arikesari seized Venigī and Trikaliṅga on behalf of his suzerain. Parts of his new conquests seem to have been placed under Arikesari’s rule as his fief, and we may date the shifting of the capital of Vemulavāḍa from this time. Of the next four generations, covering nearly a century, all our sources are strangely reticent. The rulers of the period were, in chronological order, Narasiṁha I Rājāditya, Yuddhamalla II, Baddega I, and

132 JAHPS, VI, 169-92. The name Saulpakha applied to the Vemulavāḍa region in later records (JOR, xviii, 40) is best regarded as a memento of Yuddhamalla’s early exploits.
Yuddhamalla III. The portion of the Vemulavāḍa stone inscription dealing with Yuddhamalla II seems to record some of his achievements, but cannot be made out exactly owing to the worn out condition of the record. Of Baddega we learn from Pampa that he was victorious in forty-two great battles and thus earned the title 'the soldier who knew no defeat' (solada-gāṇḍa). Pampa adds: he fought his battles against Bhima and took him captive. This is a reference to the long-drawn wars of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas in Veṅgi in which, as we learn from the charters of the Eastern Chālvāyakas, Chālavaka Bhima I had to reconquer his kingdom which had passed under the occupation of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa forces. We find here that Baddega was the loyal and doughty champion of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas on their eastern marches.

The son of Yuddhamalla III was Narasiṁha II of whom we hear a great deal more than of his predecessors. The Vemulavāḍa inscription describes his conquest of the Mālavas and Gūjjaras at some length, and Pampa gives a full account of his achievements as he was the father of his patron Arikera II. It is clear from the inscriptions and Pampa's verses that Narasiṁha took an active part in the campaign of Krīṣṇa II against the Lāṭa country and that of his successor Indra III against Malipāla I, the celebrated Gūjjarar emperor who was sent into temporary exile by the Rāṣṭrakūṭa conqueror. Pampa makes particular mention of the Lāṭas as the enemies of Narasiṁha and gives him the title Sakalalokāśraya, a favourite birula of the Chālvāyakas of Lāṭa. He refers to the burning and ravaging of the seven Mālavas, the defeat of the Gūjjarar king in battle, and the seizure of his elephants. He gives a picturesque description of the cowering restless condition of Malipāla on whom Narasiṁha descended like a thunderbolt. He adds that Narasiṁha's horses drank the waters of the Ganges and were stationed in the precincts of Kālapi (Kālpi). The queen of Narasiṁha was Jākavve, a sister of Indra III. The son of Narasiṁha II and Jākavve was Arikera II who married Revakandimadhi, a daughter of Indra III. Arikera is famous as the patron of Pampa, and for the apparently decisive part he played in the political revolution in which the sāmanatas of Govinda IV (930-34) dethroned him and transferred the Rāṣṭrakūṭa empire to Baddega Amoghavarsha III. The son of Arikera II was Baddega II, whose son Arikera III calls himself the vassal of Krīṣṇa III and makes a grant in 966 to a Jain temple erected by his father in the capital and known as Subhadhāma Jīnālava. The grant was received by the celebrated Jaina divine and author Somadevasūri, author of Yaśodhara-charita, also called Yaśastilaka-champu,

133 Parbhani plates—JBISM, XII, 3.
Syādvādopanishad and other works including a treatise on polity—Nitivākyāmrīta.

VII. THE TELUGU-CHOḍAS

The Telugu-Choḍas were an important feudatory dynasty who are first found ruling in the region of Anantapur and Cuddapah districts from about the sixth century A.D. In later times they split up into several branches, recognizing the suzerainty of the imperial Cholas, the Chālukyas of Kalyāṇi, the Kākatiyas, and the Eastern Gaṅgas. The history of these later branches does not concern us here. The early line claimed descent from Karikāla, the most celebrated of the Chola kings of the Saṅgam Age in the Tamil country, and retained the title 'rulers of the noble city of Uraiyūr', the early Tamil Chola capital. This claim is put forward in a relatively simple form in the Mālepāḍu plates of Pūnyaakumāra, early in the seventh century, and is elaborated with many embellishment in subsequent inscriptions and literature.134 Typical of the final form reached by the Telugu-Choḍa praśasti is the following from an inscription135 of S. 980 (A.D. 1058): Svasti, aridur-
dhara varabhujāi-bhāsa-prachanda pradyotadinakarakula-nandana Kaśyipagotra Karikālānvaya, śikhiśikhadhvajā, simhalāṁkhhana, Kāve-
rinātha Īrēyūrpuravareśvara, Kambaraparekhoshana, Kollimalaipurān-
taka. The mention here of the peacock-banner and the lion-crest deserves notice; the Tamil Cholas had the tiger both on their banner and for their crest; the Telugu branch, apparently adopted new emblems under local influences. We may not be sure that the lion symbol, very common among the ruling families of the Telugu country and among the Kadambas, had any connection with the prevalence of Buddhism in the Andhra country as has been suggested; the lion was the mount (vāhana) of Durgā, and the Kāṇchipuram inscription of Jaṭā-Choḍa-Bhīma expressly states that the Telugu-Choḍas got their lion-crest from goddess Amara-Durgā.136 The manner in which the Choḍas established themselves in the Telugu country is not known. It seems likely that when their power diminished at the close of the Saṅgam Age and the Pallava power became important, members of the Chola family accepted service under the Pallavas, and found occasion in course of time to establish themselves on the northern marches of the Pallava dominion. Like all feudatory dynasties, they were ready to proclaim their independence when they got the chance, acknowledging the suzerainty of

134 See Studies in Cola History and Administration, ii. 'Karikāla in History and Legend'.
135 468 of 1923.
136 El, XXI, 29 ff.
stronger neighbours at other times either voluntarily or under duress. Some hold, however, though on slender grounds, that Karikāla displaced the Pallavas from Kāṅchī about the fourth century A.D., that his sway extended into the ceded districts and that the Cholas must have settled in the Telugu country in this period. A legendary Pallava king known as Trilochana or Trinayana (three-eyed) is said to have been punished by Karikāla by the blinding of his superfluous eye when he refused to assist his suzerain in the raising of the flood-banks of the Kāverī; this puerile legend which makes its first appearance in inscriptions and literature in the tenth and eleventh centuries can furnish no basis for history.

The earliest known line of Telugu-Choḷas ruled in the Rēnāḍu or Mahārājapādi (king’s country) from about the beginning of the sixth to the middle of the ninth century A.D. The family seems to have begun its rule at Erīgal or Niḍugal in the Tumkur district on the borderland between the Pallava and Kadamba dominions, and the earliest king of whom we hear is Nandi-varman (A.D. 500) whose name indicates a subordinate relation to the Pallavas of Kāṅchī; one of the last Pallava kings of the Sanskrit charters is known to have borne that name. Of the three sons of Nandi-varman, the eldest, Sīṁhavishṇu (another Pallava name), succeeded him and conquered Parivi-vishaya from the Pallavas at the time when they were pre-occupied with hostilities against the Chāḷukyas of Bādāmi. The younger brothers of Sīṁhavishṇu were Sundarananda and Dhanaṇ-jaya, the latter being described as Erīgal mutturāju ruling Rēnāḍu. All the brothers seem to have simultaneously ruled in different areas according to the Mālepāḍu plates of Punyakumāra which say that they and their descendants for some generations enjoyed royal rule. Nothing is known, however, of the Sīṁhavishṇu line.

Dhanaṇ-jaya was followed by his son Navarāma or Mahendra-vikrama I Chola Mahārāja c. A.D. 600. He bore the title Muditaśīlākshara, justified by his well-chiselled stone inscriptions. At first a subordinate of Sīṁhavishṇu and Mahendra-varman I of Kāṅchī, as evidenced by the resemblance of his titles with those of Mahendra-varman, he seems to have affirmed his independence later just like Sīṁhavishṇu Choda. He had a ḍugarāja (yuvarāja) of Erīgal under him, possibly his eldest son Gunamudita. The younger son Punyakumāra was mutturāja of Erīgal and ruled over southern Rēnāḍu with Chippili as his capital. After Gunamudita’s rule as king (620-25), he succeeded him in the rule of Rēnāḍu with Māle-
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pādu as his capital. Guṇamudita seems to have left no sons. Punya-
kumāra’s accession seems to have taken place when Mahendra-
varman I was still on the throne of Kāñchī. Some of his titles like
Marunrupidugu, Madanavilasa, Mārdavachitta, Purushaśārdula, and
Pormukharāma bear close resemblance with the titles of Mahendra-
varman and may indicate subordination to him in the early stages;
but the titles Mahārāja, Prithivivallabha and so on indicate his
independent status as a ruler. As king he conquered Hiranyakāśhra
(Kamalapuram and Cuddapah tāluka) in his fifth regnal year (630-31)
possibly from the Pallavas. Thenceforth he was the ally and feudato-
y of the Chālukyas of Bādāmi after a short period of precarious
independence marked by the imperial titles already noticed. Hiuan
Tsang who visited the country (Chuliye) about A.D. 641-2 does not
mention the name of its ruler.

The next king after Punyakumāra was Vikramāditya Chola Mahā-
rājādhirāja (650-75), possibly a son of Punyakumāra, though we get
no direct statement to that effect. He was a contemporary of Chālukya
Vikramāditya I whose Talamanchi plates (13 July, A.D. 660) show
that his power extended as far as the Nellore district, and one of
whose inscriptions, dated in his twenty-seventh year, mentions a
Telugu-Choḍa mutturāja as aṇāpti.139 Vikramāditya Choḍa was
followed by his son Saktikumāra (675-700), and after him came his
son Vikramāditya II Choḍa Mahārājādhirāja Paramēśvara. The queen
of the last-mentioned monarch was Choḍa-Mahādevī who is seen
from inscriptions to have taken an active part in the administration.

By the time of the next monarch Satyāditya (725-50) the Telugu-
Choḍa kingdom had come to include Śiddhi 1000 (modern Sidhout).
But soon after, the Choḍas suffered a reverse and their territory
passed for a time under Vikramāditya Perbānādhirāja, a feudatory
of Chālukya Vijayāditya of Bādāmi.140 Telugu-Choḍa power was
restored by Prithivivallabha Vijayāditya about A.D. 760 and the
Bānas of Pāmbuliggi (Hāvalige) became subject to him. He also
struck up a friendship with the Pallava Nandi-varman II, and this
relation continued long after him for nearly a century as we find
a Choḍa Mahārāja Kumārānkuṣa acting as aṇāpti in the Velūr-
pālaivam plates of Nandi-varman III.

Of the descendants of Sundārananda who were perhaps ruling
over Būdili and its neighbourhood, only two late members, Mahendra
and his son Kāpi Bola, are known by name. They seem to have
maintained cordial relations with the collateral branches. Mahendra
had another son Elaṇjola whose conflict with the rising Rāṣṭrakūṭa
power is attested by a virakul (hero-stone) recording the death of a soldier in a fight against Dantiyamma Maṅgu, a vassal of Dantidurga. Later came the invasion of Krishṇa I. Kapi Bola Mutturāju was evidently the younger son of Mahendra; he ruled over Kandakoṭṭi (Gondikoṭa?) in Rāmadī-nāḍu; raids led by him against the Rāṣṭrakūṭa country (Ratṭapādi) and the Bāṇas are attested by inscriptions.  

A certain Dhanāṇjaya II (c. 750-68) of Erigal-vādi whose relation to the other monarchs is not known, bore the title Adhirāja and provoked a Rāṣṭrakūṭa invasion by his raids and suffered a defeat at Tiruvūra (c. 768); the forces of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas were led by a Chālukya general Balavarma. and he was assisted by the Kadamba feudatories of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas. Dhanāṇjaya was defeated in battle, several generals of his being killed, and his territory merged in the Rāṣṭrakūṭa kingdom.  

After Mahendra II and his sons, we hear of Nripakāma (c. 800) and Divākara (c. 825). The last is said to have become a scholar at an early age. The last known ruler of the line of Sundarananda was Adhirāja Śrīkanṭha (c. 850) who suffered a curtailment of his kingdom by the rise of the Bāṇas, Vaidumbas and Nolambas under Rāṣṭrakūṭa protection. He ruled in the S.E. corner of the Cuddapah district, and it seems probable that Kumāraṅkuśa was one of his immediate descendants.  

The history of the Telugu-Chōdas becomes very obscure in the tenth century A.D. The few records of the family found in different parts of the Telugu country do not enable us to trace the interrelation of its numerous branches and give a connected account; but some of the important centres of their power and the names of the outstanding rulers may be noted. Pottapi in the Rajamprata tāluk of the Cuddapah district became the most important seat of the Chōdas from which they spread in different directions. Pottapi appears to have risen to prominence before the close of the tenth century A.D. The conquest of Tondaimandalam by Āditva I brought the Telugu-Chōdas into contact with the imperial Cholas of the Tamil country. Āditva, as we have seen, died at Tondamanād near Kālahasti in the Chittoor district which was included in Pottapi-nāḍu at this time, and Pottapi, the headquarters of the district, was not far from it. The assumption of the title Madhurāntaka by the Telugu-Chōda ruler of the place clearly shows that he not only became a feudatory of the imperial Cholas, but accompanied his

141 EC. XII, Mi. 94.
142 EC. X. Gh. 76: 341 of 1905.
143 EC. XII, Mi. 93 and 101.
overlord Parāntaka in his expedition against Madurai and participated in the capture of the city before A.D. 910. Madhurantaka Pottapi Chola was the founder of a new line of kings who continued to rule during the next two centuries. Balliya Chola Mahārāja who was ruling Pottapi before A.D. 971-72 was probably one of his immediate successors. From Pottapi the Telugu-Chōḷas spread northwards. A branch of the family established itself in Ėruva, the tract of territory in the borderland of the present Nellore, Kurnool and Guntur districts; another branch made Peḍakal in the Kurnool district its headquarters; Siddhi Chola and Telugiga Bijjana who were ruling Kanne 300, and the country extending northwards as far as Eṭgir in the Gulbarga district of the old Hyderabad State in the time of Āhavānalla Somesvara I and his sons, appear to have been connected with the Peḍakal family. An older branch of the Chōḷas of Rēnāḍu was ruling the western marches of the Telugu country; and it appears to have fought often with the Rāṣṭrakūṭas.

The most powerful Telugu-Chōḷa chief of this dark period was, of course, Chōḍa Bhīma, son of Jātā Chōḍa Peḍakal. Only two records of Jātā Chōḍa and his son have come to light so far. A short epigraph at Miḍutur in the Cuddapah tāḷuk of the Cuddapah district records the gift of land by the king to a Brahmin officer who devastated the village of Tippalurū in a battle. Neither the identity of the enemy nor the circumstances of the battle are disclosed in the record. The situation of the inscription clearly shows that the country extending from Peḍakal to Cuddapah was under the sway of Jātā Chōḍa. Bhīma was far more illustrious than his father. His Kaṇṭhipuram inscription, though fragmentary, gives a good deal of interesting information about his career. Bhīma is said to have come into conflict with Rāṣṭrakūṭa Kṛṣṇa III. Though the details of this conflict are not known, it is not unlikely that it arose out of Kṛṣṇa’s attempt to subjugate the Telugu-Chōḍa principalities bordering on the kingdom of Veṅgi. The Telugu-Chōḍa princes of Western Andhra were also involved in it. A Kannāḍa epigraph at Maḍakasira in the Anantapur district, dated A.D. 948-49, records that a Rāṣṭrakūṭa army under Kiriva Ponnayya together with the forces of Nolamba Pallava king Diliparasa marched against Gajāṇkusā Chola, and in a battle that took place at Ibili Rāṣṭrakūṭa general was killed. Gajāṇkusā was probably a member of the Pāmbulggi
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or Nidugal branch. The outcome of the struggle is not known. Kṛiṣṇa appears to have ultimately succeeded; for, according to the Sāntipurāṇa of Ponna, Nāgamayya, the father of Mallapayya and Punnamayya, at whose instance Ponna composed the Purāṇa, was the governor of Kamma-nādu in the Veṅgi country.\textsuperscript{149} It was also at this time that Kṛiṣṇa sent Bāḍapa and Tālapa, sons of Yuddhamalla II, with an army to Veṅgi to drive away the boy king Amma II and occupy the kingdom. The attempt was completely successful; for from Interu grant\textsuperscript{150} we learn that Amma was expelled and Bāḍapa proclaimed himself king. It was probably to protect his interests that Nāgamayya was appointed as the protector of Kamma-nādu. Now, Bhuṁa could not have remained a disinterested spectator of the political changes in Veṅgi; for his sister was married to Amma II and he must have helped his brother-in-law to regain his kingdom, though nothing is known about his activities until after the death of Amma twenty-five years later.

Amma II’s career was chequered. Though he managed to recover his kingdom from the sons of Yuddhamalla, he was obliged to seek refuge in Kaliṅga on account of Rāṣṭracūṭa Kṛiṣṇa’s invasion in a.d. 955. Amma’s elder brother Dānārṇava obtained from Kṛiṣṇa sovereignty over Veṅgi which he could not maintain long; for his brother Amma soon returned from Kaliṅga and took possession of it. As Dānārṇava was not allowed to remain in the kingdom without molestation, he rose up in rebellion and, having put to death Amma II in battle, recaptured the throne in a.d. 970.

How Dānārṇava managed to slay Amma and ascend the throne is not known. It is not improbable that he secured help from his former allies, the Rāṣṭracūṭas. Kṛiṣṇa was no doubt dead by the time; but Kheṭṭiga, who succeeded him in 967, was still powerful; his authority was recognised in the south of Tuṅgalhadrā in 971\textsuperscript{151} and it was not until the Paramāra attack on Malkhed in 972-73 that his real weakness was exposed. Now, the Western Gaṅga king Mārasimha II was the most powerful feudatory of the Rāṣṭracūṭa kingdom. He married the daughter of a king called Dānapa.\textsuperscript{152} The only monarch who bore that name at this time was the Eastern Chāluṅga Dānārṇava who is also mentioned as Dānapāca in the inscriptions. It is not unreasonable to suppose that Mārasimha II helped his father-in-law to slay Amma II and seize the throne. The fact that Dānār-
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ṇava's downfall and death synchronized with the final extinction of Rāshtrakūṭa power may point to some connection between the fortunes of Dānārṇava and of the last Rāshtrakūṭa kings.

It is remarkable that Chōda Bhīma emerges into limelight during the period of the political revolution in which Taila II overthrew Rāshtrakūṭa power, and that though he and Taila were ruling adjacent territories, there is no evidence of hostility between them. Further, they had a common enemy in Chōla Rājarāja I who gave shelter to the children of Dānārṇava in their exile and fought a relentless war against the Chālukyas. These facts are significant; they were not perhaps due to mere accident.

Before attacking Dānārṇava in Veṅgi, Bhīma apparently made himself master of Pākānḍu which had passed under the Vaidumbas who were the friends of Krishṇa III; the Vaidumba Bhuvana Trinētra (accession a.d. 972), who claims to rule from Pottapi,153 was thus tarred with the same brush as Dānārṇava and the first victim of Bhīma's plans of revenge.

Bhīma's invasion of Veṅgi was completely successful. Though the details of the campaign are not known, there is no room for doubt about the ultimate result. Dānārṇava was killed in battle; his family took to flight; and Bhīma's authority was firmly established in Veṅgi. The conquest of Veṅgi was soon followed by the invasion of the hilly region known as Agency Tracts at present. After some hard fighting the Manne chiefs who held sway over it were forced to submit. This naturally led to the conquest of Kaliṅga which was then ruled by the Eastern Gaṅga king Kāmārṇava. Bhīma's invasion took place either in 978 or the preceding year. Kāmārṇava was killed in battle; but his younger brother Vinayāditya who succeeded him continued the struggle for three more years until he also fell on the battle-field in 981. Thus it took four or five years for Bhīma to complete the conquest of Kaliṅga.

Bhīma ruled over Veṅgi for twenty-seven years. Though he was engaged in wars in Kaliṅga and elsewhere in the early part of his rule, Veṅgi itself was free from trouble. There was absolute peace within the kingdom, and his subjects remained contented. But trouble was brewing abroad. The sons of Dānārṇava, Śakti-varman I and Vimalāditya, sought refuge at the Chōla court in Tanjore. Rājarāja I received them kindly and espoused their cause. He gave his daughter Kundavvai in marriage to Vimalāditya, the younger of the two brothers, and sent the elder Śakti-varman with an army under the command of Rājendra against Veṅgi. Though the conquest of
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Veṅgi is referred to for the first time in the Chola inscriptions dated in the 14th regnal year of Rājarāja I, the Chola invasion perhaps began a little earlier. Chōḍa Bhīma was a powerful monarch; he was further a veteran soldier and an experienced general. He was not likely to submit without a struggle. The inscriptions of Sakti-varman I indicate two or three definite stages in the war. As soon as Bhīma heard that the Chola force was coming, he sent an army under a famous warrior called Ekavīra to oppose its advance. He was, however, killed in battle. Next he sent another army under two of his lieutenants, Mahārāja and Baddema; but they also sustained defeat and were slain. Lastly, Sakti-varman encountered Bhīma in battle and destroyed him with the whole brood of Jatā Chōḍa.154 The death of Bhīma in battle is corroborated by the evidence of the Tiruvālaṅgāḍu plates155 in which it is stated that Rājarāja slew the invulnerable Andhra king (arandhra-Andhram) called Bhīma in fight. The death of Bhīma did not, as a matter of fact, take place in or before the 14th regnal year (a.d. 999) of Rājarāja I. The Eastern Chāḷukya and Chōḷa inscriptions represent but one side of the medal. They seem to ignore an important episode in the war. The Cholas supporting Sakti-varman I doubtless inflicted defeat on Bhīma in two or three engagements and apparently compelled him to retire to Kāliṅga in the north of his dominions in a.d. 999. They restored Sakti-varman I to his ancestral throne, and returned to their kingdom. As soon as they withdrew, Bhīma evidently renewed the attack from Kāliṅga and drove Sakti-varman out of Veṅgi and boldly advanced on Kāṇchī in s. 923 (a.d. 1001-2) and entered the city where he left a record of his arrival in the Rājasimhēśvara temple. The triumph of Bhīma was only temporary; for soon afterwards a Chola army counter-attacked and marched as far as Kāliṅga, the base of Bhīma's operations. The conquest of Kāṇīṅgam is referred to in Rājarāja's 16th regnal year (a.d. 1001-2). It must have been during this invasion that Bhīma was killed. Thus ended the career of the greatest Andhra monarch of the tenth century.

Chōḍa Bhīma's career was indeed remarkable. Scion of one of the numerous Telugu-Chōḍa families, he rose by his own ability to the position of an independent monarch not only of the entire coast of the Telugu country over which the Eastern Chāḷukyas ruled in the palmy days of their power but also a large part of the Rāyalśima where Eastern Chāḷukya power was never recognised. He had the dis-
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tinction of being the only prince of the Telugu-Choda families that ever attained the status of a sovereign ruler. With his death ended the independence of the Andhras. Veṅgi sank into the position of a Chola dependency, bound by the golden fetters of marriage alliances.

VIII. VAIDUMBAS

The only known copper-plate of the Vaidumbas\(^{156}\) depicts a liṅga with the Nandi in front, and Nandi was their emblem. Their origin is obscure. They do not put forth any long pedigree like most of the other dynasties, their praśasti only comprising a statement that their chest bore the marks of victory won in many battle-fields. Their earliest records occur in the Madanapalle tūluṅk, and they might have been related to the family of the Poīs who figure earlier in the same area and from whom Punyakumāra chose his queen Vasanta Poī Cholamahādevī. They declared their independence when the Telugu-Choda power declined and established their capital at Vaidumbavrolu and captured Chippili in the neighbourhood. Under Gaṇḍa Saṅkili (c. A.D. 800) they came into conflict with the Telugu-Chodas; beginning in some border skirmishes,\(^{157}\) their hostility soon grew into a chronic antagonism which under Gaṇḍa Trinētra Viṇḍa Mahārāja culminated in the battle of Soremaḍi (A.D. 825). After that battle he occupied Rēṇāḍu, and thus became the neighbour of the Nolambas.\(^{158}\) Vaidumba records occur generally in the southern part of Rēṇāḍu in the Chittoor district, though one at Animela\(^{159}\) takes us to the heart of Rēṇāḍu. Parts of Rēṇāḍu and Siddhi 1000 continued to be under Telugu-Choda rule, as evidenced by Śṛiṅkaṭa's grant (A.D. 850) in the south-east corner of Cuddapah. The final subjugation of Vaidumbas and the destruction of their principality was effected by Chola Parāntaka about 912. Afterwards, the surviving Vaidumbas became the friends and feudatories of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas under Kṛṣṇa III. After Krishna's death they aspired to an independent status once more, and about 972 Bhuvana Trinētra celebrated his coronation and even occupied Pottapi-nāḍu, taking it from the Chodas.\(^{160}\) In Rēṇāḍu he was succeeded by Iriṅgāya Mahārāja in 976.\(^{161}\)
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IX. NOLAMBAS

Maigala Nolambādhirāja of the family of the Pallavas of Kāñchi is said to have defeated a Kirāta in battle and founded the family of the Nolambas; he worshipped goddess Chaṇḍikā and earned praise from the Kārnāṭas, we do not know how. His son and successor was Śīngapota Kali-Nolambādhirāja, feudatory of the Rāṣhṭrākūṭa Govinda II\(^{162}\) (772-79) and contemporary of Rājādityarasa of Banavāsi and Chitravāhana II of Āluvakhēḍa 6000. He took part in quelling the insurrection of Duggamāra against the Gaṅga king who was his friend. The Gaṅga king was most probably Śrīpurusha or Śivamāra II.\(^{163}\) The earliest settlement of the Nolambas was in the modern Chikkavere tūluk of the Chitdurg district on the border between Rāṣhṭrākūṭa and Gaṅga territories, and this area came to be known as Nolambalige 1000. From there they expanded eastward and south-eastward into Telugu-Chōḍa territory under Parameśvara Pallavāḍhīrāja Chāruponnera, son and successor of Śūngapota. Inscriptions of the time of Govinda II\(^{164}\) bear evidence of Chāruponnera’s rule with his son Pallavamalla in Nolambalige 1000, Iṅgalvāḍi 300, Gaṅgavēḍi 30 and other places. Iṅgalvāḍi was definitely a Telugu-Chōḍa possession, and its occupation by the Nolambas produced the migration of the Telugu-Chōḍas to other areas. About A.D. 800 the Pennār became the boundary between the Nolamba and the Telugu-Chōḍa territories,\(^{165}\) and apparently from this time to the battle of Soremaḍi (825) friendly relations subsisted between the two powers. After that battle, the relations between Polalchol and Gaṅga Rājamalla on one side and the Bāṇas on the other have been traced in the section on the Bāṇas. The gain of Gaṅgārūṣāsīra was followed by the battle of Murggēpāḍi in the Kolār district which laid the Bāṇa power low for a time. A war with the Vaidumbas led to the capture of part of Rēṇḍū they had held till then.\(^{166}\) Under Rājamalla’s successor, Nītīmārga, Polalchola seems to have become master for a time of all the country up to Kāñchi.\(^{167}\) He was also known as Maṅgi and was killed in battle by the Eastern Chālukya Gunaga Vijayāditya III. It is not quite clear whether Gunaga acted on behalf of the Telugu-Chōḍas, or what is more probable, as the feudatory of Amoghavarsha I in pursuit of Rāṣhṭrākūṭa hostilities against Nītīmārga after the recall of Baṅkeśa necessitated by rebellions near the capital of Amoghavarsha. If Gunaga had championed
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the Telugu-Choḍas, they got no great good out of it. For Mahendra, the son and successor of Polalchola, destroyed the Telugu-Choḍas root and branch (A.D. 878).168

The fall of Mungi led to the temporary recovery of the Vaidumbas and Bāṇas.169 But all alike soon felt the weight of Rāṣṭrakūṭa arms under Krīṣṇa II (c. A.D. 900) though their submergence was only temporary.170 They recovered a few years later but only to become the instruments of Rāṣṭrakūṭa aggression against Chola Parāntaka I. The Nolamba country as a separate unit was extinguished by the conquest of Nolambavāḍi by Chola Rājarāja I.

X. THE CHOLAS

After the close of the Saigam Age, the history of the Cholas, like that of the Tamil land as a whole, becomes obscure. While the Pāṇḍyas and Pallavas emerge into light towards the end of the sixth century A.D., the Cholas do not re-enter the stage till the middle of the ninth. So for a period of well over five hundred years (300-850) the Cholas led a submerged existence. Their presence in the land of the Kāverī is, however, attested by a number of literary and epigraphical references.

There is good reason to hold that the semi-legendary Chola monarch Īlanda (Red-eyed one) belonged to the early part of this long period. His name is counted among the mythical ancestors of the imperial Cholas of the Vijayálava line in their charters, and in hagiology he figures as a nāyana (Śaiva devotee) who, as a spider in a previous birth, had been the rival of an elephant in the worship of Śiva at Tiruvānaikkavaḷ (the elephant-guarded shrine) on the island of Srīrāngam. As the result of his devotion, he gained birth in the Chola royal family and became the son of Śubhadeva and Kamalavatī, names otherwise unknown. Īlanda built many temples of Śiva, including one at Tiruvānaikkavaḷ; he also covered with gold the roof of the famous shrine of Naṭarāja at Chidambaram and built houses for the use of the Brahmīn priests of that shrine. So far the Periya-purāṇam of Sekkīlār (twelfth century). The famous Śaiva saints, Appar and Sambandar, in their Devāram hymns, mark out several temples as among those erected by Īlanda, and refer to his having been a spider in a former birth. The Vaishnava saint Tirumāṅgai devotes one of his several hymns on Tirunāraiyur171 to the works of Īlanda, and says that he built seventy beautiful
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temple of the Lord (Īśa) of eight arms. According to the hymn, Śeṅgaṇān was victorious in the battles of Veṇṇi and Alundūr, and despatched the Vēl of Vilandai to heaven. The king is called the lord of the Kāveri region, the southern Tamil (i.e. Pāṇḍya), and the king of the northern quarter, besides being also the lord of the west. There is thus no doubt that Śeṅgaṇān was revered as a great devotee and warrior in the seventh century. He was perhaps a prominent Chola king of the fourth or early fifth century, who expanded his dominion by conquests in the south, west and north, and by the temples he erected earned for himself a great reputation as a devotee of Śiva and a place in the Śaiva calendar of saints. His son Nalladikkon is mentioned in the Anbil plates. But the correctness of the statement is open to doubt, as he is not mentioned in other Chola grants, and a Nalladī figures in an early poem of Parānār as lord of Vallam, near Tanjore.

Another Chola monarch of the dark period was Pugal Chola who ruled from Uraiyr, honoured Śaiva devotees and waged successful war against Adigaimān of Tagadūr (Dharmapuri in Salem district). He is said to have sought death on a pyre when he discovered that a Śaiva devotee had been killed in his war with Tagadūr. When a certain Kūrruvan, chief of Kalandai, afterwards recognized as a nāyanār, wanted the Brahmins of Chidambaram to put the diadem on his head in the usual form, they declined to do so on the plea that they would crown only monarchs of the Chola line and preferred exile in the Chera country to complying with the wishes of the upstart chieftain. But God Śiva appeared to Kūrruvan in a dream and crowned him by planting the divine feet on his head, which is his claim to be reckoned a nāyanār. A Chola king is said to have presided at the debate in Tiruvārūr between Daṇḍi-adigal, a Śaiva saint, and the Jains who lost in the contest and had to quit the city. It was again a Chola who enabled Appar to end his fast by finding the image of Śiva at Palaiyarai near Kumbakonam when the Jains had hidden it away from him. To the same period belongs the Chola monarch whose daughter Maṅgayarkkaraśi (queen among women) became the queen of the Pāṇḍya contemporary of Sambandar and persuaded her husband to abandon Jainism in favour of Śaivism. Other Chola kings of the time are mentioned in the Periya-purāṇam, but they belong more to religious than political history, and there is no means of determining the exact period of their rule or their mutual relations. Likewise the Divyasiri-Charita and the
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Guruparamparā tell the same tale from the Vaishnava side. Devadevi, the hetaera who captivated alvār Tondār-adip-podi (Bhaktāṅghri-ṛēṇu) for a time, met the holy man first when she was returning from the court of the Chola king at Uraiyyur. The celebrated Uraiyyur-nāchchiyār who declined to marry a mortal and insisted successfully on her union with Lord Raṅganātha of Śrīraṅgam, was a Chola princess, the daughter of Dharmavarmā of the solar line of Uraiyyur. Tirumaṅgaigai-alvār is said to have started life as an officer in the Chola army. Possibly some of these literary references were merely due to the fact that the works in which they occur were composed in the days of Chola ascendency. Nevertheless, these repeated references to Cholas in the literary traditions of Saivism and Vaishnavism may be accepted as proof that even in the period of their political obscurity, the Chola rulers lent their support to the Hindu revival that resulted in the practical extinction of Jainism and Buddhism in the Tamil country.

The main thing about the Cholas in this period, however, is that they ceased to be a great power, and scions of the dynasty sought service under the Pāṇḍyas and Pallavas when these came up again at the close of the sixth century. They seem, however, never to have completely lost hold of their ancient capital Uraiyyur near Trichinopoly. Vijayālaya rises into prominence from the same neighbourhood and the various branches of the Telugu-Cholas glory in the names of Uraiyyur and Kāveri besides that of Karikāla, and as we shall see, epigraphy confirms this impression. The incidents of the Kalabhra interregnum, and the rule of Achchuta of the Kalabhra-kula in the Chola country have been mentioned already, and the rise and progress of the Telugu-Cholas have been traced in another section. Epigraphical references to the Cholas do not begin till we reach the charters of the Siṅhavishṇu line. The Velūrpālaiyam plates describe Buddhavarmā of the fifth century as the submarine fire to the ocean of the Chola army.174 Siṅhavishṇu (c. a.d. 600) is said to have seized the Chola country watered by the Kāveri and adorned by groves of areca palms and by rich paddy fields.175 Mahendra-varman I (600-80), the son of Siṅhavishṇu, gloried in his sway over the Chola country; in his inscriptions the Trichinopoly rock is called the crown of the Chola country, and Lord Śiva is said to have enjoined the king to build a temple for him on the rock to enable him to have a constant view of the rich splendour of the Chola land.176 The Kūram grant of Parameśvara-varman I includes the Chola among countries conquered by him.177 The Aihole inscription of Pulakesin II (634)
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states that he confined the power of the Pallavas inside the four walls of Kāñchipuram and thus brought prosperity to the Chola, Kerala and Pāṇḍya.\textsuperscript{178} Vikramāditya I, the son and successor of Pulakeśin II, also claims conquest of the Chola country, and his Godvāl plates (674) mention his victorious camp in the ancient Chola capital Uraiyr on the southern bank of the Kāverī.\textsuperscript{179} The Velvikuḍi grant says that the Pāṇḍya Kochchādaṇiyaṇ Raṇadhīra (710-40) assumed the title Seinbiyan, among others, thus implying that a part of the traditional Chola country acknowledged his sway. The Trichinopoly inscription of Māraṇjaḍaiyaṇ\textsuperscript{180} calls him the tilaka of two dynasties, the lunar and the solar, i.e. Pāṇḍya and Chola respectively. The Cholas are counted by the Sinnamanur plates among the allies of the Pallavas who sustained a defeat near Kumbakonam at the hands of Śrī Vallabha (A.D. 815-62).

A continuous history of the Cholas becomes possible with the rise of Vijayālaya (Abode of Victory) about the middle of the ninth century. The chronology of the period depends on astronomical data furnished by contemporary inscriptions, particularly those of Āditya I and Parāntaka I, the son and grandson, respectively, of Vijayālaya.\textsuperscript{181} The reign of Vijayālaya in the neighbourhood of Uraiyr and the extent of his territory are attested by references in inscriptions of a later time. A record from Tirunēduṅgulam\textsuperscript{182} in the Trichinopoly tāluk refers to a gift of land made in accordance with an earlier charter of Parakesarivarman Śrī Vijayālaya Chola Deva. A Vijayālaya-chaturvedimāṅgalam is mentioned among the brahmadeya villages which were required to supply men for service in the Tanjore temple in the reign of Rājarāja I.\textsuperscript{183} A kalvēṭṭu (stone inscription) of the fourth year of Vijayālaya is mentioned in an inscription of Vikrama Chola from North Arcot.\textsuperscript{184} A Pāṇḍya inscription of the thirteenth century mentions the Vijayālaya-choleśvara temple at Nāṛttāmalai in Pudukkoṭṭai;\textsuperscript{185} the temple, which survives to this day after a renovation, is a gem of early Chola architecture. The Tiruvālaṅgādu plates\textsuperscript{186} quaintly affirm that Vijayālaya caught hold of Tanjore for
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his pleasure as if the city were his lawful spouse, and that he founded a temple of goddess Niśumbhasūdīṇī (Durgā) in the city; in the Kānyākumārī inscription of Virarājendra, Vijayalaya is said to have founded Tanjore.¹⁸⁷ A stone inscription from Viracholapuram in Tirukkovilur taluk of South Arcot is dated in the third regnal year of Parakesari who captured Tanjore,¹⁸⁸ clearly a record of Vijayalaya's time and the only one giving the title which settles the identity of the king. Another from Kakkul, fifty miles farther north, dated in the eighth year of Parakesari, may also be assigned to Vijayalaya with good reason.¹⁸⁹ The duration of Vijayalaya's reign is uncertain, and his rise can only be conjecturally dated about A.D. 850.¹⁹⁰ The Pallavas were still powerful, and Vijayalaya must have been a vassal under them. The facts that he dated records in his own regnal years and that he conquered Tanjore and based his biruda on that conquest show the growing importance of the vassal and the relative decline of the suzerain's power. He was encouraged to conquer Tanjore because it was held by the Muttaraiyar, a line of chieftains who held parts of Tanjore, Trichinopoly and Pudukkoṭai, and ranged themselves on the side of the Pāṇḍyas in their struggle with the Pallavas. Vijayalaya by turning against them at once gained credit for his loyal service to his suzerain, and took the first steps towards the expansion of Chola dominion, though Vijayalaya himself could have hardly dreamt that his successes were to be the beginnings of one of the most splendid empires known in India's history. It is clear that he did not stop with the conquest of Tanjore, but made his influence felt over a much wider area, and that the Pallava rulers, hard pressed by the Pāṇḍyas and other enemies, had neither the will nor the ability to restrain the activities of their mighty vassal.

Vijayalaya was succeeded by his son Āditya I about A.D. 870-71. He was a Rājakesari, a title which was borne alternately with Parakesari by successive Chola sovereigns. Like his father, Āditya continued to serve his Pallava suzerain and further his own interests at the same time. When the Pāṇḍya king Varaguṇa II threw off his enforced allegiance to Nripatunga and invaded the Pallava territory, Āditya seems to have inflicted a defeat on the invader at Iļavai on the north bank of the Kāveri in the Chola country, and his achievement was commemorated as already noticed in the alternative name of the village Pāṇḍiyaṉai-venkaṇḍā-śola-Chaturvedimaṅgalam i.e. the Brahmin village established by the Chola who saw the back of the Pāṇḍya
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king. Aditya must have also played a prominent part on the Pallava side in the decisive battle of Sri Purambyam (A.D. 880). Unlike Ganga Prithivipati I, the other ally of the Pallava Aparajita who lost his life in the field after securing victory for Aparajita, the Chola Aditya lived to reap the full benefits of the victory. In fact the Pandyas and Pallavas were both exhausted by their long-drawn wars, and the time had come for the Cholas to come out and fill the political void that was being created. Aditya was not slow to seize the occasion. He quickly made up his mind to overthrow his nominal suzerain and annex his country to his own growing kingdom. The evidence bearing on the termination of the Pallava power about A.D. 891 has already been cited (p. 342). The result of Aditya's victory was that the Cholas took the place of the Pallavas, as the neighbours of the Rashtrakutas in the south-east.

Aditya's political achievements were not confined to the conquest of Tondaimandalam. Either the Ganga Prithivipati II assisted Aditya in the overthrow of the Pallava Aparajita, or that achievement of Aditya led to the recognition of his suzerainty by the Ganga ruler, Pritapatiyar, son of Maramaraiyar, who is no other than Prithivipati II, presented a silver vessel (kendi) to the temple of Takkolam in the twenty-fourth year of Raja Kesari (Aditya I). Aditya, after being crowned at Tanjavur, came to Koigadesa, conquered the Veda (hunter) kings, captured Talakad, and ruled over his new conquests, founding many new tax-free agraharas there. Despite the late date and the unrealistic character of this chronicle, this statement looks probable. The records of Parantaka I, son of Aditya, are found in Koigadesa and he does not claim to have conquered the country himself; an inscription of the tenth year of the king mentions his agent in Koigu for the supervision of temples in that country. It is therefore quite reasonable to suppose that Aditya conquered Koigu. The mention of Talakad implies that Aditya occupied at least a part of the Western Ganga country on the upper course of the Kaveri, a supposition which finds support in the statement of the Anbil plates that Aditya constructed Siva temples on both the banks of the Kaveri throughout its course from the Salvadri mountain to the wide ocean. Prithivipati II of the collateral branch was already a feudatory of the Chola. But there is no evidence that the main line acknowledged Chola suzerainty at this time. The Pandyas Parantaka Vira Narayana claims to have
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fought in Kosovo about the same time as Aditya's conquest of the country, and this may well be a reference to his failure to defend that part of his empire.

Aditya was on friendly terms with his Chera contemporary Sthānū Ravi. The two kings together conferred on Vikki-Annan, the husband of a Kadamba-mādevī, the personal privileges of 'throne, chaūri, palaquin, drum, a palace, ponakam (lit. food), bugle, and elephant-corps, and the hereditary title of Sebmiyan Tamilavel. He was perhaps a Chera general who had, at the instance of his master, cooperated with Aditya in his Kosovo campaign against the Pāṇḍya. Aditya's son Parāntaka married a Chera princess. A Vikki-Anna is mentioned in the Gaṅga records of the time as the son of Prithivipati II; it is not clear if the two were identical. Aditya himself had for his chief queen (mītta deviṇā) a Rāshtrakūṭa princess, Hāignon Pichichi, a daughter of Kṛṣṇa II, by whom he had a son Kannara-deva.

Aditya I died at Toṇḍaimāṇḍ near Kālahasti in Chittoor district and his son Parāntaka I built a temple over his remains, known as Kōḍandāramesvara or Adityesvara, and provided for a thousand persons of all religious sects being fed there on certain festival days.

Parāntaka's accession has been fixed by Kiellhorn between 15 January and 25 July, A.D. 907. The Chola kingdom then comprised the whole country between the Kāverī in the south and Madras and Kālahasti in the north, and included some tracts to the south of the Kāverī and parts of the Mysore plateau. Parāntaka continued to rule till 955, as his latest inscription bears a date in his forty-eighth year, but his records become rare towards the close of his reign. He enjoyed success and prosperity for the best part of his reign. As a young prince, he took an active part in his father's campaigns, particularly those against the Pallavas. He extended his kingdom to Cape Comorin in the south and even invaded Ceylon. In the north he extended his sway up to Nellore and displaced the Bānas and Vaidumbas, favouring his loyal Gaṅga feudatory Prithivipati II Hastimalla. But he found the Rāshtrakūṭa his inveterate foes, and though he repulsed an invasion of Kṛṣṇa II fairly early in his reign, his defences failed, and disaster overtook his realm when Kṛṣṇa III invaded it (c. 948). The Chola empire did not fully recover from the shock till the accession of Rājarāja I in A.D. 985.

Parāntaka appears to have come to the throne in the midst of a
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war begun by Āditya against the Pāṇḍya. The title Madurai-konda (Captor of Madurai) occurs in Parāntaka’s inscriptions from 910. The process of conquest and subjugation must, however, have been long and difficult, and his inscriptions actually appear in the Pāṇḍya country only many years later, about 930-31. The Pāṇḍya ruler who faced the invasion and lost his kingdom was Rājasimha II. When he suffered defeat in the war at the hands of Parāntaka, the Pāṇḍya appealed for aid to Kassapa V (908-18) of Ceylon,201 who equipped and sent a large force under the general Sakkasenāpati, at the sight of which Rājasimha exclaimed: ‘I will join all Jambudīpa under one umbrella’. But his high hopes were dashed to the ground on the field of Vellūr (918). According to the Udayendiram plates of Prithivīpati II, the army of Parāntaka won an easy victory against the combined Pāṇḍyan and Ceylonese forces; a herd of elephants was part of the victor’s booty, and he commemorated his success by assuming the title Saṅgrāma-Rāghava, Rāma in battle (against Laikā). The further attempt of the Ceylonese troops to rally for another engagement was hampered by a plague (upasagga) which killed Sakkasenāpati and decimated his troops. Kassapa had to withdraw his army ‘out of pity’ and leave Rājasimha to his own devices. The battle of Vellūr thus turned out to be decisive, and paved the way for the Chola conquest and annexation of the southern kingdom. The unlucky Rājasimha fled to Ceylon with the royal insignia and whatever treasure he could carry. King Dappula V, who had succeeded Kassapa there, was willing to help the refugee monarch, but in the words of the Ceylonese chronicle,202 ‘the nobles dwelling on the island for some reason or other stirred up a sorry strife to the undoing of the Pāṇḍu king. The Pāṇḍu king thought his sojourn here was of no use to him. He left his diadem and other valuables behind and betook himself to the Keralas’. Kerala was the home of Rājasimha’s mother Vānavanmahādevī; but being on friendly terms with the Cholas, the ruler of Kerala was in no position to further the cause of the fallen Pāṇḍya. Parāntaka spent some years fighting in the Pāṇḍya country, and at the end of the conquest he thought of a formal coronation for himself at the Pāṇḍyan capital. But the royal insignia had been taken away by Rājasimha and deposited in Ceylon, and Parāntaka failed in his attempt to get them back. The occurrence is recorded in the Ceylonese chronicle under the reign of Udaya IV (942-50).203 When the Chola king sent mes-
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sages demanding the restitution of the Pândyan diadem and other regalia, Udaya ‘did not give them up. So the mighty Chola equipped an army and sent it to fetch them by force.’ A battle ended in victory for the invading Chola army and the death of the Sinhalese commander. Then Udaya ‘took the crown and the rest and betook himself to Rohana. The Chola troops marched thither, but finding no way of entering Rohana (the hilly south-eastern part of Ceylon), they turned and betook themselves through fear back to their own country.’

In his Pândyan campaign Parāntaka was ably assisted by his subordinates of whom particular mention must be made of the Palovetṭaraiyar chief Kaṇḍan Anumanur of Ködumbalūr (Trichinopoly district) whose heroism on the field of Vellūr was commemorated by special endowments in the temple of Kilappaluvūr. Then there were the Vēlūr chieftains of Ködumbalūr (Pudukkoṭai) who had dynastic alliances with the Chola family. Arikulakesari, one of Parāntaka’s sons, married Pūdi Ādichcha Piḍāri, daughter of Tenna-van Ilāṅgoveḷar of Ködumbalūr. There were other alliances as well. And the Ködumbalūr chieftains had been the enemies of the Pândya for some time as the Sinnamanūr plates state that Rājāsīṁha had fought at Ködumbalūr before the Chola invasion of his country.

While Parāntaka was engaged in the Pândya war, possibly in the interval between his first and second invasion of the Pândya country, he had to encounter another enemy from the north. By the accession of Parāntaka, his half-brother Kannaradeva was kept out of the Chola throne, and Kannara’s grandfather, the Rāṣṭrakūṭa Kṛishṇa II, took up the cause of the excluded prince, who, as the son of the senior queen of Āditya I, had perhaps the better claim, at least as his grandfather thought. Kṛishṇa II planned an invasion of the Chola kingdom, evidently with a view to dethrone Parāntaka and secure the Chola throne for Kannara. His Bāṇa feudatory Vikramāditya II also joined the expedition. The decisive engagement occurred at Vallaḷa, Tiruvallam in North Arcot district. Prithividatta II greatly distinguished himself in the battle. Kṛishṇa and his allies were totally defeated. The Bāṇas were driven out of their territory, Perumbāṇappāḍi, which they had ruled for two centuries and was now handed over to Prithividatta II with the title Bāṇāḍhirāja some time before 916, the date of the Sholingur rock inscription. Parāntaka commemorated his victory against Kṛishṇa II by assuming
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the title Vira-Chola. Hostilities with the Bānas seem to have continued. Parāntaka uprooted two Bāna kings, doubtless Vikramāditya II and his son Vijayāditya III, and conquered the Vaidumbas. The dispossessed rulers fled to the Rāṣṭrakūṭa court, and they had no small share in inciting Krishṇa III to undertake his southern adventure which wrought havoc on Parāntaka’s empire and also weakened the Rāṣṭrakūṭa power.

A glimpse into a Chola campaign in the Nellore district is afforded by two inscriptions from Tiruvörriyur, a northern suburb of Madras. An officer of Parāntaka, Māraṇa Parameśvaran, overran Sītpuli and destroyed Nellūr, and on his return to the south, he stopped at Tiruvörriyur to make a thanks-offering to Mahādeva (A.D. 941)—a grant of land which was made tax-free four years later. This campaign was evidently directed against a Telugu chieftain whose identity is not now easy to decide. Sītpuli was the name of a district in the southern part of the Eastern Chālukya kingdom. The campaign had, however, no permanent results, and no records of Parāntaka have been found in the east coast region to the north of Tiruvörriyur.

The rapid progress of the Cholā power under Parāntaka roused the jealousy of the neighbouring powers, and he began to experience increasing difficulty in defending his empire on all its frontiers. The repulse he had in Ceylon about 945 has already been mentioned. He had to acquiesce in it because of occurrences elsewhere. The death of Prithivīpati II (940) removed Parāntaka’s watch-dog on the north-west frontier. Prithivīpati left behind no son of equal competence, Vikki-Anṇa having predeceased him. In the main line of Gāṅgas Būtuga II, who had married the sister of Rāṣṭrakūṭa Krishṇa III and assisted him in securing his throne from a usurper, was now left in unquestioned power because he had murdered his elder brother Rājamalla and annexed his possessions also. The Bānas and Vaidumbas were in their turn pressing Krishṇa to avenge their losses. Krishṇa himself was in the prime of life, and by no means disinclined to undertake any enterprise that would bring him glory.

These developments were possibly foreshadowed even during the lifetime of Prithivīpati II and before Krishṇa’s accession to the Rāṣṭrakūṭa throne. A cattle-raid in 936 by a Western Gaṅga king, commemorated by an inscribed hero-stone in Kil-Muttugūr in North Arcot district, was the first indication of the gathering storm.
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Parāntaka realized the situation and posted his eldest son Rājāditya with a large army, including an elephant corps and some cavalry, in Tirumunaippādi-nādu, the hilly country of South and North Arcot districts, where Rājāditya resided for some years at Grāmam, also called Rājādittapuram. We also find another son of Parāntaka, by name Arikulakesari, in the same region about the same time, doubtless assisting his elder brother Rājāditya. Parāntaka was thus not unmindful of the repercussions of his aggressive policy, and while expecting much of Pṛthivīpāti II, made his own preparations against an emergency.

The main incidents of Krishṇa’s invasion of the Chola kingdom are to be gathered from two inscriptions. One from Solapuram is dated in Saka 871 (A.D. 949), the year in which Kannaradeva Vallabha entered Tondaimanadalam after the overthrow of Rājāditya. The Atakur inscription of Būtuga II is the other important record. It states that the battle of Takkolam was fought in the current Saka year 872, i.e. A.D. 949-50 and that Būtuga himself killed Rājāditya in that battle. Parāntaka’s inscriptions from the South and North Arcot districts bear dates only up to A.D. 948, and no inscriptions whatever of his reign are known to bear his regnal years 42 to 44 inclusive, a fact clearly pointing to some great disaster in the period 949-51. Thus all lines of evidence go to show that A.D. 949 was the crucial year. Krishṇa III and his brother-in-law Būtuga invaded the Chola empire from the north-west, and the decisive battle was fought at Takkolam, six miles to the south-east of Arkoṇam, a railway junction in North Arcot. The Atakur inscription states that Kannaradeva ‘was making a display of triumph after fighting against and killing the Mūvaḍi-Chola-Rājāditya at a place called Takkola;’ it adds: ‘when Kannaradeva was fighting the Chola, Būtuga made the hōvdāh the battle-field, and aimed at, pierced, and killed Rājāditya’—an achievement for which Krishṇa rewarded him with the districts of Banavase 12,000 and Belvole 300. This account is confirmed on the Chola side by a verse in the larger Leyden grant: ‘The hēroic Rājāditya, the ornament of the solar race, having shaken in battle the unshakable Krishnārāja with his forces, by means of his sharp arrows flying in all directions, was himself pierced in his heart by the sharp arrows of the enemy, and (thus) winning the praise of the three worlds, he ascended to the heaven of heroes in a tall vimāna’.
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The battle was hard-fought, and the Chola cause suffered disaster mainly on account of a well-aimed arrow of Būtuga having fatally wounded Rājāditya.

Even this decisive victory did not mean the collapse of all resistance to Krishṇa’s advance. Inscriptions dated in his reign do not appear till 953, and become common only after 956.217 Inscriptions in South Arcot between the years 952 and 954 mention names of minor chieftains who owe no allegiance either to the Chola or Rāṣṭrakūṭa. Krishṇa in due course assumed the title Kachchhiyum-Taṇḍaiyum-kond, captor of Kāṇchī and Tanjore. From the spurious Sudi plates,218 we learn that Būtuga, after Takkolam, assaulted Tanjore, Nalkote, and a number of other fortresses, and handed over to Krishṇa elephants, horses and a vast amount of treasure seized from these places. Krishṇa was still in his camp at Melpādi in 959, ten years after he invaded Taṇḍaiyam, distributing territory among his followers and constructing temples called Kālapriya, Gāṇḍamārtanda, Krishṇesvara. The Karhad grant219 which gives these details adds that Krishṇa extorted tributes from several kings, including the king of Ceylon, and erected a pillar of victory at Rāmeśvaram. We cannot decide if this is an empty boast or the record of a triumphant raid across the southern half of the Chola empire. No inscriptions of Krishṇa or of his vassals occur south of the latitude of Pondichéry. But the disaster that befell the Chola kingdom can hardly be exaggerated. The blow not only resulted in the loss of the northern possessions of Parāntaka, but loosened his hold on the south, and the Pāṇḍyas once again asserted their independence. The Chola empire ceased to exist; it had to be built up all over again.

Only a few inscriptions in the neighbourhood of Tanjore attest the closing years of Parāntaka’s reign. These are dated in the forty-fifth and forty-sixth years of his reign. One record, bearing a date in the forty-eighth year, comes from distant Vanamāladinne in Punganur tāluk of the Chittoor district.220 The suggestion has been put forward that Parāntaka lost his life in A.D. 953 in a Pāṇḍya war, falling a victim to Vira Pāṇḍya who assumed the title Solan-talai-Kond, ‘who took the head of the Chola’, and that the Chittoor record must have been dated in Parāntaka’s reign owing to the ignorance of the king’s death.221 But talai-kond does not necessarily involve decapitation, and may have involved only humble submission, the vanquished
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ruler placing his head at the feet of the victor;\textsuperscript{222} again Solan need not mean the Chola king as any prince could be so described. And the Chittoor record may well be evidence that, for all the successes of Krisha, some remoter parts of the Chola empire still continued loyal to Parāntaka and that the invader had not fully mastered the country. We have in fact no evidence on the manner of Parāntaka's death. He had many wives, the names of no fewer than eleven occurring in the inscriptions. Kokkilān was the mother of Rājāditya. A Kerala princess was the mother of Ariṇjaya; her marriage, which took place when Āditya I was alive, apparently furnished the occasion for a large influx of Malayălis into the Chola country in search of service under the king and his sons. Vellanugumaran, the Kerala general of Rājāditya,\textsuperscript{223} built a temple in Grāmam and was the leading example of a large class of less-known immigrants figuring as donors of small charitable gifts in the inscriptions of the time. Besides Rājāditya, Parāntaka had at least three other sons; Gaṇḍarāditya; Uttamasili, and Arikulakesari, Arindigai or Ariṇjaya. One daughter, Viramādevi, called queen of Govinda Vallavarayar,\textsuperscript{224} was perhaps the queen of Rāṣṭrakūta Govinda IV; another, Anupamā, was married to the chieftain of Koḍuṇmbāḷūr. Parāntaka performed several hiranyagarbhas and tulābhāras and gave many brahmadeyas. He was a Saiva and covered with gold the Śiva temple of Chidambaram. His reign was a great epoch in temple architecture and in the progressive organisation of rural self-government. The two celebrated inscriptions\textsuperscript{225} of Uṭtaramerūr give clear evidence not only of the diligent pursuit of constitutional reform in village sabhās but of Parāntaka's love of high-sounding titles. The Karandai plates (of Rājendra I) lay special stress on the canal system created by Parāntaka for the improvement of agriculture.

The period of thirty years or less that intervened between the close of Parāntaka's reign and the accession of Rājarāja I in A.D. 985 is marked by weakness and confusion, and its history, in spite of the abundance of epigraphic material, is not altogether free from doubts. It is not possible here to set forth the details of the evidence and the considerations for and against the different views possible.\textsuperscript{226} Before beginning the narrative of the probable course of events in the period, the genealogy of the kings and the order of their succes-
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sion may be indicated. The genealogy, as gathered from the copper-plate charters of the time, is as follows:

Parāntaka I

By Kokkilān

Rājaditya

By Kerala princess

Gaṇḍarāditya

Ariṇjaya

Kalyāṇī of the

Vaidumba race

Madhurāntaka

Parāntaka II Sundara

Uttama Chola (Parakesari)

Chola (Rājakesari)

Āditya II

Karikāla

Rājarāja I

The order of succession was the following:

A.D.

Rājakesari Gaṇḍarāditya 949-957
Parakesari Ariṇjaya c. 956-957
Rājakesari Sundara Chola
Parāntaka II c. 956-973
(Parakesari Āditya II) c. 956-969
Parakesari Uttama Chola 969-985

The convention was that the ruling monarchs called themselves Parakesari and Rājakesari alternately; as Āditya II did not live to rule independently and was followed by Uttama Chola who became yuvārāja in Sundara’s lifetime and succeeded him after his death, both Āditya and Uttama Chola have been marked Parakesaris in accordance with their records, and Āditya’s name has been put within brackets to indicate that he did not rule as an independent sovereign.

Rājaditya having met his fate at Takkolam, his younger brother Gaṇḍarāditya immediately took his place as yuvārāja, and his independent rule is attested by three Rājakesari inscriptions from the Trichinopoly district, all dated in the eighth year and mentioning Pillaiyār or Ālvār Arikulakesarideva. There is reference to gifts made to the temple of Tiruvēṅkuḍu by Šemivan Mahādeviyār, the queen of Gaṇḍarāditya alias Mummudi-chola-deva in the second year of his reign; it occurs in an inscription of the sixth year of Rājarāja I.
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The sphere of Chola rule under Gaṇḍarāditya must have been very limited as Kṛishṇa III continued to occupy large parts of the Chola country to the end of Gaṇḍarāditya’s reign. In fact Kṛishṇa was still fighting against stiff resistance in the Chola country in the early years of Gaṇḍarāditya’s reign. In an inscription of the second regnal year (951) the Chedi chieftain Narasiṃha-varman Siddhavāḍavan of Tirukkoyilur claims to have won a success in the battle of Viracholapuram, apparently fighting on the side of the Chola against the Raṣṭrakūṭa invader; four years later, the same chieftain had to acknowledge Kṛishṇa III as his overlord. Gaṇḍarāditya was the author of a hymn on the Chidambaram temple in which he calls himself the king of Koli (Uraiya) and lord of Taṇjaiyar (people of Tanjore) and mentions his father’s conquest of the Pāṇḍya country and Ceylon and his gilding of the temple. Gaṇḍarāditya had the title Mērkelundurulnadāvar, the king who went to the west; it is not easy to explain this. His queen Śembiyan-mahādevi survived him for many years and lived on till 1001, leading a life of devotion and charity, building many stone temples and conferring substantial endowments upon them. The son of Gaṇḍarāditya being an infant, the next ruler was his younger brother Ariṇjaya whose position as yuvarāja had been recognized by Gaṇḍarāditya. There is no evidence available of the transactions of Ariṇjaya’s short reign. Two of his queens, Vīman Kundaīai and Kodai-pirāṭṭi, survived him and made gifts in his son’s reign. It is not certain whether the former was an Eastern Chalukya princess, a daughter of Chālukya Bhīma II, or the daughter of a nobleman of the Tamil country, Araiyan-Adittan Vīman, who figures in two inscriptions from Tiruppallanam dated in the second year of a Parakrēṣari who may have been Ariṇjaya himself. Ariṇjaya died at Āṟṟūr, a place which must have been very near Mēḷpāḍī where Rājarāja I erected a memorial temple called Ariṇjīśvara. The place of Ariṇjaya’s death shows that he had begun the task of recovering the territory occupied by Kṛishṇa III. Evidently he met with little success as we may surmise not only from his death in the frontier-region, but also from the continuation of the series of inscriptions dated in the regnal years of Kṛishṇa III for another ten years till about A.D. 967. A daughter of Arikulkasēri, called Ariṇjigai-pirāṭṭiyar, is said to have become a Bāṇa queen, an alliance which may imply that Ariṇjaya sought to win over the Bāṇas to his side in his contest with the

229 ARE, 1936-37, II, 22.
230 540 of 1920.
231 572 and 587 of 1920.
232 167 and 172 of 1928.
233 86 of 1899 (SII, 111, 17).
234 215 of 1911.
Rāṣṭrakūṭa invader. As the inscription mentioning this fact is dated in the reign of Rājakesari, it is probable that the Bāna alliance was contracted even in the reign of Gaṅḍarāditya, and that Ariñjaya was only continuing the diplomatic and military policy initiated by his elder brother.

Ariñjaya was succeeded by his son Sundara Chola Parāntaka II, also known as Maduraikonḍa Rājakesari. Sundara’s attention was first given to the Pāṇḍyan war in the south of which the exact course is far from easy to ascertain. A certain Vīra Pāṇḍya, as already noted, claims to have ‘taken the head’ of a Chola; some time later Vīra Pāṇḍya was either killed or defeated in battle by Āditya II Karikāla when he was still a boy. The identity of the Chola who was defeated and humiliated or killed by Vīra Pāṇḍya is not known.235 But that the Chola reprisal came in the reign of Sundara Chola is clear. The Leyden grant236 says that in a great battle at Chēvūr (south of Sevali hills, the southern boundary of Pudukkoṭai), Parāntaka caused rivers of blood to flow, and that his son Āditya, yet a boy, played with Vīra Pāṇḍya in battle, like a lion’s whelp sporting with a tusker. We may assume that the battle furnished the occasion for Āditya ‘taking the head’ of Vīra Pāṇḍya, a title which occurs in the Parakesari inscriptions of Āditya. The Leyden grant does not state explicitly, that Vīra Pāṇḍya was slain by Āditya, though the Tiruvālaṅgādu plates do. But in the inscriptions Sundara Chola gets the titles ‘Captor of Madurai’, and ‘he who drove the Pāṇḍya into the forest’, and so the chances are that, after the battle of Chēvūr in which Vīra Pāṇḍya sustained a bad defeat, the Chola forces led, among others, by Bhūti Vikrama kesari and his lieutenant Parāntaka Siriyavelar of Koḍūṅbhālūr, continued the campaign in the Pāṇḍya country and forced Vīra Pāṇḍya to seek refuge in the forests.237 On this occasion also the Pāṇḍya was supported by troops from Ceylon, with the result that Siriyavelar led an expedition to the island where he fell fighting in the third year of Sundara Chola, about A.D. 959.238 The Ceylonese chronicle confirms
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the account by recording an unsuccessful Chola expedition against
the island in the reign of Mahinda IV (A.D. 954-70). The Vessagiri
slab inscription of Mihindu (Mahinda) likewise mentions the success-
ful campaign of senapati Sena against the Damilas, i.e. Cholas.

The reign of Sundara Chola was thus a period of recovery from the
disasters of the Raśṭrakūṭa invasion. But the reconquest of the south
was far from complete, and several years later Rājarāja I claimed
that he subdued the Pāndyas when they were still powerful and
illustrious, implying thereby that his father and elder brother, in
spite of their exertions, had not made much headway against them.
Things shaped better in the north, where Krishṇa's inscriptions get
fewer and those of Sundara, Āditya, and Pārthivendrāvarman (most
probably an alternative name of Āditya himself as one inscription
gives the name Pārthivendra Āditaparum) become more numer-
ous. We have, however, no knowledge of the steps in the progress
of the Chola recovery. That Sundara took an active share in the direc-
tion of affairs in the north becomes evident from the fact that he
died in his 'golden palace' at Kāṇchīpuram and thereafter came to be
called 'pon-māligait-tuṇḍina-duvār'. At his death, one of his queens,
Vānāvanmahādevi performed satī and her image was installed later
in the Tanjore temple by her daughter Kundavai. Sundara left
behind him the reputation of a second Manu born to wean the world
from the ways of evil (kali). In Sundara Chola's reign literature, Sans-
krit and Tamil, received encouragement. The earliest copper-plate
charter of the period written in ornate Sanskrit and Tamil dates from
his reign, and a highly poetic eulogium of his reign, cited in the
commentary of the Virāsoliyam, a work on Tamil grammar,
bears witness to his patronage of letters. The eulogy calls Sundara
king of Nandipura (modern Nāṭhankovil); it is addressed to the Bud-
dha to secure the strength and prosperity of the king, and furnishes
evidence of the prevalence of friendly relations between the Chola
monarchs and the southern Buddhist sangha many years before the
date of the larger Leyden grant of Rājarāja's reign which records the
gift of an entire village to a Sumatran Buddhist monastery at Nega-
patām.

Sundara Chola's last days were clouded by domestic tragedy. Its
details are revealed casually by an inscription of the second year of

239 CV, Ch. 54, pp. vv, 12-13.
240 EZ, I, 29ff.
241 SII, III, 158.
242 Ibid., 285 and n. 5.
243 Tiruvāḷaṅgadu Pl. vv, 65-66; 236 of 1902, (SII, VII 863); SII, II, 73.
244 Yēppā, V, 11 (pp. 102-3).
Rājarāja from Udaiyārūndi.245 Under orders from Rājarāja the sabhā of Viraṇārāyaṇa-Chaturvedimāngalam, now called Kāṭummannār-
koṭil in South Arcot, arranged for the confiscation and sale of the
properties of some persons who had been found guilty of treason as
they had ‘murdered Karikāla Chola who took the head of Vira Pān-
dya’ (i.e. Āditya II). The murder was most probably instigated by
Uttama Chola, who, though born in the elder branch of the royal
family, found himself shut out from the throne when the young
Āditya was proclaimed yuvārāja. The Tiruvālangādu plates give a
veiled account of the tragedy and its results in some verses which
by themselves are somewhat enigmatic, but become fully intelligible
in the light of the Udaiyārūndi inscription. Āditya disappeared owing
to his desire to see heaven. Though his subjects, with a view to dispel
the blinding darkness caused by the powerful kāli (Sin), entreated
Arumolivarmān, he, versed in the dhārma of the kshatttra, did not
desire the kingdom for himself even inwardly as long as his paternal
uncle coveted his own (i.e. Arumolivarmā’s) country’. The sun of
Āditya had set as the result of crime; the darkness of sin prevailed;
the people appealed to Arumoli (Rājarāja) to dispel it. But that would
have meant civil war, and so, though by no means a coward, Rājarāja
yet consented to a compromise by which Uttama Chola was to be-
come yuvārāja immediately and successor to Sundara, but was to be
succeeded not by his children but by Rājarāja himself. Naturally the
murderers of Āditya went scot-free so long as their instigator reigned;
they paid the penalty of their treason after his death. Sundara Chola
died a few years after the murder of his elder son and heir-apparent,
and was followed on the throne by Uttama Chola.

By the time of Uttama Chola’s accession (969) the Chola recovery
had advanced far, particularly in the north. South Arcot, North Arcot,
and Chingleput again became Chola territory as attested by a num-
ber of inscriptions recording endowments, sales, and the construction
of irrigation works and showing that general peace had been restored
and the effects of the wars forgotten.

Of the events of the sixteen years during which Uttama Chola ruled
we learn little from the numerous stone inscriptions of his time or
from the Madras Museum plates of which the beginning is missing.
Like other Chola copper-plates, the Museum plates are beautiful spec-
imens of calligraphy and are of very great interest to the study of the
social life and administration of the Chola kingdom; but they add
little to our knowledge of political history. Some inscriptions from
the Trichinopoly district246 mention a high official of Uttama Chola’s
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government by name—Ambalavan Paḻuvūr Nakkan of Kuvalālam (Kolar). He was an officer of perundaram rank who rebuilt of stone the old shrine of Vijayamaṅgalam celebrated by Appar as a temple (in Govindaṇuttūr on the banks of the Coleroon) commemorating Arjuna’s penance for obtaining Siva’s favour; on this officer Uttama conferred the title of Vikrama-sōla-mārāyar, from which we may infer that Vikrama was a title of Uttama. The officer continued to serve Rājarāja I with the title Mummudisōla prefixed to his personal name, and with another title Rājarāja Pallavaraiyan. From his birthplace we may infer that Uttama Chola’s sway extended to Kolar; this is rendered probable by a conflict between him and the Western Chalukya ruler Taila II mentioned in the Sogal inscription of Saka 902 (980).  

The earliest known Chola coin is a gold piece of Uttama Chola’s reign, a unique specimen figured by Sir Walter Elliot from a drawing, though the coin seems to have been somehow lost. Its obverse and reverse are identical, the centre occupied by a seated tiger facing a fish to proper right and separated from it by a line, the legend Uttama Cholan in grantha characters along the circular margin, all within a ring of beads. The weight of the coin was estimated by Elliot at 50 to 60 grains, and this conforms to the standard that prevailed in South India before the time of Rājarāja I.

The names of five queens of Uttama Chola are known from his inscriptions recording endowments by all of them in a village that bore the name of their mother-in-law Śembiyān-mahādevi in the Tanjore district. One son of Uttama Chola, Madhurāntakan Gaṇḍarāditya, held office under Rājarāja I.
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