Chapter Fifteen

THE CHÂLUKYAS OF BĀDĀMI

I. ORIGIN AND EARLY HISTORY

The origin of the Châlukyas of Bādāmi, the successors of the Vâkâṭakas in the overlordship of the Deccan, is still shrouded in considerable obscurity. The original name of the dynasty is itself uncertain. The early records of the Châlukyas of Bādāmi give the name of their house as Chalkya,¹ Chalikya, or Chalikya,² and the form Châlukya becomes common only after the lapse of a century. We have adopted it as the name of the dynasty for the sake of convenience.²a

Like some other clans and dynasties of ancient India, the Châlukyas have been assigned a foreign origin by some scholars. Rice held that the Châlukyas and Pallavas were immigrants from Seleucia and Parthia, and naturally carried on their old traditional hostility in the country of their migration.³ The Scythians, the Parthians and the Kushânas, however, betray their foreign origin by the un-Indian forms of the names of their early rulers like Chashtana, Gondophernes, Kadphises, etc. Such is not the case with any of the early Châlukya rulers. Nor are references to Châlukyas found in any records or inscriptions hailing from the Panjâb, and belonging to about the fourth or fifth century A.D. The phonetic resemblance between Seleucia and Châlukyas must therefore be regarded as purely accidental. D. R. Bhandarkar and V. A. Smith thought that the Châlukyas were a branch of the Gurjaras, and so foreign immigrants into India like the latter.⁴ There is, however, no evidence to show that the Châlukyas were a branch of the Gurjaras. The argument that the province of Gujârat came to bear its present name during the reign of the Châlukyas, and so the latter must be of Gurjara extraction, is also very weak. It is during the rule of later Châlukyas of Anahilapattana

¹ Bādāmi ins., a.d. 578, IA, III, p. 305.
²a "The name of the dynasty is spelt with a long ā in the first syllable, as Châlukya became the normal spelling in later times. Most of the records of the Early Châlukyas spell their name with a short vowel in the first syllable" (cf. BG. i, ii, p. 180).
³ Rice, Mysore and Coorg from Inscriptions, p. 62.
⁴ IA, XL, p. 24; EH!, pp. 440-1; JBBRAS, XXI, pp. 425 ff.
(C. A.D. 960-1175) and not that of early Chālukyas of Bādāmi (C. A.D. 550-750) that Gujarat got its present name. Neither traditions nor inscriptions establish any connection between the Chālukyas of Bādāmi and the Chaukulis of Anahilapattana. There is no evidence whatsoever to show that the Chālukyas of Bādāmi were of the Gurjara stock; they had no connection with the modern province of Gujrat till they conquered its southern part in C. A.D. 630. The fact that Pulakesin II took pride in having conquered the Gurjaras suggests that his house did not belong to that race. There is thus hardly any evidence to show that the Chālukyas were ethnically of the Gurjara stock and therefore of foreign extraction. Besides, it is not yet definitely known whether the Gurjaras themselves were foreigners and this question has been discussed elsewhere.

Among the officers of the Ikshvākus, who flourished in the third century A.D. (Vol. II), there is one who bears the name of Vāsiṣṭhiputa Khāinda-chāliki-reśmanka. But as he is expressly described as belonging to the family of the Hīraṃṇakas, it may well be doubted whether the word chāliki, which forms part of his name, can be rightly regarded as suggesting his extraction from the stock or family later known as Chalkya or Chaliki.

The mythological history of the dynasty, as officially accepted by the later Chālukyas of Kalyāṇi in the eleventh century, assigns it a northern origin. We are told that as many as fifty-nine kings of this house ruled at Ayodhyā before one of its scions migrated to the Deccan. Neither sober history nor the records of the Chālukyas of Bādāmi are, however, aware of any connection of the house with Ayodhyā at any stage of its history; we cannot, therefore, attach any importance to this story. Bilhana’s account of how the founder of the dynasty issued miraculously from the chuluka or water in the palm of Brahmadeva, and the statements made in the eleventh and twelfth century records about Atri, the Moon, Budha, Ayu, Manu etc. being among the ancestors of the Chālukyas are just interesting myths.

The earliest documents of the Chālukyas of Bādāmi state that they were Hāritiputras of Mānavya-gotra, famous for their devotion to Svāmi Mahāsena and Saptamātrikās. Records of the Chutu Sātakarnīs and the Kadambas, who were ruling in Karnatak before the Chālukyas, also describe the rulers of these dynasties as belonging to the identical family and gotra and devoted to the same deities. It would, therefore, appear that the Chālukyas of Bādāmi were connec-

5 EI, XX, p. 19.
6 IA, XVI, p. 21.
8 IA, XIV, p. 48; XIX, p. 427.
ted with the Chuṭu Sātakarṇīṣ and the Kadambas in a manner not yet clearly known. It has been suggested that Jayasiniha, who was a commander of the fort of Harivatsa under the Rāṣṭrakūṭa chief Abhimanyu⁹ somewhere in M. P., may be identical with the grandfather of Pulakeśīn I. ¹⁰ There is nothing impossible in this suggestion; Jayasiniha, who belonged to Karnatak, may have sought service in M.P.¹¹ as a seeker of fortune. The date of Abhimanyu is, however, not yet definitely known, and his contemporaneity with Jayasiniha, the grandfather of Pulakeśīn I, cannot, therefore be definitely asserted.

The available evidence thus tends to show that the Chālukyas were an indigenous Brāhmaṇa family,¹² being in some way related to the Chuṭu Sātakarṇīṣ and the Kadambas of Karnatak. The story of their rise to power is shrouded in obscurity. The records of the later Chālukya dynasty, of the eleventh century, state that Jayasiniha, the grandfather of Pulakeśīn I, rose to eminence by overthrowing the Rāṣṭrakūṭa king Indra, son of Krishṇa, obviously some time about A.D. 500.¹³ It has been also argued that this Rāṣṭrakūṭa king Indra may have been a grandson of king Avidheya of the Pândurangapalli grant.¹⁴ There is, however, no evidence to show that king Avidheya was a Rāṣṭrakūṭa or that he had a grandson named Indra. If the overthrow of this early Rāṣṭrakūṭa family really marked the foundation of the Chālukya power, it is difficult to explain why this most important achievement of the founder of the house was completely ignored in all the grants of the early Chālukyas. It should have been mentioned at least in the Aihole inscription by Ravikirti, who scrupulously describes all the exploits of the ancestors of his hero Pulakeśīn II. As it is, he grows eloquent in describing the valour and successes of Jayasiniha in general terms, but is altogether silent about his ever having defeated a Rāṣṭrakūṭa king Indra, as stated in the later Chālukya records.¹⁵

The Vākṣṭakas were the predecessors of the Chālukyas in the overlordship of the Deccan, and it has been shown already (Ch. VII) how

---

⁹ EI, VIII, p. 163. This record is undated and so Abhimanyu’s date cannot be determined with certainty.


¹¹ It has been suggested that Abhimanyu was ruling, not in Madhya Pradesh, but in Satara district of Mahārāṣṭra. ABORI, XXV, pp. 36-50. If that be so, the scene of his service would be on the outskirts of Karnatak.

¹² Hsiian Tsang describes Pulakeśīn II as a Kṣatriya; that may be due to his being a king. The Kadambas also later became known as Kṣatriyas owing to their profession.

¹³ Eg. Kauthem and Yewur plates, IA, XVI, p. 21; VIII, p. 11.

¹⁴ MAR. 1929, p. 197.

¹⁵ For a fuller discussion of this question, see Altekar, ‘Was There a Rāṣṭrakūṭa Empire in the 6th Century?’, ABORI, XXIV, pp. 149-155.
their last known king Harishepa was ruling over practically the whole of the old Hyderabad State, Mahārāṣṭra, Berar and a considerable portion of M.P. His son and successor, if any, was probably a weak and sensuous ruler, and the feudatories began to reassert themselves and declare independence. There was a race for the hegemony of the Deccan, and the Kadambas of Karnatak, the Mauryas of Konkana, the Kalachuris, and the Naḷas of Chattisgarh seem to have been the chief among the early competitors. They were all, however, destined to be overthrown by the Chālukyas in a short time.

In his Aihoḷe panegyric Ravikirti has attributed no specific exploits to Jayasimha and Raṇarāga, the grandfather and father, respectively, of Pulakeśin I. The same is the case with the Mahākūṭa record of Maṅgaleśa, who was the grandson of Raṇarāga. We may, therefore, conclude that neither Jayasimha nor his son Raṇarāga was anything more than a petty local chief or officer. It is, however, not unlikely that they served in the army of the Kadambas or the Mauryas, while these were fighting for the supremacy of the Deccan, and succeeded in carving a small principality somewhere in southern Mahārāṣṭra or northern Karnatak.

The real founder of the greatness of the dynasty was Mahārājya Pulakeśin I (c. A.D. 535-66). His birudas were satyāsraya 'the asylum of truth' and raṇavikrama 'the valorous in war'. The Aihoḷe prāṣasti describes him as the bridegroom of the damsel, viz. the city of Vatāpi, the capital of the Chālukyas. The peculiar propriety of describing Pulakeśin I in this way has been brought out by an inscription carved on a boulder of the Bādāmi fort which describes how it was fortified in Saka 465 (A.D. 543-44) by the Chālukya king Vallaṁheśvara, who had performed several sacrifices including the Aśvamedha. Among the Chālukya king Pulakeśin alone is credited with the performance of Aśvamedha sacrifice. We may, therefore, be sure that the Chālukya king Vallaṁheśvara, who fortified Vatāpi, is identical with Pulakeśin I, who also bore the epithet Vallaṁ. Other known

16 ABORI, XXVI, p. 20. See above, Ch. VII, p. 145.
17 The statement in the eleventh century records that Pulakeśin was the son of Viṣṇu, the adventurer from Ayodhyā, has no historical value.
18 It has been shown above how the overthrow of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas, attributed to Jayasimha by later records, cannot be accepted as a historical fact.
19 Both the spelling and derivation of this name are uncertain. Fleet thinks it to be a hybrid word, meaning 'tiger-haired', Pule-buli, standing for tiger in Old Canarese (DK, p. 343 n. 5). Prof. K. A. N. Sastri has suggested that the name of the king means 'great lion', the root pu meaning 'to be great' according to Sanskrit lexicons. Neither derivation is convincing.
20 IA, VIII, p. 237, v. 4.
20a EI, XXVII, pp. 4-9.
facts of history also show that the year A.D. 543-44, when Vāṭāpi was fortified, fell within the reign of Pulakesin I.

Very little is known about the personality and career of Pulakesin I. He seems to have made Vāṭāpi the capital of the rising kingdom of the Chālukyas. His celebration of the Aśvamedha sacrifice need not imply that he had aimed at or achieved any imperial status; for a number of feudatory chiefs are known to have performed this sacrifice during the four centuries preceding the time of Pulakesin. It is not very likely that the Chālukya principality comprised more than two or three districts during the reign of Pulakesin which may be placed between c. A.D. 535 and 566.

Pulakesin was primarily a warrior as his epithet ranavikrama, 'valorous on the battle-field', shows. Perhaps he had also a literary taste; some later records describe him as well grounded in Manusmriti, the Rāmāyaṇa, the Mahābhārata, the Purāṇas and history.21 Being a Brāhmin by caste, he naturally took delight in utilizing part of his growing wealth in celebrating a number of sacrifices like Agnishtoma, Agnichayana, Vājapeya, Bahuśvarṇa, Purudarīka and Aśvamedha. He also performed the Hiranyagarbha ritual, calculated to secure a divine body in heaven. Durlabhamahādevī was his chief queen. She belonged to the Batpura family which held a sīf somewhere in southern Koṅkaṇa.

2. KIRTI-VARMAN I (C. A.D. 567-597)

Pulakesin I had two sons, Kirti-varman (also called Kirtirāja) and Maṅgaleśa, who appear to have been half-brothers. Of these the former, who was the elder, ascended the throne in Śaka 488 or A.D. 566-67. Besides the usual biruda of prithvivallabha, he bore the epithets of satyāśraya 'the avslum of truth' and Pururanapārākrama, 'valorous in war like Puru'. Like his father, he also had a fairly long reign of about 30 years which closed in A.D. 597-98.

Luckily we have sufficient data to reconstruct the career of Kirti-varman. One of his earliest acts was to further fortify his capital.22 He then pursued an aggressive imperial policy and defeated in turn the Nālas of Bastar, the Mauryas of Koṅkan and the Kadambas of Bana-vāsi. But his victory, at least over the last two, was evidently not of a decisive character, for we find his son Pulakesin again proceeding to chastize them. We may, however, safely assume that these States were

21 IA, XIX, p. 16.
22 Chipilun plates of his son Pulakesin describe him as the founder of Vāṭāpi, Vāṭāpyah prathamavidhātuḥ, EL, III, p. 51, but in view of the new Bādāmi rock inscription we shall have to take this statement with a grain of salt.
made to acknowledge Chālukya overlordship and compelled to cede considerable territories to the conqueror. As a consequence of these victories and annexations, most of Mahārāṣṭra and a greater part of the old Hyderabad State came within the Chālukya sphere of influence. This conclusion is supported by the fact that when his successor Maṅga-lesa thought of expansion in the northern direction, he had to cross the Narmadā to attack the Kalachuris ruling beyond that river. We may, therefore, reasonably conclude that towards the end of the long reign of Kirti-varman, Western India from Khāndesh to Goa came under the Chālukyas. The eastern boundaries of the kingdom cannot be definitely determined, but a greater part of the old Hyderabad State seems to have been included in it; for, otherwise, the invasion of the Naļa territory in Bastar region would have been impossible. To transform a small principality of a few districts into such an extensive kingdom was no doubt a creditable feat, attesting the bravery, diplomatic skill, and power of organisation of the reigning king.

Kirti-varman is also credited with having defeated the kings of Vaṅga, Aṅga, Kaliṅga, Vaṭṭūra, Magadha, Madraka, Keralā, Gaṅga, Mūshaka, Pāṇḍya, Dramila, Chola, Alūka (Ālupa) and Vaijayantī in an official record issued within five years of his death.23 There is no doubt that love of alliteration and the desire to parade geographical knowledge are mainly responsible for this grandiose list. We cannot, however, exclude the responsibility of frontier skirmishes having occurred between the Chālukyas and some of the powers mentioned. If Kirti-varman’s attack against the Naḷas of Bastar region is a historic event, his skirmishes with the Kalingas and Mūshakas could not be purely imaginary. Aṅga, Vaṅga and Magadha seem far off from Mahārāṣṭra, but we should not forget that the Maukhari emperor Iśānavarman, who was about this time ruling over U.P. and Bihār, claims to have defeated the Andhras and the Śūlikas. If the latter were Chālukyas, as suggested by some, we cannot dismiss the conflict with the Aṅgas, Vaṅgas and Magadhās as purely imaginary. It is not unlikely that occasional skirmishes occurred between adventurous captains of the Maukhari and the Chālukya in the no man’s land lying between the two kingdoms, and these may have been hailed as victories by either side. Among the southern powers, the Cholas, the Pāṇḍyas and the Keralas could hardly have come into conflict with the Chālukyas, but this can hardly be said about the Gaṅgas and the Ālupas, who were the immediate southern neighbours of Kirti-varman. We may, therefore, conclude that while the Chālukya kingdom embraced Mahārāṣṭra and parts of Karnatak and the old Hyderabad-
bad State, advanced guards of its armies may have come into conflict with the Gaṅgas and the Ālupas in the south, the Kaliṅgas and the Mūshakas in the east, and the Maukharis in the north.

The task of guarding a portion of the southern boundary of the kingdom was entrusted to Satyāśraya Dhruvarāja Indravarman in c. A.D. 590.24 This governor belonged to Ādi-mahā-Bappura family, probably the same as that of Durlabhahādevi, the mother of Kīrti-varman. It is very likely that he was a son of Kīrtivarman's maternal uncle and was stationed at Revatīdvipa25 situated in the Ratnagiri district, where we find him at the beginning of the reign of Pulakesin II.

Like his father, Kīrti-varman performed a number of Vedic sacrifices such as Bahusuvarna and Agnishtoma. He was, however, equally interested in Pauranic religion and gods, and constructed a beautiful cave temple for Vishnu at Bādāmi. The king’s younger brother was in charge of the construction of the work which he completed in A.D. 578. Kīrti-varman, however, was not a narrow Vaishnava, for he sanctioned land endowment to a temple of Makuṭēśvaranātha, a form of Siva.26 Kīrti-varman died in A.D. 597-98 leaving at least three sons viz. Pulakesin, Vishnu-vārdhana and Jayasiṁha.

3. MAṆGALESA (C. A.D. 597-610)

Kīrti-varman I left several sons behind, but was succeeded by his younger half-brother Maṅgaḷesa in A.D. 597-98.27 At the time of his coronation he took the titles of raṇavikrānta and iiru-raṇavikrānta ‘valorous in great battle’, and prithvivallabha ‘the favourite of the earth’. Like his elder brother he revered both Vishnu and Siva. We have seen above how, acting as his brother’s agent, he completed the construction of the Vishnu cave at Bādāmi in A.D. 578. He, however, commemorated his victory over the Kalachuris by increasing the endowment of the Śiva temple Makuṭēśvaranātha.28

Some time about A.D. 600 he led an expedition against the Kalachuri king Buddhārāja, son of Saṅkaragaṇa, who was ruling in southern Gujarat and Malwa. It is stated that Buddhārāja was defeated

24 JBBRAS, X, p. 365.  
25 Bhandarkar and Fleet have correctly identified this with the fort of Raīree situated on a promontory about 8 miles south of Vengurla in the Ratnagiri district. The view that Revatīdvipa is Sumatra is untenable; see DKD, p. 347, n. 2.  
26 IA, XIX, p. 7.  
27 R. G. Bhandarkar placed the accession of Maṅgaḷesa in Śaka 513 or A.D. 591, EHD, p. 81. This is an untenable view because the Goa plates of Dhruvarāja Indravarman obviously refer to the 20th year of his own reign and not Maṅgaḷesa’s, who is not even mentioned in the record. See JBBRAS, X, p. 365.  
28 IA, XIX, p. 7.
and fled from the battle-field, leaving a large booty in the hands of
the victor. A portion of it was utilized by the conqueror in giving
religious donations to the temples in and near the capital. The defeat
of Buddharaśa had no far-reaching consequences, for we find him
ruling his kingdom a decade after his defeat.

We have already seen how Revatīdvipa had been annexed
to the Chālukya kingdom by Kṛiti-varman in c. A.D. 590. The local
governor, however, was unable to retain it, and Maṅgaleśa had to
effect its reconquest, probably some time between 602 and 608.
Dhruvarāja Indravarman was continued in the governance of the
province.

Several records of the later Chālukyas, composed four centuries
later, state that Maṅgaleśa was merely acting as a regent for his
minor nephew Pulakesin, and that he willingly handed over the
administration to the rightful heir as soon as he came of age. Con-
temporary records, however, show that such was not the case; later
court-poets have simply glossed over an unpleasant episode in order
to show that ‘no scion of the Chālukya family can ever think of an
unrighteous step’. At the time of Kṛiti-varman’s death in A.D. 597, it
appears that Pulakesin, his eldest living son, was still in his teens.
The relations between Kṛiti-varman and Maṅgaleśa were fairly cor-
dial during the reign of the former. Maṅgaleśa seems to have
discharged the duties of yuvāraja (heir-apparent) as Pulakesin was
too young during the greater part of his father’s reign. It appears
that Maṅgaleśa was permitted to carry on the administration as before
after the death of his brother, as Pulakesin was an inexperienced
youth of only about 15 or 16 at that time. The relations between
Maṅgaleśa and his nephew were cordial for some time. The uncle
was already more than 50 and the idea probably was that at his
death the crown will pass on to Pulakesin.

Maṅgaleśa, however, soon changed his mind and began to work for
leaving the throne to his son after his death. He began to eliminate
the reign of his brother in his charters and formed a party to defeat

29 IA, XIX, p. 16.
30 Sārasvati Plates, EI, VI, p. 297. The discovery of this record renders untenable
the view of Fleet (DKD, p. 347) that as a result of this victory, the Chālukya dominion
extended up to the Kim if not the Māhī.
31 Aihole ins., v. 15.
32 IA, III, p. 305; X, p. 57.
33 The Bādami record shows that as early as A.D. 578 Maṅgaleśa was issuing grants
under his own authority. IA, VI, p. 363.
34 IA, VII, p. 161.
the claims of his nephew. The latter, who was now (c. A.D. 605) about 23 or 24, had to flee from the court and seek shelter elsewhere.35

4. PULAKESIN II (C. A.D. 610 - 643)

Pulakesin was a young prince endowed with energy and political insight. He soon succeeded in forming a powerful party ready and willing to support his rightful claim. His own younger brothers, Vishnu-vardhana and Jayasimha, who were throughout loyal to him, may have made common cause with him.36 Dhruvaraja Indra-varman of the Bappura family, governing Revatidvipa, also probably championed his cause, for he is known to be professing loyalty to Pulakesin as early as A.D. 610.37 The Sendraka feudatory king Senananda, who was his maternal uncle ruling in south Koikana, may be presumed to have played an important part in securing the throne for his nephew, its rightful claimant. The Chalukya chief Svamiraja, whom Mangalesa claims to have overthrown and killed, may have been a collateral relation of Pulakesin, who died fighting for his cause. Several other feudatories may have been won over by the young prince, who was remarkable as much for his diplomacy as for his energy.

The tussle between the uncle and the nephew probably lasted three or four years. This internecine war must have induced a number of lukewarm feudatories to rebel and declare independence. There was confusion and anarchy for a while everywhere in the wide Chalukya dominions.38 But Pulakesin won complete success. Youth, energy, diplomatic skill and rightful claim triumphed over old age, selfishness and injustice. Mangalesa not only lost the cause, but also his own life. What became of his son, for whom he wanted to secure the crown, is not known. Probably he also perished in the struggle.39 Pulakesin formally ascended his ancestral throne some time in Saka 532 (A.D. 609-10). Satyasaraya ‘asylum of truth’, and vallabha or prithu-vallabha ‘the favourite of the earth’ were his usual epithets. Though the greatest among the Chalukya kings, his own records describe him only as Maharaaja; only his successors’ records designate

35 Aihole inscription, v. 7.
36 The same probably was the case with Budhavarasa Ananga-saraya, if this prince also was his brother as stated in his Sañjan plates (EI, XIV, p. 152). The genuineness of this record is, however, doubted.
38 Aihole ins., v. 7.
39 Fleet’s view that Dhruvaraja Indra-varman of the Goa Plates (A.D. 610-11) was probably the eldest son of Mangalesa (BG, I, (ii), p. 349) overlooks the fact that this prince is expressly described there as belonging to the Bappura family. ²
him as Mahārājādhīrāja. The title Paramēśvara, ‘the great king’, was taken by him as early as A.D. 612.

The overthrow of Maṅgaleśa did not automatically secure the whole ancestral kingdom for Pulakeśin. The feudatories, who had sided with Maṅgaleśa or who had declared independence, had to be subjugated. We can get some idea of the extent to which the Chālukya power had been shaken, when we note that in the Sholapur district, which was the very heart of the kingdom, two chiefs, Āppāyika and Govinda, openly challenged his suzerainty. Pulakeśin, however, managed to win over the latter and defeat the former.

Ravikīrti has given us a detailed description of the different conquests of Pulakeśin effected between A.D. 610 and 634. They seem to be, however, arranged on the geographical rather than on the chronological principle, and it is, therefore, difficult to reconstruct satisfactorily the career of the great Chālukya emperor. Even the time of his most memorable achievement, namely the defeat of emperor Harsha, is a point of keen controversy among historians, one section holding that the event took place some time before A.D. 612, and the other placing it about 20 years later.

It is very likely that, after consolidating his power in the centre, Pulakeśin turned his arms against the Kadambas of Banavāsi, who had been once reduced to the feudatory status by his father. Senānanda Sendraka, his maerial uncle, and Indrarman, his Bappūra relation, who were ruling in Koṅkaṇa, must have sent their battalions to take part in this expedition. The imperial army must then have turned to the Gaṅgas and Ālupas ruling in part of Mysore and South Canara respectively. They recognized Pulakeśin’s overlordship and were allowed to rule in feudatory capacity. There is epigraphic evidence to show that the Ālupas continued to be steadfast in their loyalty for several generations.

The Mauryas of northern Koṅkaṇa had once acknowledged the Chālukya overlordship, and we may well presume that Pulakeśin next ordered his armies against them. Their island capital Purī, which was probably located in Elephanta island, off Bombay, was besieged and stormed with the help of a naval force. It is likely that all these

40 After describing the overthrow of Āppāyika and Govinda, who were creating trouble in the very heart of Pulakeśin’s kingdom, Ravikīrti takes us systematically round the whole of the Deccan—from Banavāsi to Koṅkaṇa, thence to southern Gujarat and Malwa, thence to the Narmadā pass where Harsha was defeated, thence to Kosala, Kalinga, Pallava, Chola, Pāṇḍya and Kerala kingdoms. It is, however, hardly likely that Pulakeśin’s clashes with these different states occurred in the order implied by the enumeration. Fleet, however, held this view and placed even the defeat of Harsha before the formal coronation of Pulakeśin in A.D. 610; see DKD, pp. 350-51.
41 IA, XIX, p. 149.
achievements kept Pulakesin busy for at least six or seven years. During this period the administration was carried on by his loyal younger brother Vishnuvardhana, who was formally invested with the powers of a yuvrāja.

We may well presume that by c. A.D. 616 Pulakesin had reconquered most of his ancestral possessions. But he was not content with this. Some time about c. 620 he marched against the Andhra country, won a sanguinary engagement near Koleru lake, and penetrated up to Pishṭapura, modern Pithapuram; 12 miles north-east of Kākināda, where a feudatory of the Vishnukundins was ruling. Most of the Andhra country was soon occupied. The Vishnukundins, who were ruling in this province, challenged the power of the conqueror, but were defeated and their power was gradually liquidated. Pulakesin had no intention to relinquish the Andhra country. His younger brother Vishnu-vardhana had stood loyal to him through thick and thin and helped him in his eastern conquest. To reward his loyalty without diminishing his ancestral kingdom, Pulakesin appointed him to rule over the newly conquered Andhra province in a semi-independent capacity. Vishnu-vardhana was, therefore, installed to rule over the new eastern dominion with Pishṭapura as his capital. During his reign (A.D. 624-41), he continued to acknowledge his elder brother’s lordship. Pulakesin also used to pay him occasional visits: thus we find him in Andhra country in his 21st regnal year (A.D. 631) on an occasion when his brother was donating a village in Guntur district. The successors of Vishnuvardhana, however, gradually asserted their independence.

From his base at Pishṭapura, Pulakesin launched attacks upon Kaliṅga and Kosala. But these were probably mere military raids which hardly left any permanent result behind. By A.D. 625 Pulakesin had become a mighty monarch, a true overlord of the Deccan in the literal sense of the term. It is not unlikely that he carried on diplomatic relations with Persia. Whether the Indian embassy which visited the court of the Persian emperor Khusru II in A.D. 625-6 was

42 EC, VIII, Nagar 35. Trivento, I, pp. 112-20.
43 He is thus described in the Satara plates issued in the 8th year of Pulakesin’s reign.
44 His Yekkeri inscription, which seems to be dated in his 6th regnal year, describes him as the overlord of the Deccan. EI, V, p. 7.
45 According to one calculation the Eastern Chālukya records yield A.D. 618 as the initial year of the independent reign of Vishnu-vardhana, the founder of the Eastern Chālukya dynasty. But this needs adjustment in the light of other data. See N. Venkataramayya, Eastern Chālukyas, p. 49.
46 As shown by Timmapuram plates, EI, IX, p. 317.
47 EI, XVIII, p. 257; Kopparn plates.
sent by Pulakesin or Harsha is a moot point. Nor are scholars agreed as to whether two of the panels in Cave I at Ajanta really represent the visit of a return embassy sent by Khusrv to the court of the Deccan emperor. The alleged Persian costume also appears elsewhere in the Ajanta paintings. It is also pointed out that the paintings and architecture of the cave belong to the age of the Vakathakas rather than to that of the Chalukyas; and even otherwise, there is no reason why Buddhist monks should have permitted the sudden introduction of a secular theme in honour of Pulakesin II who is not known to have been a patron of Buddhism. Foreign costume was well-known in the Deccan from the time of the Western Kshatrapas.

The occupation of Andhradesa and the overlordship over the Gangas and the Banaas brought the Chalukyas into direct contact with the Pallavas, and Pulakesin sent an expedition against the Pallava king Mahendra-varman. This initiated a long feud between the Karnataka and Tamil kingdoms which weakened both the combatants and made them look upon each other as 'natural' enemies. The feud did not terminate with the two rulers or even the two dynasties, and was carried on by their respective successors for several centuries.

In the first conflict, the offensive was taken by Pulakesin. With his bases in Gangavadi and Andhra country, he could easily carry the war into the enemy's country. But even Ravikirti only claims that Pulakesin compelled Mahendra-varman to seek the protection of the ramparts of Kanchi. The Pallava capital was thus threatened, but not captured, by Pulakesin. A Pallava record refers to king Mahendra-varman defeating an unnamed enemy at Pullalura, modern Polilore, 15 miles to the north of Kanchi. Most probably this was the place where the advancing Chalukya forces were repulsed by the Pallavas. The war was indecisive. The Chalukyas could claim victory, as they penetrated into the heart of the Pallava kingdom; but the Pallavas could also legitimately boast of success for having driven out a mighty invader.

During the next ten years, c. A.D. 630-40, Pulakesin seems to have been occupied with North Indian politics. By this time both Pulakesin and Harsha had become mighty emperors and each was anxious to

48 It appears that the name of the king can be read both as Prmesha and Pikesha. The latter can refer only to Pulakesin but the former, which stands for Parameshvara, was the title both of Pulakesin and Harsha. Tabari describes the embassy as coming from an Indian king, and Harsha who was a powerful ruler by this time and used to import horses from Persia could also have sent the embassy. See IRAS, 1878; JIH, 1925, pp. 27-33; K. A. N. Sastri, Foreign Notices of S. India, p. 9.
extend his sphere of influence and win fresh laurels. A conflict between the two became inevitable and it took place some time between A.D. 631 and 634.\textsuperscript{51}

Malwa, Gujarat and Kăthiāwār have often been the bones of contention between the overlords of the Deccan and North India. The same was the case at about A.D. 630. Harsha attacked Valabhi in order to bring its ruler under his sphere of influence. The Gurjara king Dadda II of Broach claims to have protected the Valabhi ruler against Harsha.\textsuperscript{52} Dadda was a petty ruler and he could not have foiled the efforts of Harsha unaided. Rāvikirti tells us that the Gurjara king as well as the rulers of Lāṭa and Mālava had become feudatories of Pulakesin. The Lāṭas, Gurjaras and the Mālavas were hostile to the father of Harsha and also to Harsha himself, and they seem to have formed a subordinate alliance with Pulakesin in order to oppose the onward march of Harsha. Harsha, however, soon turned the tables against Pulakesin by winning over the Valabhi ruler to his side by marrying his daughter to him. Pulakesin tried to strengthen his northern frontiers by appointing one of his loyal younger brothers, Jayaśimha, the governor of Nasik and Khāṇḍesh districts, and by creating a new viceroyalty in northern Konkana and southern Gujarat under

\textsuperscript{51} Scholars are not agreed as to the date of this war. One school holds that it took place before A.D. 611-12. It is pointed out how Hiian Tsang tells us that all the wars of Harsha were fought during the first six years of his reign and how the Hyderabad plates of Pulakesin, issued in A.D. 612, show that he had already assumed the title of Parameśvara, which he is said to have taken only after the defeat of Harsha, \textit{DKD}, p. 351. Mookerji, \textit{Harsha}, p. 36. Neither argument is, however, convincing. The observation of the Chinese pilgrim that Harsha did not unsheathe his sword after A.D. 611-2 is belied by the known events of Harsha’s reign; and it is only the copper-plates issued in the reign of Pulakesin’s son Vikramāditya which aver that Pulakesin assumed the title \textit{Paramesvara} after the overthrow of Harsha. Pulakesin issued a number of charters before A.D. 631. They describe how he defeated enemy kings in hundreds of battles, but do not name Harsha among them. It is inconceivable that if Pulakesin’s memorable victory over Harsha had been won before A.D. 631 it should not have been described in glowing colours in his earlier records. The Kandalgaon Plates, dated A.D. 614, refer to the defeat of Harsha, but they are admitted on all hands to be spurious (\textit{IA}, XIV, p. 330). The approximate date for this conflict given in the text, viz. some time in A.D. 631-34, is based on the circumstance that the Lohanera plates of Pulakesin issued in A.D. 631 do not refer to Harsha’s defeat, while it is described in glowing colours in the Aihole record of A.D. 634. The earliest known date for Gurjara king Dadda II, who is stated to have afforded protection to the king of Valabhi against Harsha, is A.D. 629. This circumstance would also suggest that Harsha had turned his attention to Gujarat, Kăthiāwār and Deccan after c. A.D. 630.

\textsuperscript{52} \textit{Parameśvara-sri-Harshadevaśabhibhūta-Valabhipati-paritrānopapāta-raśvevītānaḥ}, \textit{IA}, XIII, p. 77. As A.D. 629 is the earliest known date for this ruler, Harsha could not have begun his drive against Malwa, Gujarat, and Kăthiāwār long before A.D. 630.
the charge of another younger brother named Budhavarsha Anangāśraya.\textsuperscript{53}

The actual conflict between the two emperors probably took place, as noted above, some time between A.D. 631-54. According to Hiuán Tsang, Harsha was the aggressor and summoned his best generals and mobilized his most renowned divisions in order to subdue Pulakesin; but he failed in his objective and sustained the only rebuff of his career.\textsuperscript{54} Rāvikiṛti, the court poet of Pulakesin, also exultingly describes how the great Harsha lost all his harsha (joy), being overpowered by fear and dismay as his army returned discomfited, sustaining particularly heavy losses in elephants.\textsuperscript{55} It appears that this battle convinced each combatant that he could not successfully impose his yoke upon the other, though in later years frontier skirmishes may have occurred between them.

By c. 640 the rule of the Chālukyas had lasted for nearly a century over the Deccan, and it would be interesting to ascertain its influence upon the moral and material welfare of the people. Luckily for the historian there is a contemporary account from the pen of a disinterested foreign observer, viz. the Chinese traveller, Hiuán Tsang. This pilgrim was in Mahārāṣṭra for a few months during A.D. 640-11 and was very highly impressed by the prosperity of the country, the efficiency of the administration and the character of the people. He says:

'The soil is rich and fertile and it is regularly cultivated and very productive. Men are fond of learning and studying both heretical and orthodox books. The disposition of the people is honest and simple; they are tall in stature and of a stern and vindictive character. To their benefactors they are grateful, to their enemies relentless. If they are insulted, they will risk their life to avenge themselves. If they are asked to help one in distress, they will forget themselves in their haste to render assistance.'

The pilgrim then goes on to narrate how the government was efficient and army remarkably brave, and how the king could, therefore, frustrate the imperial ambitions of Harsha, the northern emperor.

Pulakesin must have been more than 50 in A.D. 640, but neither his advancing age nor his numerous victories could induce him to

\textsuperscript{53} The genuineness of the Sanjan plates, which support the above reconstruction of history, is not above suspicion, but Konow thinks that the plates may be a copy of an earlier genuine grant. El, XIV, p. 148. Jayasimha is known from Nirupan grant. <DKD>, pp. 357, 360).

\textsuperscript{54} Watters, II, p. 239; Beal, Life, p. 147.

\textsuperscript{55} Ahelo ins., vv. 23-24.
sheathed his sword. His failure to capture Kāṇchī was still rankling in his heart. The Pallava king Mahendra-varman had in the meanwhile been succeeded by his son Narasiṅha-varman. The new ruler was quite alive to the danger from the north and sought to strengthen his position by all means, and enlisted the help of Māna-varman, the exiled Ceylonese king. There seems to be no justification for the view that he made alliance with some of his northern neighbours like the Bāṇas of Bāṇavāḍi.\textsuperscript{56}

Pulakeśin seems to have watched the situation for some time, but eventually he decided to take the offensive. As usual, he carried the war in the enemy's territory and penetrated almost to the outskirts of Kāṇchī. But Narasiṅha-varman was soon able to turn the tables against the invader. He defeated the Chālukya army in three successive engagements fought at Pariyala, Maṇimaṅgala and Sūramāra.\textsuperscript{57} Maṇimaṅgala, the scene of the second battle, is only 20 miles east of Kāṇchī.

In his second venture, Pulakeśin had again very nearly succeeded in winning his objective, when he was thrown back by Narasiṅha-varman. The latter, however, had realised that the Chālukya power was a real menace; it had twice threatened the capital within two decades. It was, therefore, essential that the power of the Chālukyas should be crushed for ever. He, therefore, took full advantage of the chaos caused in the Chālukya camp by three successive defeats and pressed his victories home by a bold march directly towards Vatāpi, his enemy's capital. He was successful in his objective. The city was captured, and a column of victory that had been installed there by Pulakeśin to commemorate his victory over the Pallavas was carried away as trophy.\textsuperscript{58} The claim of several Pallava records\textsuperscript{59} that Narasiṅha-varman was the conqueror of Vatāpi is confirmed by a damaged inscription on a rock behind the Mallikārjuna temple at Bāḍāmi, attesting its occupation by Narasiṅha-varman. The silence of Chālukya records about these events only shows that they usually passed over inconvenient facts. Had Pulakeśin died in one of the engagements of this war, the fact would no doubt have been exultingly mentioned in Pallava records. It appears that he retired from Vatāpi and soon died of old age and a broken heart.

Pulakeśin was at the height of his glory in A.D. 641 when Hiuan Tsang was travelling through his kingdom. The war with Kāṇchī

\textsuperscript{56} SII, IX, i, No. 48.
\textsuperscript{57} SII, I, p. 148; II, p. 366.
\textsuperscript{58} Vatāpināmadhye vijītāvicargah sthitam jayastambham-alombhaya-d-yah, SII, II, p. 508.
\textsuperscript{59} SII, I, p. 148.
probably took place soon after this date. We may, therefore, place his death in C. A.D. 643.

Pulakesin was undoubtedly the ablest ruler of the Chalukya house. It was he who first secured a real imperial status for his family, and the Chalukya empire reached its greatest extent during his reign. His name and achievement struck terror in the hearts of his enemies all over the country. Victory is never a certain factor in war and the great catastrophe, that overwhelmed Pulakesin towards the end of his career, should not be allowed to minimize the value of his earlier achievements.

5. INTERREGNUM (C. A.D. 643-54)

The history of the Chalukyas during the next 11 years is not easy to follow, the available evidence being insufficient, obscure and conflicting. A number of Pulakesin’s sons appear on the scene, each claiming to be the chosen successor of his father. The difficulties of the historian are not over even when one of them, Vikramaditya, succeeds in re-establishing himself as the Chalukya emperor. He claims to have captured Kanchi and compelled the Pallava king to bow down before his feet. The Pallava records, on the other hand, graphically describe how Vikramaditya had to flee from the battle-field, covered with only a piece of rag, and how his capital was once more destroyed by the Kanchi forces. It is not possible, in the limited space available here, to discuss the complicated problems with which this period bristles; we shall just indicate what appears to have been the probable course of events.

Manavarman, the exiled king of Ceylon, living in the court of Narasimha-varman, and Paradurgamardana, a feudatory chief of the latter, seem to have been the two allies who helped him in completely destroying the Chalukya power for a while. It appears that not

60 The other views about the three kings who formed a confederacy are the following: (i) The ‘avanipati-tritaya’ consisted of the three branches of Pallava family each holding sway over three different parts of the Pallava kingdom (Venkataramanayya, Madras Christian College Magazine, January 1928, pp. 7-18). (ii) The Cholas, Pandyas and Keralas, the southern neighbours of the Pallavas (Panchamukhi in El, XXII, p. 27). The Chalukya records, however, do not betray any marked animus against these powers. (iii) Narasimha-varman and two brothers of Vikramaditya constituted the triumvirate (K. A. N. Sastri, JAHF, I, p. 178). Vikramaditya, however, had very cordial relations with one of his elder brothers Chandraditya and his widow. (iv) Pallavas, Pandyas and Manavarman (Dubreuil, Pallavas, pp. 43-44). (v) Three branches of the Pallava dynasty. (vi) Three generations of the Pallava rulers, Narasimha-varman, Mahendra-varman II, and Paramesvara-varman I (Fleet, DKD, p. 362.). In favour of the view advanced in the text, it may be pointed out that Manavarman is known to have helped Narasimha-varman during his exile (ET, III, p. 277; SII, II, p. 343).
only was Vātāpi captured, but a considerable portion of the Chālukya empire was also occupied by the triumvirate for five or six years. Several Chālukya records describe how Vikramāditya restored to gods and Brāhmaṇas the grants that were resumed by the conquerors.

Pulakesin II left behind him several sons. The names of four of them are known so far—Chandrāditya, Āditya-varman, Vikramāditya, and Jayasimha, and their seniority seems to have been in the order stated above. It is but natural that each of these sons, whose ages may have varied between 30 and 40, should have tried to retrieve the fortunes of his house. This is suggested by the Kochrem and Nerur grants of Vijayabhaṭṭārikā, the widowed queen of Chandrāditya, and the Karnul plates of Āditya-varman. Unfortunately, these charters are not dated in the Saka era, and we cannot therefore determine their precise time. The grant of Āditya-varman, issued in his first regnal year, gives him the full imperial titles. It must obviously have been issued a few years after the death of Pulakesin II, when Āditya-varman had succeeded in re-establishing his authority in the Ceded districts. Whether he was a real emperor of the whole of what had been recovered of the Chālukya empire may however be doubted, for we find his sister-in-law, Vijayabhaṭṭārikā also issuing, charters in South Konkan in her own name and with her husband’s seal and dating at least one in her own regnal year. It would thus appear that Chandrāditya and Āditya-varman, who were probably local governors under their father in the Ceded Districts and South Konkan, succeeded in re-establishing their authority in their local spheres after a few years. They were, however, either unable or unwilling to undertake the difficult task of driving out the invaders from the whole empire and restoring its old glory. Vikramāditya, who was probably younger than both these brothers, had sufficient energy and ambition to undertake this task. We do not know whether Āditya-varman cooperated with him, but there is no doubt that Chandrāditya and his queen extended their help. Jayasimha-varman, a younger brother was extremely useful, and he was later rewarded by the governorship of Southern Gujerat, with a semi-independent status. A late eleventh

Paradurgamardana is described as the conqueror of Vātāpi, and his son Samarābhirama is credited with having killed a Chalukki king in a battle at Adhirājanāgala (Chronological list of Inscriptions in Pudukottah State, p. 2, no. 14. Journal of Oriental Research, VII, pp. 1-10.).

61 The tradition recorded in later Chālukya records that Vikramāditya was a great-grandson of Pulakesin II, Āditya-varman and Nedamari being his father and grandfather respectively is definitely contradicted by contemporary records and has to be rejected.

62 IA, VII, p. 163; VIII, p. 45.
century Gaṅga record gives some authority for the view that Vikramāditya received valuable assistance from his maternal grandfather, the Gaṅga king Durvinita. But the date of Durvinita is far from certain and it would not be wise to place explicit faith in a record issued about 500 years after the events concerned. Some feudatories also must have come forward to help the young prince, hoping to be rewarded later.

The efforts of Vikramāditya and his allies were crowned with success, and the hostile forces were driven out from the territory of the Chālukyas, probably by a.d. 654. How exactly this was accomplished is, however, not yet known. There is no doubt that Vikramāditya’s bravery and generalship played an important part. He was a skilful cavalry leader, and epigraphic records describe how, seated on his favourite steed Chitrakāṇṭha, Vikramāditya delivered crushing attacks against his enemy. Vikramāditya’s Pallava opponent during the earlier stage of the struggle was Narasiṃha-varman, later on he had to measure swords with his successor Mahendra-varman II, who had, however, a short reign. By a.d. 660 the Chālukya power was firmly established as far south as Nellore district.

The expulsion of the invaders was no doubt a great achievement, but it raised fresh difficulties, at once complicated and embarrassing. Vikramāditya, who restored the Chālukya empire, was not its rightful heir, for he had at least two elder brothers. The legal heir to the throne was Chandrāditya, his eldest brother, but he had died before the reconquest was complete, and Vijayabhaṭṭārikā, the dowager-queen of Chandrāditya, assumed the reins of government. We find her giving the full imperial titles to her brother-in-law, and

63 It graphically describes how the Gaṅga king conquered the king of Kāñchī, who was like Rāvaṇa disturbing the peace of the world, and established his daughter’s son in the kingdom of Jayasiṃha-vallabha, which no doubt refers to the Chālukya empire. (EC, VIII. Nagar No. 35.) But some scholars place Durvinita’s reign somewhat earlier.

64 The claim made on behalf of Vikramāditya in a record of his son that he restored the glory of his house with the help only of his own valour and diplomacy (Karnāl Pl. IA, VI, p. 86) need not be seriously taken.

65 EI, IX, p. 98.

66 Honnur Plates of a.d. 670 published in MAR, 1939, pp. 139 ff. show that probably Vikramāditya had a third elder brother Ranarāgavikrama by name, whose daughter was married to a Gaṅga prince named Mādhava. Since Vikramāditya makes the grant recorded in this document at the request of his niece and her husband, it is clear that he was on fairly cordial terms with Ranarāgavikrama. It is possible that Ranarāgavikrama was another elder brother who resigned his claim voluntarily in favour of Vikramāditya. It is, however, not unlikely that Ranarāgavikrama was another name of Chandrāditya.
describing him as invincible in both the charters issued by her. But her grants are issued in her own name and not with the permission of Vikramāditya. One of them, the Nerur plates, is further dated in the fifth year of her own reign—svarājya-paṁchama-saṁwatsara—and in the other, the Kochrem plate, she describes herself as Vijayamahādevī or the victorious empress; this charter further bears the seal, not of Vikramāditya but of Chandrāditya.

It is not easy to reconcile the evidence of these two charters with other known facts which make it clear that Vikramāditya was the real emperor at this time. It appears that the relations between him and his sister-in-law were very cordial. In her own charters issued under her exclusive authority, she goes out of her way to describe the glorious achievements of her brother-in-law Vikramāditya, who was undoubtedly the de facto and de jure emperor. Vikramāditya, on his part, allowed his elder widowed sister-in-law to issue charters under her own authority dated in her own regnal years and stamped with the seal of her deceased husband. The facts disclosed by these two charters would suggest the Vijayabhāṭṭārikā continued to rule after her husband’s death, probably as a regent for her minor son, from whose accession she dated her own reign. She was a shrewd lady. She had fully realised that the logic of facts had placed all power in the hands of her younger brother-in-law Vikramāditya, and that the theoretical seniority of herself or her minor son could no longer count for anything. She therefore recognized her brother-in-law as the emperor in her own charters. The latter probably felt that courtesy and respect for seniority demanded that he should permit Vijayabhāṭṭārikā to issue charters in her own name and to date them according to the regnal years of her minor son. It appears that this son either did not attain majority or acquiesced in the feudatory status.

Some records of Vikramāditya refer to his success in winning the crown after defeating all the dāyādās or collateral claimants. Who these relations were, who disputed his succession, we do not definitely

67 Fleet reconciles the conflicting facts disclosed by the above records and the charters of Vikramāditya by assuming that the latter was not the de jure emperor when the Kochrem and Nerur charters were issued. He thought that the de jure emperor at the time was a minor son of Chandrāditya, as a regent for whom Vijayabhāṭṭārikā was ruling, and that it was the death of this minor emperor that rendered the accession of Vikramāditya possible. See, IA, VIII, p. 45. It is, however, not likely that Vikramāditya, who had reconquered the empire by his sword, would have waited for a few years to become the de jure emperor. Hence the alternative reconstruction of history as suggested in the text.
know; but very probably one of them was his brother Āditya-varman, who had succeeded in carving out a small principality in the Ceded districts. Vikramāditya crushed the efforts of all these claimants and formally crowned himself as emperor in the latter half of A.D. 654. A record dated in his third regnal year claims that he had become the exclusive repository of the royal power, and thus once more re-established imperial unity. He formally took the imperial titles Paramēśvara and Mahārājādhirāja.

When the enemy forces were driven out in the south, the re-establishment of the Chālukya overlordship in Central and Northern Mahārāṣṭra, old Hyderabad State, and Western Madhya Pradesh could not have presented any difficulties. It is true that some feudatories ruling in portions of this territory had become independent, but they again accepted the Chālukya overlordship, when Vikramāditya succeeded in driving out invaders. We find all these territories re-occupied, and a new viceroyalty established in southern Gujarat at Nausari by c. A.D. 660. The new Gujarat viceroy was Vikramāditya’s loyal and capable brother Jayasimha-varman; we find him gratefully recognising his debt to his elder brother in his own charter.

Vikramāditya, however, was not content merely to re-establish his authority over the wide empire of his father. His name as well as other birudas like ranarasika ‘delighting in war’, urubalaskandha ‘of mighty army,’ and rājamalla ‘wrestler among kings’ aptly indicate his ambitious nature, pining for fresh military laurels. He decided to start a war of revenge against the Pallavas.

The events of this new Chālukya-Pallava war are difficult to arrange chronologically, as the records are partly undated and partly conflicting. The victories of the Chālukyas over the Pallavas can be reasonably placed between A.D. 670 and 675. The Pallava victories, however, which are no less historical, cannot be dated, and so the narrative becomes obscure. If we assume that the Pallava victories were won before A.D. 670 we shall have to conclude that the Pallava king Mahendravarman II, who succeeded Narasimha-varman, invaded once more the Chālukya dominions. He scored some initial victories, but was driven out by Vikramāditya, who eventually carried the war in the enemy’s country and succeeded in capturing Kāśi. The final victory would, in this case, lie with the Chālukyas. Such, however,

68 He claims to be the favourite son of Pulakeshin who had by his own prowess conquered the whole earth. He is also seen claiming for himself full imperial title in Karmil plates issued in the first year of his reign. IA, XI, p. 67.
does not seem to have been the case. Vijayāditya, the grandson of Vikramāditya, is known to have helped him in defeating the enemies nearer home, when the grandfather was engaged in the southern expedition. This would suggest that the victories scored by the Pallavas were won in the course of a counter-offensive taken some time after A.D. 675. Vijayāditya was probably too young to participate in military campaigns 10 years earlier.

Though naturally burning with a desire to take revenge, Vikramāditya must have spent a few years in making the necessary preparations; for, recent experience had shown that the Pallava power could not be lightly treated with impunity. The preparations were probably completed by A.D. 668, when Vikramāditya launched his offensive. The Gaṅgas, who had warmly supported his efforts to reconquer the paternal dominion, must have given valuable advanced bases for his army to invade the Pallava territory. Vikramāditya’s younger brother, Jayasiṁha-varman, the governor of southern Gujārat, sent detachments to participate in the expedition under the command of his crown-prince Śrīyāśraya Śilāditya.72 Who was ruling at Kāṇchi when Vikramāditya undertook this expedition in C. A.D. 668 is not definitely known. The Gadval plates of Vikramāditya, issued in A.D. 674, claim that Vikramāditya had pulverised the fame of Narasiṁha-varman, dissolved the power of Mahendra-varman and subdued Parameśvara-varman.73 It is probable that Mahendra-varman II, and not Narasiṁha-varman, was ruling at Kāṇchi when Vikramāditya launched his attack against it in C. A.D. 668.

Vikramāditya’s blow was swift and decisive, and there is no doubt whatsoever that he captured Kāṇchi, the Pallava capital. He remained in effective possession of this city for five or six years. One of his records shows that his victorious army was encamped at Malāiyūr (Malaiyūr in Wandiwash taluk) to the west of Kāṇchi in A.D. 670-1,74 and another record proves that four years later its camp was moved further south to Uragapura in Trichinopoly district, on the southern bank of the Kāvēri.75

Mahendra-varman had a short reign, and it is therefore not improbable that his life was cut short in this war. He was succeeded by his son Parameśvara-varman, who had to face the task of driving out

72 MAR. 1923, p. 83 no. 72. Śilāditya, mentioned in this record, cannot be Harsha-vardhana as suggested by Shama Sastri, who has edited the record (cf. IHO, V, p. 235).

73 EI, X, p. 105. See Ch. XII on Pallavas for full explanation of data briefly noticed here.

74 MAR, 1939, No. 30. Honmūr pl.

75 Gadval plates; EI, X, p. 105. Hultsch’s view that Uragapura is to be identified with Negapattam is untenable, because it is not situated on the Kāvēri.
the invader and reconquering his patrimony. The claim in the Chālukya records that Parameśvara-varman was subdued by policy and made to bow at the feet of the conqueror may no doubt suggest that he played the part of a meek and loyal feudatory. But such was not the case. He marshalled his resources and soon organized a counter-offensive. This, however, took more than five or six years, for Parameśvara-varman had to face the hostility of some of his southern neighbours also—like the Pāṇḍya king Arikeśarīn—who were not unwilling to benefit by his discomfiture.

Vikramāditya’s army was not lying idle during the period of five or six years when it was in effective occupation of Kāñchī. Some Chālukya records claim that Vikramāditya had shattered the power of the Cholas, the Pāṇḍyas, and the Keralas. It is thus clear that Vikramāditya was planning further conquests southwards, while encamped at Kāñchī, and may have scored some victories against the Pāṇḍyas and Keralas. These, however, were probably not very substantial, for there is no evidence to show that the Chālukya army occupied any territory to the south of the Trichinopoly district.

The effective occupation of Kāñchī for about five years and the successes obtained in the raids against the southern kingdoms had produced a false sense of security in Vikramāditya. He had underrated the power of organization and resistance of Parameśvara-varman, the Pallava king in exile. When, therefore, Parameśvara-varman launched a sudden attack against him, he was taken by surprise. The critical battle, which was the turning point in the war, was fought at Paruvalanallūr in the Lālgudi taluk of the Trichinopoly district. Vikramāditya was taken completely by surprise; his camp was thrown into disorder and he had to beat a precipitate retreat, ‘covered merely with a rag’, if we are to accept the Pallava records at their face value. Theré can, however, be no doubt that the battle was a decisive one; it permanently drove out the army of occupation from the Pallava kingdom, inflicting fairly heavy losses upon it both in men and materials.

While Vikramāditya was slowly withdrawing his army from the distant Trichinopoly district, fresh troubles arose nearer home. The news of the disaster must have induced some lukewarm feudatories to declare independence. Parameśvara-varman seized the opportunity to make the confusion worse confounded by sending some crack divi-

---

76 EI, X, p. 105.
77 It is also necessary to note that this claim is for the first time made in the records of Vikramāditya’s son; see IA, XIX, p. 149. His own records do not refer to this feat.
78 Cf. IA, VI, p. 86.
79 SII, I, p. 149; II, p. 370.
sions under an able general to attack the enemy’s capital; for there
is a clear reference in some Pallava records to Parameśvara-varman
pressing upon the city of Raṇarasika, i.e. Vikramāditya.80 The crown-
prince Vinayāditya, and his son Vijayāditya, who were in charge of
the home administration, proved equal to the task and soon convinced
the rebels that a repetition of the events following the fall of Bādāmi
in c. 643 was impossible. Several Chālukya records compare the
overthrow of the invading force by Kumāra Vinayāditya to the feat
of Saṅkara in shattering the Asura army.81 Whether the capital was
really threatened, as claimed by the Pallava records, we do not know.
But for some time the Pallava counter-invasion appeared a serious
menace, creating unrest and commotion throughout the kingdom. The
crown-prince and his youthful son, however, soon brought the situa-
tion under complete control, to the great relief of the aged emperor.82

The Chālukya-Pallava war, which seems to have lasted for about
ten years and must have caused considerable bloodshed and misery,
ultimately benefited neither party. Vikramāditya could not maintain
his foothold in Tamil country and the Pallavas also had to retire from
Karnātaka. It produced, however, one good result: it drove home
to each party the utter futility of the struggle. In any case, neither
is known to have invaded his opponent’s territory for nearly half a
century.

7. VINAYĀDITYA (A.D. 681-696)

Vikramāditya was succeeded by his son Vinayāditya some time
between the 22nd of June and the 4th of July, 681.83 Besides his
father’s titles Mahārājādhirāja, Parameśvara and Bhāttāraka, he also
took the title of rājasrāya, ‘the asylum of kings’. He was probably
nearing fifty at the time of his accession.

A number of victories have been attributed to him. He is said to
have reduced to subjection the Pallavas, Chōlas, Pāṇḍyas, and Keralas.
Evidently the reference is to his success in repelling the foreign in-
vaders, who had entered into Chālukya kingdom towards the close
of his father’s reign. It is very doubtful whether any fresh conflict
took place between the Chālukyas and their southern neighbours
during the reign of Vinayāditya. The statement that the kings of

80 SII, I, p. 12 v. 5.
81 EI, XXV, p. 23.
82 IA, VI, p. 86; IX, p. 126.
83 As suggested by Dayyandinne plates, EI, XXII, p. 25. Togarchedu and Jejurī
plates, however, show that he commenced to rule some time between October 678
and July 679 A.D. See IA, VI, p. 86; EI, XIX, p. 62. It is not at present possible to
reconcile this conflicting evidence.
Persia, Ceylon and other countries used to pay him tribute is perhaps more rhetorical than historical. The defeat of the Mālavas and the Haihayas probably refers to some skirmishes on the northern frontier of his kingdom. 84

Copper-plates issued by his son claim that Vinavāditya had defeated the overlord of Northern India and won as trophy pālidhvajā 85 and several other emblems of the imperial status. It appears that his crown-prince Vijavāditya had participated in the northern campaign and accidentally fallen into the hands of the enemy, who suddenly counter-attacked while retiring. The crown-prince, however, managed to effect his escape and defeated the enemy once more and delivered to his father the emblems of the Gaṅgā and Yamunā, pālidhvajā, dhakkā (drum), five musical instruments, rubies, elephants and other booty. 86 The name of the northern emperor with whom Vinavāditya came into conflict is not given, and it is not easy to identify him. He may be king Vajraṭa, who is known to have been defeated by the Chālukyas. But neither the identity of Vajraṭa nor the locality of his kingdom is definitely known. Mirashi identifies him with Śilāditya III of Valabhi 87 and this is quite likely, though not certain. It has been also suggested that this king of Northern India might be either Ādityasena of Magadha who adopted imperial titles, or Yaśo-varman of Kanauj, both of whom are credited with military conquests in the South (cf. Chapter XXI). But this is not proved by reliable evidence, and on the whole no satisfactory solution can be offered at present about the identity of Vinavāditya’s northern opponent.

Several grants of Vinavāditya have come to light. They produce the general impression that the kingdom was prosperous during his rule, and show that the king was taking active interest in administration, touring from place to place for the purpose of inspection.

8. VIJAYĀDITYA (A.D. 696-733).

Vinavāditya was succeeded by his son Vijavāditya, some time in the rainy season of A.D. 696. He was known by the pompous title samastabhuccanāśrīya ‘the asylum of the whole universe’. He had the

85 This was a huge composite banner. constituted of 1080 flags with ten different ensigns. IA, XIV, p. 104.
86 See Nerur plates, dated A.D. 700. IA, IX, p. 128.
87 IHQ, XX, pp. 181-88, 358-59.
advantage of being trained under his grandfather and father, and is known to have taken an active part in the campaigns of both, to which reference has been already made. He reigned for 37 years, the longest among the early Chalukya rulers; but his reign is hardly marked by any important political incident known to us. His records show him touring from place to place, obviously for administrative purpose; they also show how the old feudatories like the Bānas and Telugu-Chōdas continued loyal to him. But neither his copper-plates nor those of his successors show that he ever undertook any military expedition after his accession. He seems to have been more interested in building than in fighting. The Saṅgamaśvara temple at Paṭṭadakal, which is rightly described as a magnificent stone structure, was built by him, and was originally known as Vijayeśvara after him. It is one of the early examples of the so-called Chalukya style of architecture.

Besides his queen or queens he had his mistresses also; one of them, Vināpotigal by name, who describes herself as 'the soul's darling of Vijāvādiyā', is known to have performed the Hiranyagarbhadāna ritual and offered a ruby seat with a silver umbrella to a deity in a shrine at Mahākūta. Vijayaśrī had a younger sister named Kuṇikumamahādevī, who was a patron of Jainism.

During the latter part of his reign, Vijāvādiyā closely associated his son Vikramaśrī in the administration. One set of Nerur plates specifically refers to the crown-prince Vikramaśrī after mentioning the reigning emperer, his father; a grant registered in a Kanarese record at Paṭṭadakal is in the name of both. These records are unfortunately undated; but an inscription from Lakṣmeśvara shows that the crown-prince had been entrusted with the important power of sanctioning constitutions of the village councils and municipalities, and determining the rights and duties of the villagers and government officers. Unfortunately, this record is not well preserved; otherwise it would have thrown considerable light upon the system of local government under the Chálukyas. Another inscription, discovered at Ulchala shows that the crown-prince Vikramaśrī defeated the

---

88 The military expedition in the North during which he had accidentally fallen in the hands of the enemy, was an event in his father's reign, and not his own. Cf. mātaṅgajāṭha-pitrīśat-kurvam-aparaṁ pahōamānair āśādyā katham-api vidhivasādāpatitope. IA, IX, p. 128.
89 A Jain temple built by her existed at Lakṣmeśvara in the eleventh century: IA, XVIII, p. 38.
90 IA, IX, p. 133.
91 IA, X, p. 166.
92 El, XIV, p. 188.
92a Ancient India No. 5, 'Ten Years of Epigraphy'.
9. **VIKRAMĀDITYA II (A.D. 733-744).**

Vijayāditya was succeeded by Vikramāditya II in A.D. 733. He ruled only for 12 years but his reign is crowded with a number of important events.

We have seen already how Vikramāditya I had appointed his younger brother Jayasimha-varman to rule over southern Gujarat. His capital was Nausari and he had a semi-independent status. Whether Jayasimha’s eldest son, Yuvarāja Śrīrasaya Śilāditya ascended the throne and had a short reign, or whether he predeceased his father, we do not know. In 731-32, we find Javārasaya Mangalarāja, Śilāditya’s younger brother, ruling at Nausari.93 Very soon thereafter he was succeeded by his younger brother Avanijanāsraya Pulakeśirāja.94 Pulakeśin could hardly have been less than 55 at the time of his accession in c. 735. He was, however, a remarkably capable, energetic and brave ruler. Soon after his accession Gujarat had to face an invasion by the Arabs of Sindh. A number of kingdoms in Kathiawar and northern Gujarat were swept away by the Muslim avalanche, and it approached the outskirts of Nausari, the Chāluksya capital in Gujarat. Pulakeśin, however, was not daunted by the fate of his northern neighbours. He resolutely faced the invaders, repulsed them with heavy loss, and thus saved Gujarat and the Deccan from the Muslim menace.95 Whether Pulakeśin received any help from Vikramāditya II, we do not know. Probably the Chāluksya emperor did send imperial contingents to help his kinsman at Nausari, whose resources were obviously very much limited. Vikramāditya must have been watching the outcome of the engagement with keen interest; when Pulakeśin successfully hurled back the Arab army flushed with a series of victories, Vikramāditya conveyed his appreciation by conferring a number of significant titles upon him: they were Dakshināpathasaśādhāra (Pillar of the Deccan), Chāluksya kulānākāra (Ornament of the Chāluksya Family), prithivīvallābha (Beloved of the Earth), anvartakancarṇa (Repeller of the Unrepelled) and aranijanāsraya (Asylum of the People of the whole World).96 Doubtless he must have also expressed

93 IBBRAS, XVI, p. 5; IA, XIII, p. 75.
94 That Pulakeśirāja, one of whose elder brothers Śrīrasaya had taken an active part in the campaign against Kāñchī in c. A.D. 670, should succeed to the throne after the reigns of his two elder brothers in c. 735 appears very improbable, but the evidence is conclusive. He may have been born to Jayasimha in his old age.
95 HIED, I, p. 109; RC, I, i, p. 109. Cf. also, infra, Ch. XIX.
96 Nausari plates, Vienna Or. Congress, Aryan Section, p. 290.
his appreciation by giving him valuable presents and perhaps by increasing the extent of his principality.

The truce of half a century existing between the Chalukyas and Pallavas was, as noted above, broken by the successful invasion of Pallava dominions by Vikramāditya II while yet a crown-prince. The hostility was continued throughout his reign. An undated Paṭṭadakal inscription of his queen Lokamahādevī describes him as "a ruler who had captured Kāñchī three times." Details of the invasions are, however given to us only in the copper-plate grants issued by his son. We learn from them that Vikramāditya came to the conclusion that it was high time for him to crush the power of the Pallava dynasty which was the 'natural' enemy of his house. He, therefore, launched an attack upon Kāñchī, leading his forces to the capital through Tonḍai-mandala. The Pallava king Nandipōta-varman came out to meet him, but was signally defeated. He fled from the battlefield leaving behind his khaṭvāṅga-baner, martial musical instruments known as katunukha and samudraghosa, a large number of elephants of high breed, and heaps of costly jewels. The place of this decisive engagement is not known, but it could not have been far from Kāñchī. Nothing could now impede the conqueror's entry into the Pallava capital. Vikramāditya, however, was one of those rare conquerors, who believe in humane warfare. With a rare magnanimity he spared his enemy's capital and signalised his entry into it by giving large charities to temples and Brāhmaṇas. King Narasimhaōpāta had recently built a magnificent Śiva temple at his capital, named Rājaśiṃheśvara, and given it costly presents. The conqueror ordered all these gifts to be laid before him and surprised the temple authorities by returning them to the deity. Vikramāditya, however, took his revenge in a subtle and refined fashion. He got a Kannada inscription engraved on a pillar of the Rājaśiṃheśvara temple, describing how he had conquered Kāñchī, without destroying it, and how, having inspected the cash and ornaments belonging to the temple of Rājaśiṃheśvara, he gave them back again to the god. The inscription concludes: 'Those who destroy this inscription and the stability of the king's charity shall enter the world of those who have killed the men of the ghaṭikā (Brāhmaṇa teachers of the college) of the city.'

97 IA. X, p. 166.
98 E. X, p. 201; V, p. 202. This record also states that the irresistible valour of Vikramāditya caused distress to the Pāṇḍya, Chola, Kerala, Kalabhrā and other kings. This merely refers to the awe inspired by the victory of the Chalukya emperor in the far south, and does not necessarily prove any expeditions against the kings enumerated here.
99 Gaṅga king Koṅguni Arasa co-operated in this expedition.
100 E. I, III, p. 366.
is this clever curse at the end which probably prevented the record being destroyed by the Pallavas when they reconquered the city.

Vikramāditya did not aim at permanently occupying the Pallava capital. Probably, Narasimha-varman’s Pallava inscription at Bādāmi, commemorating his conquest of the Chālukya capital, was ranking in his heart, and he felt quite satisfied when he had paid back the Pallavas in the same coin by getting his own conquest of Kāñchī engraved in a Kannada inscription in the most famous temple of the city. He seems to have soon returned to Bādāmi after a short occupation of the Pallava capital.101 The date of this event is not definitely known, but may be placed at c. a.d. 739.

A few years later Vikramāditya formally appointed his son Kirti-varman as the crown-prince. The latter was anxious to commemorate the event by a fresh military exploit and requested his father to despatch him to overthrow the Kāñchī ruler, the ‘natural’ enemy of his house. Vikramāditya concealed the request and a fresh expedition was launched against the Pallava capital. The Chālukya records simply claim that the Pallava king,102 unable to offer an open fight, shut himself in a fort, and was harassed and discomfited there by the Chālukya crown-prince.103 Obviously, Kirti-varman could achieve nothing particularly remarkable, and returned after a show of force.

Names of two of the queens of Vikramāditya are known; the senior one was Lokamahādevī and the junior one was her younger sister Trailokyamahādevī. The crown-prince Kirti-varman was the son of the latter. The queens were princesses of the Haihaya family ruling near Jabalpur, but the name of their father is not known. Each one of them built a temple at Pāṭṭadakal known after her name. Of these the temple of Lokesvarabhattāraka still exists, but is now known as the temple of Vināyaksha. The temple of Trailokyēśvara, built by the second queen, cannot be satisfactorily identified at present. Gunda, the architect of the former temple, was a famous personage, who was given the titles of tribhuvanāchārya (‘preceptor of the three worlds’), anivaritāchārya (‘unrepulsed teacher’) and ‘teṣaṁkanadeśeya sutradhāri’ (‘the architect of the Deccan’). He had built several palaces and temples, and secured some privileges for the members of his order from the Chālukya emperor.104

101 Pallava records claim no counter-victory for Nandipota-varman against the Chālukyas; we may, therefore, take it that the victory of Vikramāditya was a decisive one.

102 He is not named, but obviously he must be Nandi-varman Pallava-malla, the contemporary Kāñchī ruler.

103 EI, IX, p. 203.

104 IA, X, pp. 164-5. For some other temples built at Aihole and Lakshmeśvar, see IA, VII, p. 106; VIII, p. 286.
VIKRAMĀDITYA was succeeded by his crown-prince KIRTI-VARMAN in A.D. 744. Nripasinhha, 'Lion among kings', was his peculiar personal title. The prestige of the CHALUKYAS was at its height at the accession of the new king. The entire Deccan was under their overlordship, the power of the PALLAVAS had been effectively broken, and the Arab army priding on its invincibility had been repulsed. The new king was able, energetic, and conscientious in the discharge of his duties. In short, everything seemed to indicate a further spell of glorious career for the house of the CHALUKYAS for several decades. But the unexpected happened in the reign of KIRTI-VARMAN II; within a decade of his accession, the CHALUKYA empire was completely shattered.

The danger came from quite an unexpected quarter. It was neither the hereditary and natural enemy of the family, the PALLAVAS, nor any of the old feudatories like the SINDAS, the SENDRAKAS, the ĀḷUPAS, the BĀNAS, or the GANIGAS, that overwhelmed the imperial CHALUKYA power. A new feudatory house, known as RĀṢHṬRAKUṬA, was slowly rising into prominence in Berar; it was its energetic chief DANTIDURGA who dealt the first decisive blow to the CHALUKYA empire some time before A.D. 753. His descent from a CHALUKYA princess had aroused imperial ambitions in him, and it seems very probable that he had co-operated with his CHALUKYA confederate Pulakesīn of NAUSARI in repelling the Arab invasion. At any rate by A.D. 742 we find him assuming new titles prithivīvallabha and khadgāvaloka,105 which may have been conferred upon him by his feudal lord VIKRAMĀDITYA II. It seems very likely that DANTIDURGA accompanied the crown-prince KIRTI-VARMAN in his raid against the PALLAVAS. The death of VIKRAMĀDITYA II in 744 was probably the real starting point in the execution of the imperial plans of DANTIDURGA. He, however, was a shrewd politician and decided to effect the expansion of his power without coming into conflict with the CHALUKYAS. He, therefore, annexed the Gurjara kingdom of NANDIPURA and also brought MALWA under his control. He gradually brought the greater part of Madhya Pradesh within his sphere of influence; most of this territory was a kind of no man's land in those days. KIRTI-VARMAN probably realized by this time the danger from this feudatory and decided to check him. But DANTIDURGA was more than a match for him. He attacked KIRTI-VARMAN quite unawares and secured a decisive victory which put him in effective possession of central MAHĀRĀṢṬRA before the beginning of A.D. 754. KIRTI-VARMAN, however, still continued to control KARNĀṬAKA and made fresh efforts to reassert his authority. In A.D. 757 we find

105 EI, XXV, p. 25.
him encamped in the Sholapur district, obviously contemplating a march against the Rāṣṭrakūṭas, whose ambitious king Dantidurj had recently died and been succeeded by his uncle Kṛishṇa. The new king, however, was equally capable and completed the work of his predecessor by conquering Karnāṭaka also and extending his power right up to Gaṅgavādi or Mysore. Nothing more is heard of Kṛishṇa varman after A.D. 757, and later Chālukya records admit that the sun of the imperial glory of the Chālukya family set with him. Some Chālukya chieftains occasionally come in our view during the eighth and ninth centuries. But most of them were petty chieftains ruling over a few villages and probably unconnected with the Bādā family.
Chapter Sixteen

The Rāśhtrakūṭas

I. ORIGIN AND EARLY HISTORY

The name Rāśhtrakūṭa means chief of the rāṣṭra, division or kingdom as the case may be. It occurs in the inscriptions of several dynasties from the fourth century A.D. as the designation of a class of provincial officials functioning under the control of the central government. It is not unlikely, though there is no proof of it, that the line of kings who bore the dynastic name 'Rāśhtrakūṭa' originally belonged to this class of provincial officials. The Raṭhikas of the Aśokan inscriptions have been regarded sometimes as the ancestors of the Rāśhtrakūṭas; but the Raṭhikas of the Mauryan epoch were a tribe, and there is no evidence to connect them with the Rāśhtrakūṭas across eight centuries in time. There can be no connection also between the Kannaḍa-Telugu caste name Reḍḍi or Raḍḍi and this dynasty, for, as Fleet rightly pointed out,¹ 'the earliest traces of the Rāśhtrakūṭas are obtained from Central India and the more northern parts of the Bombay Presidency, where, now at all events, the Reḍḍi caste does not seem to exist.'

The Rāśhtrakūṭas were of Kannaḍa origin, and their inscriptions clearly indicate that Kannaḍa was their mother tongue, though in State documents they made a very large use of the Sanskrit language. One title which was assumed by the Rāśhtrakūṭa princes of both the main line and of the subordinate branches may well be taken to contain the clue to their original home. That title is Laṭṭalūra-puravareśvara, the eminent lord of the city of Laṭṭalūra. Laṭṭalūra has been identified by Fleet with Lāṭūr in the Bidar district of the former Hyderabad State.² We may compare the similar titles which connected the Telugu-Choḍas with Uraiyūr, and the Kaliṅga-Garigas with Koḷāhalapura (Kolar). In relatively late copper-plate grants beginning from the Sanjan plates (No. XIX)³ the dynasty claims descent from the line-

---

¹ BG, I. ii. p. 384.
² EI. VII. p. 186 f. Lattalūr is the same as Raṭṭalur, the town of Raṭṭas.
³ The Roman numerals within brackets refer to the serial number of inscriptions in the list given at the end of this chapter.
age (vaṁśa) of Yadu. In grants of the reign of Govinda III (e.g. Nos. IX and X) there occurs a verse which states that the family of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas became proof against assaults of enemies after the birth of Govinda just like the Yādava vaṁśa after the birth of Krishṇa (Madhurīpu). The comparison was obviously suggested to a court-poet by the name Govinda of the monarch whose praśasti he was composing, and about 60 years later it seems to have given rise to the idea of connecting the Rāṣṭrakūṭa line with the Yaduvainśa. Other details of the myth may be culled from other grants. Thus we learn that the Rāṣṭrakūṭas belonged to the Sātyaki branch of the Yaduvainśa (No. XXI). Some records introduce an eponymous ancestor Raṭṭa, himself said to be the son of Tuṅga or a line of Tuṅgas (Nos. XXIV, XXV, XXVI). These names are transparent inventions, belonging to "a period when all the great families of Southern India were devising Purānic pedigrees."

The Rāṣṭrakūṭas of Malkhed had the Pālidhvaja banner and the Garuḍa-lāṅchhama. They were heralded in public by the sound of an instrument called Tivali or Trivali. They had both Śiva and Vishṇu as family gods, and the images of Gaṅgā and Yamunā were among their insignia. These and the Pālidhvaja were adopted by the Chālukyas of Bādāmi as symbols of their victory against north Indian kings and might have been taken from them by the Rāṣṭrakūṭas.

Western Chālukya inscriptions, beginning from the Kauṭhēm grant of A.D. 1009, state that Jayasiṅha I, the founder of the Bādāmi line of Chālukyas, established his power after overthrowing an early Rāṣṭrakūṭa king, Indra, the son of Krishṇa. But of this achievement none of the several inscriptions of the Bādāmi period shows any knowledge. This early empire of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas must therefore be treated as a myth, and the attempt of some modern scholars to treat it as history cannot be regarded as successful.

The earliest ruling family of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas so far known is that founded by Mānāṅka, mentioned above (p. 52). Another Rāṣṭrakūṭa family ruling in the Betul district of the Madhya Pradesh will be discussed in the next chapter. A Rāṣṭrakūṭa Govindarāja, son of Sivarāja, acting as vijnāpti (petitioner), is mentioned in the Naravana plates (A.D. 743) of Chālukya Vikramāditya II of Bādāmi. This prince was clearly a feudatory or official under the Chālukyan emperor. Lastly we have the Antrōli-Chharoli plates (No. III) bearing the Garuḍa seal dated A.D. 757, also belonging apparently to a collateral branch of the Malkhed line holding sway in the Lāṭa country. These

4 BRG, i, ii, p. 383.
5 BISMJ, X, pp. 9 ff.
plates mention four generations: Karka I, his son Dhruva, his son Govinda, and his son Karka II, who issued the grant in A.D. 757, and was therefore the contemporary of Dantidurga, the founder of the imperial Rāshtrakūṭa line. The exact relation of these kings to the Malkhed line cannot be decided with certainty, though it is not impossible that Karka I of this charter was identical with the grandfather of Dantidurga himself.

II. RISE AND EXPANSION

We now come to the main line of which history must regard Dantidurga (he whose elephant is his fortress) as the founder. Inscriptions usually give the names of three generations of his ancestors while one engraved in the Daśāvatāra cave at Ellora (No. IV) adds the names of two earlier generations giving a total of five predecessors of Dantidurga. The descent of Dantidurga would then be as follows:

Danti-varman

Indra I (called also Prichchhakarāja in No. XIX, v. 3)

Govindarāja

Kakka I

Indra II

Dantidurga.

It may be noted that chronology offers no difficulties in our treating the list of kings given in the Daśāvatāra cave inscription as a continuation of the line ruling in the Betul district. The Tivarkhed plates (No. I) of Nannarāja Yuddhāsura⁵ᵃ, the last of the four kings of that family, were issued from Achalapura, Elichpur in Berar, which may be accepted, as we shall see, as a good starting point for the career of Dantidurga and for the single achievement of his father recorded in the inscriptions. That achievement was the capture by Indra of the Chālukya princess Bhavaganā whom he married by force on the battle-field of Kheṭaka (Khaira) (Nos. VI, v. 11 and XIX, v. 7). The princess must have belonged to the Gujarāt branch of the Chālukyas, but we know nothing of the occasion for the battle. The event may be placed somewhere about A.D. 725. For the rest,

⁵ᵃ A record held to be spurious by V. V. Mirashi, EI, XXVIII, p. 8.
Dantidurga's predecessors are only names to us as no definite achievement of any of them is mentioned in the inscriptions.

Dantidurga, occasionally called also Danti-varman, had the title *khaḍgāvaloka* (he whose glances are as keen as the edge of a sword) (No. II), and was also known as Vairamegha (Kaḍaba plate) which sounds more like his personal name than a title. In the Ellora plates (A.D. 742), the earliest record of the reign, he bears the titles *prithivi-vallabha* and *khaḍgāvaloka*, and is already in occupation of Ellora. His titles may imply that he too had a hand in repulsing the Arab invasion of Lāṭa and was, like Pulakesin (above, p. 435), honoured with titles by Chālukya suzerain Vikramāditya II about A.D. 733-34. After his overthrow of the last Chālukya ruler of Bādāmi called Kirti-varman II (p. 438), he assumed full imperial rank and described himself in the Samangadhi plates (Jan. A.D. 754) (No. II6a) as *Prithivi-vallabha Mahārājādhirāja Paramēśvara Paramabhaṭṭāraka*. That record says that his elephants tore up the banks of the rivers Mahi, Mahanadi and Revā; that out of regard for his mother he enabled her to make grants of land in each village in his territory comprising four hundred thousand villages; and that he acquired supreme sovereignty by the easy conquest of the Vallabha, i.e. Chālukya Kirti-varman II, by quickly overcoming with only a small force the boundless Karnațaka army which had proved its mettle in defeating the rulers of Kāñchi, Kerala, Chola and Pāṇḍya, besides Harsha and Vajrāta of Northern India. The undated and fragmentary Daśāvatāra cave-inscription (No. IV) ascribes to him victories against Vallabha, the lord of all kings,7 Kāñchi, Kaliniga, Kosala, and Śrīśailadesa, besides the conquest of the Rājās of Mālava, Lāṭa and Tāṅka. The same record states that he gave presents at Ujjain on a liberal scale to Rājās and to the poor. It adds that the king's camp was located (at Ujjain?) in a Gurjara palace.

Later inscriptions contain clever elaborations of these themes. To cite only a few of these: Dantidurga is said to have performed a *Hiranyagarbha* at Ujjain with the Gurjara ruler and others acting as his door-keepers (*Pratihāras*), an obvious play upon the dynastic name of the Gurjara ruler (No. XIX). Again the Lakshmi of the Chālukyas is said to have noticed the marks of the conch and the discus on his hands and to have approached him of her own accord abandoning the ocean, i.e. her original abode, for the Chālukya dynasty. And in a verse of untranslatable *double entendre* we get a clue to Dantidurga's strategy of indirect approach to his objective,

6 E1, XXV, p. 25.
6a The genuineness of the record has been doubted, E1, XXVIII, p. 7.
7 Ibid., p. 29.
for he is said to have first attempted to lay his hand on the Jaghnya-
deśa and then on the Madhyađeśa before grasping the Kāñchipula
of the Earth (maiden) (No. XXI). Lastly, Dantidurga is said to have
transplanted the creeper Lakshmi from the basin (ālavāla) of the
Chālukyas to his own family where it was watered by the rut of war-
elephants (No. XXV).

There is nowhere in our sources any clear indication of the chro-
nological order in which these campaigns were undertaken by
Dantidurga. The order observed in the Samangadh plates (No. II),
the initial location of the family in Berar, and the verse cited above
relating to the strategy followed by Dantidurga, may all lead us to
suppose that the overthow of the Chālukyas of Bādāmi and the as-
sumption of the imperial position were among the last achievements
of this talented and warlike monarch. Lāṭa and Mālava were in a
disturbed condition consequent on the Arab impact, and Dantidurga
must have taken advantage of the confusion to aggrandize his own
power. That may explain the references to the rājās of Mālava, Lāṭa
and Ėṭaika, the presence of the king at Ujjain, and his performance of a
Hiranyagarbha at that place. Success against Kosala and Kaliṅga in
the east might have come next, but we lack all knowledge of detail.
Lastly he struck southward, making a show of force in the Śrīśaila
country, then under the Telugu-Chodhas, and going down still further
south to Kāṅchī, the capital of the hereditary enemies of the Chāl-
ukyas, viz the Pallavas. Dantidurga’s invasion of Kāṅchī is men-
tioned by Tirumangai Ālvār, and we have every reason to believe that
after an initial demonstration of force, Dantidurga struck up an
alliance with Nandi-varman Pallavamalla to whom he gave his daugh-
ter Revā in marriage. Revā became the chief queen of Pallavamalla,
and her son Danti-varman succeeded his father on the Pallava throne.

All the operations of Dantidurga are thus seen to have been laid
on the outlying territories of the extensive Chālukyan empire and
calculated to sap its strength quickly, before the final assault could
be delivered at the heart of the empire. Kṛiti-varman II was no match
to the bold and astute Dantidurga, and as the Chālukya records
themselves put it, ‘in his reign the Rājaśrī of the Chālukyas dis-
appeared from the face of the earth’. Kṛiti-varman found that he had
lost the battle before he even suspected that it was coming. In fact
all indications point to the progressive attenuation of Chālukyan
power before Dantidurga’s aggrandizement, rather than a sudden
military disaster of an overwhelming character. That seems to be
the meaning of the easy victory which Dantidurga claims to have
won against the Chālukyas. Kṛiti-varman continued to rule with dimi-
nished glory for some years after the date of Dantidurga’s Saman-
gadh charter (No. II), and perhaps did not quit the stage until the reign of Dantidurga’s successor Krishna I. His Vakkaleri plates, which record a grant made by him from the victorious camp at Bhandāragaviṭṭage on the north bank of the Bhīmā river, is dated in the eleventh year of his reign, A.D. 755-6; and that is the last we hear of him. Dantidurga describes his territory as comprising four lacs of villages. In later times the Rāṣṭrakūṭa kingdom was reckoned to include seven and a half lacs. Probably Dantidurga succeeded in making his sway effective only over a little more than one half of the Chālukyan empire of Bādāmi. The conquest was completed as we shall see by his successor.

Lāṭa is included among the conquests of Dantidurga. But from the Antroli-Chharoli plates of A.D. 757 (No. III) we see that Lāṭa was under Rāṣṭrakūṭa Karka II in A.D. 757, and presumably the ancestors of Karka for at least three generations ruled before him in the same area. Karka II moreover bears the imperial titles Mahārājādhirāja, Paramēśvara and Paramabhattaraka. It may be that Dantidurga’s campaign against Lāṭa was directed against this ruler and that he acknowledged Dantidurga’s supremacy for a time, and subsequently made an attempt to withdraw his allegiance and set up as an independent power. We shall return to this question in the history of the next reign.

How long Dantidurga lived after the date of the Samangadh plates (No. II, 5 January A.D. 754) is only a matter for conjecture, and there occur different statements in the inscriptions regarding the manner in which Dantidurga’s reign came to an end. Some records (Paithan, Alas)8 simply state that when Dantidurga died his uncle Krishna, the son of Kākka, succeeded him on the throne. A verse in the Baroda plates of A.D. 812-13 (No. XII) states that Krishnārāja uprooted a member of his family who had taken to evil ways and began himself to rule the kingdom for the good of his family (gotrahitāya). Lastly the Karda plates (No. XXVIII) state that when Dantidurga died childless,9 Krishnārāja became king. Dantidurga was obviously a strong and able ruler who laid the foundations of a lasting empire, and it is difficult to believe that he was the wicked kinsman whom Krishna had to set aside before he assumed the sway himself. It may be inferred therefore that Dantidurga died childless, and that possibly there was a dispute between Krishna and another member of

8 E.I., VI, p. 203; VII, p. 232.
9 Cf. EC, XI, Chittoḍurg, 76. The Rāmeśvara stone inscription of Krishna III (SII, IX(1), No. 68) implies that Dantidurga died in battle while he was still young—surasundari-prāthite yāte yānti dīvam.
the family, who sought the throne and succeeded in seizing it for a while, but whom Krishna overthrew easily because of his unpopularity.

The accession of Krishna may be placed in A.D. 756. He had the titles Subhatuṅga (High in Prosperity) and Akālavarsa (Constant Rainer). One of his first tasks was to complete the overthrow of the Chālukya power, and inscriptions (No. IX and XIX) say that he dragged the Chālukya Lakshmi to himself, and that he dispelled darkness, viz. the Chālukyas (No. XXII). The victory against the Chālukyas is not mentioned in the earliest record of the reign dated A.D. 758, but it is not unlikely that the conquest had been completed earlier. In any event, as already noted, we hear of Chālukya Kirti-varman II for the last time in A.D. 757.

Under Krishna I the newly established Rāṣṭrakūṭa power, in spite of the difficulties it faced, expanded in all directions. The Bhāndak plates, A.D. 772 June (No. VI), show that the whole of western Madhya Pradesh had come under Krishna's rule by that time. In other inscriptions Krishna is said to have overcome Rāhappā by the strokes of his sharp sword and thereby gained the Pālidhvaja banner and the imperial title Rājadhirāja Parameśvara. The identity of Rāhappā with Kakka II of Lāta was suggested by Fleet long ago. If this is correct, Krishna's war against Rāhappā may be taken to mark the end of the first Lāta branch of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas. Rāhappā's identity or at least his close connection with Kirti-varman II has also been suggested, and the accession of the Pālidhvaja and the imperial title as a result of the victory may be taken to support this. Southern Koṅkana was also conquered and brought under his sway by Krishna who established Śanaphulla, the founder of the Silāhāra family of southern Koṅkana, as his feudatory in that part of the empire.

The expansion of the empire in the southern direction is attested by several inscriptions. The Telegaon plates of A.D. 768 (No. V) were issued from the king's camp at Manne in the heart of the Gaṅga territory. There is a stone inscription at Haṭṭimattūr. Dharwar district, dated in Krishna's reign and recording the death of a couple of soldiers in a fight. There are a number of inscriptions dated in the reign of the Gaṅga king Śrīpurusha Muttarasa recording the death

10 Akālavarsa was rendered by Fleet into 'untimely rainer'. But verse 22 of the Bhāndak plates (No. VI) gives the real sense. It says: 'He was called Akālavarsa by the world as he always rained wealth on friends, arrows on enemies, love on young women and protection on the helpless.'

12 BG, I, ii, pp. 392-93.
13 EI, VI, p. 161.
of several soldiers in fights in the war with Kannarasā (Krishṇa I), and mentioning Bāgeyar and Pinchanur as the scenes of two of the battles in the war.14 The Gaṅga kingdom became thus subject to the Rāśṭrakūṭa overlordship. In the east, Krishṇa pursued his hostility to the Chālukyas against the Veṅgī branch of that line. The campaign against Veṅgī was entrusted to his son Govinda who was yuvārāja at the time, and the Alas plates15 of A.D. 769-70 mention clearly that the ruler of Veṅgī came to meet Govinda and his army on their march against the Veṅgīmandala in the victorious camp at the confluence of the Krishṇa and the Musī rivers and offered his submission, placing his treasure, his army, his country and himself at the disposal of Govinda. The ruler of Veṅgī at the time was Vijayāditya I (A.D. 755-72). Veṅgī escaped this time by offering formal submission; there was no invasion of the Veṅgī kingdom and no battle. But this successful march of a Rāśṭrakūṭa prince to the frontiers of the kingdom was the shadow cast by the coming events on the fortunes of the Eastern Chālukyas.

The Rāśṭrakūṭa empire under Krishṇa I may thus be taken to have extended over the whole of the modern Maharashtra State, a good part of the Mysore country, practically the whole of the former Hyderabad State, with Veṅgī farther east acknowledging its supremacy, and a good part of Madhya Pradesh.

Quite in keeping with the high imperial position to which Krishṇa had raised his kingdom were the great works of art that signalized his reign, the celebrated temple of Kailāsa at Ellora being the most prominent among them. In the Wardha plates Krishna is said to have constructed many temples of Śiva which resembled the Kailāsa mountain (also Nos. XXIV, XXV, XXVI). The Baroda grant of A.D. 812-13 (No. XII) proclaims in unmistakable terms the glory of the temple at Ellora. To cite Prof. R. G. Bhandarkar's rendering of the passage:

"When the Gods moving in their aerial cars saw it they were struck with wonder and constantly thought much over the matter saying to themselves, this temple of Śiva is self-existent, for such beauty is not to be found in a work of art. Even the architect who constructed it was struck with wonder, saying, when his heart misgave him as regards making another similar attempt, "wonderful! I do not know how it was that I could construct it!" King Krishṇa with his own hands again decorated Sambhu (Śiva) placed in that temple by means of gold, rubies, and other precious jewels though he had already been decorated by the wonderful orna-

14 MAR, 1910, p. 23.
ments of the stream of the Gaṅgā, and Moon and the deadly poison.'

The Kadaba plates also contain a description of the temple to which it gives the name Kaṁṇēśvara, Kanna being of course the popular form of Krisna. This huge rock-cut temple is universally recognized as the high-water mark of all the excellences of the style of architecture and sculpture originally associated with the Pallavas; a verse in the Telegaon plates (No. V) says that the country over which Krisna ruled was adorned with all the excellences of Kāṅchi, and Sten Konow has justly surmised that this is an indirect acknowledgement of the debt Krisna owed to the Pallava model, the Kailāsanātha temple at Kāṅchipuram.

The location of the Rāṣṭrākūṭa capital in this period is not free from uncertainty. The fact that Krisna chose Ellora as the seat for the most magnificent monument of his reign may raise the presumption that the capital must have been located very near Ellora, if not in Ellora itself. According to the testimony of many later inscriptions Mānyakheṭa was built and made the capital of the empire by Amoghaivarsha I. But a verse cited by Fleet from a Jaina work Kathākosa states that Subhātuṇiga was living at the excellent city of Mānyakheṭa, and Subhātuṇiga happens to be a title of Krisna I. But as the same title was borne by Krisna II also, it seems better to take the verse from the Kathākosa to refer to that monarch as that would be in conformity with the testimony of the inscriptions cited above.

The death of Krisna must have occurred some time between A.D. 772, the date of his Bhāṇḍakas plates (No. VI), and A.D. 775, that of the Pimpari plates of his son Dhruva.

III. CIVIL WAR AND RECOVERY

Krisna was followed on the throne by his son Govinda II who, as we have seen, had been made yuvarāja some time before A.D. 769. In the Alas plates, issued even while he was yuvarāja, Govinda bears the titles Prabhūtavarsha (profuse rainier) and Vikramāvaloka (the man with the heroic look). These titles are repeated in other records of later times, and the Telegaon plates give him another title Prabhūtuṇiga (the eminent lord). He is also sometimes called simply Vallabhā (Pāithan, Pimpari, Bagumra). Govinda's name is omitted in some of the later grants of the line (No. XII, XIII). This was due probably to his being merely a collateral, the main line of succession continuing.

16 EI, IV, No. 49.
17 IA, XII, p. 215.
18 EI, X, p. 88.
through his younger brother Dhruva. From the Dhulia plates (No. VII), A.D. 779, of his son Karka Suvarṇavarsha we see that Dhruva was ruling in the region of Nasik and Khāndesh as the viceroy of his elder brother Govinda II. One military achievement is attributed to Govinda II in a verse in the Daulatabad plates (A.D. 793),19 which is a *double entendre*, comparing Govinda to Hari for his having exhibited the strength of his arm in snatching the glory of Pārijāta and in uprooting Govardhana. Pārijāta might have been the name of a local ruler, and if the uprooting of Govardhana may also be treated as part of the campaign against Pārijāta, the scene of the war must be sought in the Nasik region where Dhruva was ruling as viceroy. If this view is correct the campaign will form part of the struggle between the two brothers that fills a considerable place in the inscriptions and appears to have ended disastrously for Govinda.

For the next verse (v. 11) in the Daulatabad plates states that Nirupama, the younger brother of Govinda, seeing that Govinda had become conceited, was abandoned by princes, and had deserted the path of good policy, took upon himself the burden of royalty out of devotion to his ancestors and in order to preserve the sovereignty of the family. The evidence from other records supplements this information. Thus we learn (Nos. XXIV and XXV) that Govinda abandoned himself to a dissolute life, left the cares of sovereignty entirely to his younger brother Nirupama, and thereby lost his hold on the kingdom. But obviously Govinda did not yield without a struggle, and made an attempt to defend himself against his brother's efforts to depose him. He summoned to his aid the Pallava ruler of Kāñchī, the Gaṅga king, the king of Veṅgi, and the ruler of Mālava,20 even though they were traditional foes of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa kingdom. This alliance of Govinda with hostile monarchs against his own brother was apparently the lapse from good policy which Dhruva resented and which threatened in his view to disrupt the Rāṣṭrakūṭa empire. Dhruva claims21 that he made conciliatory overtures to Vallabha, but as he was not inclined to make peace, he speedily defeated him in a battle, and assumed the sovereignty himself. How exactly Govinda ended his life, on the battle-field or in prison, is not clear from the sources.

Dhruva's victory, however, was not so easily or quickly achieved as his records lead one to suppose. An inscription of the reign of Krishna III contains a pointed statement that the waters of the Gangas bore the appearance of the Yamunā owing to the victory of Govinda.

19 EI, IX, p. 194, v. 10.
20 Paithan pl., EI, III, p. 104.
21 Ibid.
over Indra, doubtless Indrāyudha of Kanauj. As Vatsarāja be-
friend ed Govinda, his rival Dhr uva must naturally have sought the 
help of Indrāyudha and got him to attack Vatsarāja of Malwa in the 
rear; this must have given cause to Govinda for the attack on Kanauj. 
Dhr uva’s rebellion commenced, apparently, about 775, the date of the 
Pimpari plates in which he bears imperial titles; but Dhr uva did not 
succeed at once, and had to eat the humble pie for a time as a result 
of Govinda’s victories at Govardhana and Kanauj; so even as late as 
779 (Dhulia plates) he had to acknowledge Govinda as his suzerain.

The final success of Dhr uva against his brother Govinda II and 
his accession to the throne must have occurred about 780 or soon 
after. Dhr uva was also called Dhora, a Prākrit form of the same name, 
and he had the titles Nirupama (unequalled), Kali-calla ba (fond of 
war), Dhārīvarsha (heavy rainer) and Śrīvallabha. One of his first 
tasks after securing the throne was to proceed against the enemies 
who had assisted Govinda II in the late civil war. The Paithan plates 
state summarily that by defeating the kings of the east, north, and 
south, and capturing vast quantities of jewels and gold from them, 
together with the Pālidhva jā and other insignia of royalty, he attained 
supreme sovereignty, and became a veritable Indra on earth. For 
details we must turn to other records. They state (Nos. VIII, IX, X) 
that he caught and imprisoned the Gaṅga, levied a tribute of elephants 
from the Pallava who made his submission, drove into the desert Vat-
sarāja, proud of his victory against Gauḍa, and lastly deprived 
the Gauḍa ruler himself not only of his two white umbrellas but of 
his fame which had reached far in all directions. He is said to have 
won victories also against the king of Kosala (No. XIII). He also waged 
war against the ruler of Veṣā and punished him severely for the 
support he had given to Govinda II.

The Gaṅga ruler who went to the aid of Govinda II and paid for it 
by being caught and thrown into prison by Dhr uva was doubtless 
Śivamāra II. An inscription from Nanjangūḍ says that during

21a SII, IX (1), No. 68, v. 6, cited by Dr. N. Venkataramanayya in his paper: ‘An 
unknown incident in the History of the Rāṣṭrakūtas of Malkhed’, PIHC, IX (1945), 
pp. 85-90. The victory of Govinda is mentioned in a pun not easily translated. 
It reads:

Yat senayā hindra-madā-vamardanād Gaṅgāpayo
Yāmunaccaḥ vibhāti.

The two meanings are (1) by Govinda’s army Indra’s pride was crushed—senayā hi 
Indra-madāvamardanāt: (2) the pride of the great serpent was crushed by the army: 
se r nayā a hindra-madāvamardanāt, a reference to Śrī Krishna’s fight with the Serpent 
Kāliya which took place in the Yāmuna.

22 EC, IV, Hg. 93.
23 EC, XII, Suppl. Nj., 209.
Sivamāra’s absence from the kingdom it was looked after by his younger brother Vijayāditya who, however, like Bharata, treated the kingdom as a trust. The Rāṣṭrakūṭa conqueror appointed his son Kāśībha as viceroy over Gaṅgavādi ninety-six thousand.24 The Pallava monarch who had likewise to make his submission and yield a tribute of war elephants to Dhrūva must have been Nandi-varman II. The relations between Dhrūva and Veṅgi find elucidation in a verse from Pampabhūrata read along with the inscriptions of the Chālukyas of Vemulavāḍa.25 Dhrūva was aided in the war against Veṅgi by Arikesarī I, the founder of the line of Chālukyas that ruled at Vemulavāḍa as the loyal feudatories of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas practically throughout the period of their supremacy. Arikesarī played a decisive part in the war against Veṅgi which included Trikaliṅga within the sphere of its influence. He is said to have taken all Veṅgi by force and ruled it. Allowing for exaggeration, we may assume that as a result of Arikesarī’s campaign, parts of Telingana definitely changed hands, being annexed to the Rāṣṭrakūṭa empire and held as a fief by Arikesarī and his successors from this period. The ruler of Veṅgi at the time was Vishnuvardhana IV who made his peace with Dhrūva by offering him the hand of his daughter Śilamahādevī who became the chief queen of Dhrūva.26

In northern India there was beginning a struggle for supremacy between the Gurjara-Pratihāra rulers and the Pālas of Bengal. The struggle had commenced, and Vatsarāja, the Gurjara ruler, had won a success against Dharmapāla of Bengal. But this did not deter Dhrūva from punishing the Gurjara ruler for his having taken the side of Govinda II in the late war; he was forced to seek refuge for a time in the deserts of Rajasthan. Dhrūva did not stop there, but proceeded further north into the Ganga-Yamuna Doab where he met Dharmapāla and inflicted a defeat on him, and perhaps reinstated Indrāyudha for a time. Forced to flee from that country Dharmapāla abandoned into the hands of Dhrūva the parasols and other insignia of his sovereignty (No. XIX). In the Baroda plates (No. XII) Dhrūva is said to have captured the images of Gaṅgā and Yamunā from his enemies, and thereby attained the supreme position of sovereignty. These are doubtless exaggerated statements, for there is no evidence that Dhrūva’s expedition to the north resulted in any considerable extension of the territory of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa empire beyond the Vindhvas. But as a demonstration of the force of the new power that had come up in the Deccan the raid must have been very effective.

24 EC, II, No. 35.
25 JMU, XV, p. 112.
26 EI, XXII, p. 107.
Among the inscriptions of Dhuva’s reign we may note two undated records, one from Naregal,27 mentioning that a certain Mārakka Arasa was ruling Banavāsi 12,000 under Dhora, the other from Pattadakal28 recording gifts by Badipoddū, a dancing girl of the temple of Lōkamahādevi, the modern Virupāksha temple, to that very temple.

Dhuva had many sons; at least four of them are known, Kām'bha, the viceroy of Gāṅgavādi, who was the eldest son, and Karka-Suvārnavarsha, who was ruling in Khándesh as viceroy even in the reign of his uncle Govinda II (No. VII), Govinda, and Indra. Towards the close of his reign Dhuva was struck by the superior ability of Govinda and wanted to abdicate the throne in his favour (No. IX). But Govinda resisted the proposal accepting only the position of yuvarāja with its symbol the kanṭhikā (necklace) out of deference to his father's command. While this action of Govinda is commended in one of his inscriptions (No. IX), other records (Nos. XIV, XV, also Paithan) definitely state that Govinda obtained full sovereignty over the kingdom from his father at a formal coronation. Probably Dhuva made Govinda emperor in his own lifetime; if that was so, his aim of avoiding trouble about succession was not realised.

Dhuva’s death must have occurred some time in 793-94, between the dates of the Daulatabad plates of Saṅkaragāṇa and the Paithan plates of Govinda III.

IV. APOGEE

Govinda III had the titles of Jagattuṣiga (prominent in the world), Prabhūṭavarsha (the abundant rainer), Śrīvallabha (the favourite of Fortune), Janavallabha (favourite of the people), Kirti-Nārāyaṇa (the very Nārāyaṇa in respect of fame), and Tribhuvanadvacala (pure in the three worlds, No. XIX). Dhuva’s choice of Govinda for the succession appears to have caused widespread discontent among Govinda’s brothers and the feudatories and officials of the empire. This discontent did not find open expression during the lifetime of Dhuva, but burst into a flame very soon after his death. Govinda was not unaware of the situation, and did his best to forestall his enemies among whom his elder brother Kām'bha was the chief. Immediately after his coronation Govinda sought to enlist the active support of his sāmantas, confirming them all in their respective places and addressing kind words to them in open council saying that in his mind they took the place of his father. He also released the Gāṅga ruler Śivamāra imprisoned by his father, evidently hoping for support from him in the

27 SI, VI, p. 163.
28 IA, XI, p. 125.
ensuing struggle (No. XIX). But kaṁbha had also been preparing actively and had gone too far to recede. Śivamāra, when he returned to his country, also threw in his lot with Kaṁbha who found several other allies to support him, for Govinda is said to have inflicted a crushing defeat on a confederacy of twelve rulers although he was single-handed, his actions being compared by the poet to that of Sainvartaka, fire outshining the lustre of twelve suns at the destruction of the universe. The identity of these other confederates is by no means clear, though, as Fleet suggested, Kaṭṭiyara, a Chālukya prince who is mentioned in the Didgūr inscription,²⁹ might have been among them. Govinda is said to have used his victory with moderation and to have once more harboured the quondam rebels under his wings as the ocean does the submarine fire (No. XIX). Indra, the brother of Govinda, who was loyal to him throughout the struggle, is said to have advocated moderation to the vanquished foes of Govinda who was inclined to treat them harshly (No. XII). Kaṁbha himself was reinstated as viceroy over Gaṅgavādi as is clear from his Maṇne plates issued in A.D. 802 (No. VIII). The Gaṅga ruler Śivamāra, however, who had abused the favour shown to him, was once more captured and put in prison (Nos. IX, XIX).

After quelling the rebellions in the south, Govinda carried his arms into Northern India. There, according to the Rādhānpur plates (No. IX), the Gurjara fled somewhere out of fear, and the ruler of Mālava readily offered submission to Govinda. The Saṁjan plates (No. XIX) state that Govinda defeated in battle Nāgabhaṭa and Chandragupta, and being only eager for fame, he reinstated them as well as other rulers in their respective kingdoms. The caverns of the Himālayas resounded to the noises made by his horses, elephants and musical instruments, and the kings Dharma and Chakrāyudha offered their submission to him who thus became Kīrti-Nārāyaṇa. Returning from there Govinda again followed the bank of the Narmadā, acquiring the Mālava country along with the Kosala, Kalinga, Veṅgī, Dāhala and the Oḍraka—all of which he began to rule by the agency of his own servants.

Here then is the picture of an extensive and successful campaign in Central and Northern India. These campaigns must have taken place before 803-4, the date of Govinda’s encampment³⁰ on the

²⁹ Et, VI, p. 253. The position of Mārasalba of the undated Gudigere inscription seems to be less certain now (Ibid, p. 257).

³⁰ Walter Elliot plate. IA, XI, p. 126. Ins. No. X omits the reference to the campaign against Gurjara (verse 15 of ins. No. IX) and another verse 19 on the Veṅgī ruler acting as the humble servant of Govinda. It has been inferred from this that the northern campaign took place between A.D. 806 and 808. But one may not be
Tuṅgabhadrā after the northern campaigns. The Gurjara opponent of Govinda was doubtless Nāgabhaṭa II, the son of Vatsarāja. The facts cited above from the Rāṣṭrakūṭa grants find a good commentary in a very significant statement in the Gwalior prāśasti of Bhoja,31 saying that the kings of Andhra, Sindhu, Vidarbha and Kaliṅga fell like moths into the youthful fire of Nāgabhaṭa’s energy. It has been rightly pointed out: 32

‘The force of this simile is preserved if we suppose that the kings of these four countries were not conquered by Nāgabhaṭa but joined him of their own accord in the first instance, although, ultimately they lost their power thereby. The position of these four countries confirms this view. Joined to Mālava and Rājputāna, which were the home territory of the Gurjaras, the four countries form a central belt right across the country bounded on the north by the empire of the Pālas, and on the south by that of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas. It appears quite likely, therefore, that they formed a confederacy against the two great powers that pressed them from the two sides.’

Indra, the loyal brother of Govinda, played a prominent part in the war against the Gurjara ruler, for in the Baroda plates of Karka II, A.D. 812-3 (No. X.II), Indra is said single-handed to have put the lord of the Gurjaras to flight. Whether Indra had become viceroy of Lāṭa before he undertook the campaign against the Gurjara or after, cannot be determined, nor can the identity of the ruler of Mālava who made his submission to the victor be decided.

After inflicting a decisive defeat on Nāgabhaṭa II and on his ally Chandragupta, whose identity is uncertain, the Rāṣṭrakūṭa armies pressed further north into the Ganga-Yamuna Doab and up to the Himālayas. The celebrated Pāla ruler Dharmapāla and his protégé Chakrāyudha, whom he had installed on the throne of Kanauj, thought it prudent to make their submission to the invader, instead of offering him battle and risking defeat; for after all he had done them signal service by crushing the power of their chief enemy Nāgabhaṭa when it was at its height, and he might withdraw into the Déccan when the campaign was over leaving the States of North India to their own devices. These calculations proved to be right in the main.

quite sure of this. The Māṅga plates (No. VIII) give all the Rādhānpur verses. In D R. Bhandarkar Volume, pp. 153 ff, Dr. Altekar postulates two northern and two southern expeditions of Govinda for which there seems to be no warrant in the records themselves. See EI, XXIII, pp. 214-17 and 293-97 for a discussion between Mirashi and Altekar, where, I think, Mirashi has the best of the argument on the chronology of the campaigns, and the date of the Māṅga plates.

32 By R. C. Majumdar, ibid., p. 104.
It seems probable that the Mālava country became part of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa empire, being annexed to the viceroyalty of Lāṭa. In the Baroda plates of Karka (No. XII) there occurs the following significant statement: 'the ruler of Mālava had been subjugated by Karka who then caused his own arm to become the excellent door-bar for the protection of that ruler in the direction of the lord of the Gurjaras who had become insolent by his victory over Gauḍa and Vaiṅga.' The Gurjaras ruler against whom Mālava was protected by Karka was also Nāgabhaṭa II. He seems to have renewed his contest with Dharmapāla after the withdrawal of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa army and gained successes in fights against him and his confederates. But in the direction of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa power, his strength availed him little, and the northern viceroyalty of Lāṭa was holding successfully the extended frontier of the southern empire for some years.

No details are forthcoming regarding the campaigns against Kālīṅga, Dāhala and Oḍraka; Vaiṅga we shall consider presently.

After his return from the Himalayan region, Govinda fixed his camp at the foot of the Vindhya mountains on the banks of the Narmadā. Hearing through his spies of the approach of the victorious monarch, king Mārāśarva who was ruling in the Broach region from his capital Śrībhavana, modern Sarbhon, offered his submission to Govinda, welcomed him into his capital, and laid at his feet the choicest treasures accumulated by his ancestors. Govinda spent the whole of the ensuing rainy season at Śrībhavana and there was born to him a son Mahārāja Sarva, the future Amoghavarsha, and astrologers in Govinda's camp predicted a bright future for the newly born prince.

When he left Śrībhavana, Govinda marched with his army on an expedition to the south to destroy the haughtiness of the Dravida kings, as the Saṅjan plates (No. XIX) put it (v. 30). According to that record Govinda terrified the Kerala, Pāṇḍya and the Chola kings and caused the Pallava to wither ... the Gaṅgas, who became dissatisfied through baseness, were bound down with fetters and met with death', and the lord of Vaiṅga worked as an unpaid servant in the camp of Govinda. We also learn that the king of Lāṅkā and his minister, who

---

33 Inscription No. IX, vv. 17-18, and XIX, vv. 25-28. Altekar (History of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas, p. 68) says that Govinda spent the rainy season of A.D. 808 (date of No. IX) at Sarbhon and that Amoghavarsha was born in that year. These seems to be no support for this statement. The inscriptions are clear that Govinda's campaign against Pallava and his encampment on the bank of the Tuṅgabhadra came after his stay at Śrībhavana, and the Walter Elliot plates issued in the camp on the Tuṅgabhadra are dated S. 726, A.D. 803-4. So the camp at Śrībhavana and the birth of Amoghavarsha must be placed some time before this date. See also EI, XXIII, p. 217.
had been negligent of their own interests, were captured and brought over as prisoners to Hēlāpura and that two statues of the lord of Lāṅkā, which were received at Kāṅchī, were thence carried over to Māṇyakheṭa where they were installed like pillars of victory in front of a Śiva temple (No. XIX, v. 34).

We get no details from any other source regarding the action taken by Govinda against Gaṅgas, Kēla, Pāṇḍyas, Chōla and Lāṅkā. We may note in passing that the reference to two statues of the lord of Lāṅkā adorning the portals of a Śiva temple in the Rāṣṭrakūṭa capital is very interesting. It seems to imply that one way of proclaiming the subordination of feudatory rulers was to install their portrait images as dvarapālakas in temples in the capital city of a suzerain.

The inscription of A.D. 803-4 states distinctly that Govinda won a victory against Danti, the ruler of Kāṅchī, and levied tribute from him before he went and established his camp in the Rāmesvara tīrtha on the Tungabhadrā. As we have seen, it was during his stay at Kāṅchī that Govinda received the statues of the ruler of Lāṅkā. Govinda’s southern campaign appears to have been no more than a digvijaya, the conventional assertion of superior power by a triumphant march across the territory of the neighbouring rulers demanding tokens of their submission.

Of the ruler of Veṅgi the inscriptions of Govinda III say that he was ever ready to carry out with alacrity the behests of his suzerain. The statement that he helped to build the surrounding wall of his camp has sometimes been understood to refer to the fortification of Māṇyakheṭa. The contemporaries of Govinda III at Veṅgi were Viṣṇu-varṇadhana IV and Viṭhāyaḍitya II. Viṭhāyaḍitya II resented the hold of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas over Veṅgi, while on their side they treated him as a rebel and found a convenient tool in his half-brother Bhīma Saluki whom they set up as his rival. Viṭhāyaḍitya was a great fighter and had the title nareṇḍra-mṛigarāja (lion among kings). But so long as Govinda III was alive and commanded the aid of his vassals like the Western Gaṅgas and the Chālukyas of Vemulavāda, things went badly for Viṭhāyaḍitya, and Bhīma Saluki found it possible to rule with some pretence to power in parts of the Veṅgi kingdom. A verse in the inscriptions of Amoghavarsha I and Kṛṣṇa II sums up the achievements of Govinda saying: ‘Having fettered the people of Kēla, Mālava and Gauḍa together with Gūjaras dwelling in the hill fort of Chitrakūṭa and then the lords of Kāṅchī, he became Kṛtinārāyaṇa’ (Nos. XVII, XVIII).

Among the feudatories of Govinda mentioned in the inscriptions of the reign we may mention Yeṉayamma and Madanāga Arasa, both
ruling Banaväsi; and a Nolamba Pallava Chāruponnera ruling in Nolambavādi. Govinda’s chief queen (Mahādevi) was Gāmundabbegal. The king performed a gosahasra-dāna at Belvole (Gadag district). The last known date for Govinda is that of the Torkhede plates, S. 735, A.D. 812-3 (No. XI). He must be taken to have died soon after, say A.D. 814.

Govinda III was beyond doubt one of the greatest of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa monarchs. He spread the fame of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa empire literally from the Himālayas to Cape Comorin. He more than justified his father’s choice of him as most fitted to rule the empire, and showed his great capacity both in diplomacy and on the battlefield. Well might his court-poet claim for him the distinction that after his birth the Rāṣṭrakūṭas became as unassailable as the Yādavas after the birth of Śrī Kṛiṣṇa.

Govinda III was followed on the throne by his only son Mahārāja Sarva, better known as Amoghavarsha I (fruitful rainier). His Sirur inscription (No. XVIII) couples his fifty-second regnal year with A.D. 866; thus the date of his accession was A.D. 814. He had the titles Nṛpatuniga (exalted among kings), Atiśayadhavala (wonderfully white in conduct), Mahārāja-shaṇḍa (best of the great kings), and Vīra-Nārāyaṇa (the heroic Nārāyaṇa). Amoghavarsha must have been a lad of about fifteen years when he was called to the throne, and troubles seem to have fallen thick upon the boy-king. In four verses his Sañjan plates (No. XIX, vv. 38-41) give a turgid account of the revolts of feudatories and officials and relations (sāmantas, sachivas, bāndhavas) and the consequent anarchy which threatened to disrupt the empire early in his reign. They state also that Amoghavarsha owed his reinstatement in power to Ārya Pātālamalla. Now Pātālamalla appears to have been a title of Karka I of the Lāta family of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas, the son of Indrarāja, the loyal younger brother of Govinda III and founder of that branch. Karka is said to have installed Amoghavarsha on his throne after conquering with his sword the arrogant and insolent customs officials (śaukkikas) and district officers (rāṣṭrakūṭas) who had taken hold of what territories they could, and formed a close alliance among themselves.

Great must have been the danger through which Amoghavarsha

34 EC, VIII, sb. 1 and 9.
35 EC, XI, Cl. 33-34. 7
36 BK, 148 of 1926-27.
37 BG, I, pt. i, p. 124.
38 Verse 39 of ins. No. XIV is the same as verse 10 of No. XVI. The verse occurs in other records also. I accept the reading of the Surat plate (No. XIV) as the most authoritative, and interpret the verse somewhat differently from my predecessors.
passed. The Sañjan plates (No. XIX) employ a significant simile and state that when the sun set, the moon and the stars began to shine out in the sky; Amoghavarsha was evidently dethroned for a time and the rebels had it all their own way. Prominent among them must have been Vijayāditya II of Veṅgi, and perhaps also the Gaṅga ruler in the south. It is not clear if the rāṣṭrakūṭas whom Karka had to subdue before restoring Amoghavarsha to the throne were members of collateral branches of the royal family or the several officials of the empire bearing that designation, more likely the latter. Of Vijayāditya II of Veṅgi the records of his successors state that he fought 108 battles against the Gaṅgas and Raṭṭas incessantly night and day for 12 years with sword in hand, and that he erected the same number of Śiva temples called Narendrēśvaras after his title Narendramṛgārāja. This sounds much like a legend, and the number 108 is conventional; but some of these temples are mentioned in later Eastern Chāluṭkya inscriptions. The 12 years might well have been the duration of the rival rule of Bhīma Saluki. In any case, there can be little doubt that for a time Vijayāditya gained the upper hand, deposed Bhīma Saluki, and after making himself master of the whole of the Veṅgi kingdom overran considerable parts of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa empire.39

The combined exertions of Amoghavarsha and his cousin Karka proved equal to the occasion. Amoghavarsha is said to have surrounded and burnt the number of disaffected kings who were like thorns to the kingdom.40 He was once more firmly seated on his throne by a.d. 821, the date of the Surat plates of Karka (No. XIV). As Karka’s part in the suppression of anarchy and the restoration of Amoghavarsha does not find a place in his Nausari plates (No. XIII) of a.d. 816 we may assume that the peak of the rebellion and its suppression fell between the years a.d. 816 and 821.

But at no time during his long reign of 64 years did the empire of Amoghavarsha really enjoy peace in all its parts. Rebellions of feudatories and wars waged against them to bring them back to obedience occurred repeatedly. The chronology of these wars is far from certain as the data regarding some of them at least come to us piecemeal from inscriptions dated several years after the close of Amoghavarsha’s reign. One thing is certain, that the war with the Eastern Chāluṭkya began again somewhere about a.d. 850. Peace was maintained in that quarter during the rest of the reign of Vijayāditya II which lasted till a.d. 847, as also during the very short reign of less than two years of his son and successor Kali Vishṇu-vardhana V.

40 Kapadavanj plates, E1, I, p. 85, v. 9.
The next ruler, the son of Vishnuvardhana V, was Guṇaga Vijayāditya, one of the ablest sovereigns of the Eastern Chālukya line. Although connected with the Rāśṭrakūṭas through his mother Silamahādevi, perhaps daughter of Indra, the founder of the Lāṣa line, Guṇaga Vijayāditya made up his mind to free the Veṅgī kingdom from the yoke of Amoghavarsha. He seems to have begun his campaign by an attack upon Staṁbhapuri, modern Kambham (Cumbum) in the Kurnool (Karnāl) district, which was then included in the Rāśṭrakūṭa dominions. Amoghavarsha naturally retaliated and dispatched an army to reduce Guṇaga Vijayāditya to submission. A decisive engagement took place at Viṅgāvalli, which must be sought near Kambham. In this sanguinary battle, Amoghavarsha in his anger is said to have pleased the God of Death by offering him rare sweets in the form of the Chālukyan forces (Nos. XXII, XXIII). Elsewhere Amoghavarsha is said to have raised up the prosperity of the Raṭṭa kingdom sunk in the ocean of the Chālukyas and to have uprooted and fired the inimical Chālukyas as if they were pulses (peas) (No. XXI). It may be doubted, however, if this last reference is to the campaigns against Guṇaga Vijayāditya or the earlier war against his grandfather Vijayāditya II. However that may be, Viṅgāvalli was a decisive battle, and Guṇaga Vijayāditya had to submit to Amoghavarsha and acknowledge him as his suzerain.

About the same time Amoghavarsha had to deal with a formidable rebellion in the Gaṅga country, and very soon after with another rebellion in the northern part of the empire. The facts of the Gaṅga rebellion are set forth in considerable detail in the Kunnār inscription of A.D. 860.41 This inscription records the achievements of a favourite general of Amoghavarsha called Bāṅkeśa Sallaketana as narrated by the king himself. By the king’s favour Bāṅkeśa had been set to rule over a territory comprising 30,000 villages, Banavāsi being the seat of his rule. At the king’s desire Bāṅkeśa strove hard to suppress the adversaries of the monarch and in particular to stamp out rebellion in Gaṅgavādi. On that occasion although many fellow-feudatories had deserted and joined the rebellion, Bāṅkeśa fought for his master aided solely by the daring which sprang from his anger. He destroyed the enemy Nitimārga, brought Raṅavikrama to the path of loyalty, and thus made the anger in his master’s heart not barren.42

41 EI. VI, pp. 25 ff. This inscription is now seen to be a thoroughly genuine document. Kielhorn had doubted its authenticity on insufficient grounds. See EI, XVIII, pp. 236-37.
42 Kielhorn missed the play in the verse on the titles Nitimārga and Raṅavikrama of the Gaṅga ruler Yerraya who headed the rebellion: dhvastaripu-netimārga raṅa-
easily captured the impregnable fortress of Kedāla, defeated Raṇa-vikrama, the ruler of Talavānapura, crossed the river Kāvērī, and laid waste much of the enemy country.

It is clear that in this war the chief enemy of the Rāṣṭrapūta power was the Gaṅga ruler Yerṣaya, also known as Niṭimārga and Raṇa-vikrama, whose reign extended from about a.d. 837 to 870. Many other feudatories of the empire had also joined the Gaṅga ruler and Baṅkeśa had a difficult task before him. He was proving himself equal to it, and would have completed it had not Amoghavarsha recalled him hastily to assist him in overcoming troubles nearer home. The Konnūr inscription continues that when through internal dissensions a disturbance had arisen near the emperor, at his mere word that Baṅkeśa should return, he went and joined him in a few days. He vowed that he would subdue the enemies and ‘make his master drink milk’ within three months. The rebellion was serious and somehow the crown prince Kṛishṇa II was involved in it. But he was sent away from the rebel camp before Baṅkeśa forced a battle on the other confederates, either slaying or taking prisoner most of them, and thus fulfilled his promise to his master.

We do not get the details of this rebellion nearer home from any other source. It seems probable that the Lāṭa branch was also involved in the revolt besides the crown prince Kṛishṇa II. The Bagumra43 plates of a.d. 867 say of Dhruva, the son and successor of Karkarāja, that he fell in battle with the Vallabha forces. It would thus seem that the friendly relations that prevailed between Amoghavarsha and the Lāṭa branch under Karka at the beginning of the reign underwent a change under his son Dhruva I. In his Baroda plates (No. XVI) of a.d. 835 there is nothing to indicate hostility between Amoghavarsha and his Lāṭa feudatory, and the war, which began some time after that date and led to the death of Dhruva I on the field, continued under his son Akālavarsha who claims to have recovered his ancestral kingdom after freeing it from the occupation of the Vallabha forces.44 The war continued also under his son Dhruva II who claims that he had to fight on two fronts against the Gurjaras on the north and the Vallabha in the south.45 Dhruva was assisted in these wars by his younger brother Govindaṛa,46 though another younger brother and some other kinsmen had turned hostile

vikramaṁ ekabuddhim abhiniya. With less excuse all others who have followed him have failed to notice it also.

43 IA, XXII, pp. 183-84, v. 32.
44 IA, XII, p. 184, v. 34.
46 Ibid., vv. 58-59.
to him. The Gurjara enemy against whom Dhruva fought was Mihira Bhoja whose name appears in the inscription.\textsuperscript{47} Dhruva II would appear ultimately to have made his peace with Amoghavarsha some time about A.D. 860 in order the better to be able to meet the domestic crisis and the invasion of the Gurjara ruler Mihira Bhoja. We find him securely seated on his throne after victories in A.D. 867.

To return to Amoghavarsha’s relations with Gaṅgas and Veṅgī. By the time Bañkeśa was ordered to go to the emperor’s side to encounter the rebels in the north, the battle of Veṅgāvallī had been fought, and Gunāga Vijayāditya had made his submission and acknowledged the supremacy of Amoghavarsha. He retained the dependent status to the end of Amoghavarsha’s reign, and served him during the period as a loyal feudatory against those who made trouble against their suzerain; and when Bañkeśa went away from the Gaṅga country, Vijayāditya took his place with his army. The Gaṅga king Nītimārga had found an ally in the Nolamba ruler, called Maṅgi,\textsuperscript{48} whose territory lay on the route of Vijayāditya to Gaṅgavādi. A fierce engagement took place between the Eastern Chālukya troops and those of the Nolamba ruler, when Vijayāditya marched into Nolambavādi. The Chālukyas gained a complete victory, thanks to the advice of Vinayādi Sarman, the military adviser of Vijayāditya, who directed the course of the battle. Maṅgi was slain, and the road to Gaṅgavādi lay open for Vijayāditya. The Gaṅga army was beaten in its turn and compelled to take refuge on the lofty summit of the Gaṅgakūta, that is, the Śivagaṅga hill in the Nelamaṅgala taluk of the present Bangalore district in Mvsore.\textsuperscript{49} The back of the Gaṅga rebellion was broken, and Nītimārga Permāṇaḍi was obliged to make peace with Amoghavarsha. The peace seems to have been sealed by a dynastic alliance, Nītimārga’s son Būtuga I marrying Abhalabbe, the daughter of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa emperor.\textsuperscript{50}

The Sirur inscription of A.D. 856 (No. XVIII) states that the rulers of Vaṅga, Aṅga, Magadha, Mālava and Veṅgī worshipped Amoghavarsha. The reference to Veṅgī and Mālava is intelligible. But it is not easy to explain the mention of Vaṅga, Aṅga and Magadha. In fact Amoghavarsha was too fully occupied with wars and rebellions nearer home for him to think of meddling in the politics of Northern Indian states. Even the Gurjara Pratihāra ruler Mihira Bhoja was, as we have seen, left by him to be dealt with by his cousins ruling

\textsuperscript{47} Ibid., v. 41.
\textsuperscript{48} EI, V, p. 125.
\textsuperscript{49} EI, IX, p. 51, v. 3.
\textsuperscript{50} Sudi plates; also EC, XII, Nanjangud 289, giving the name of the princess as Chandrobalabbe.
in the Lāṭa country. The only direct contact with Northern India in the reign was that arising from the crown prince Krishna II marrying a Chedi princess, daughter of Kokkala I (No. XXVIII).

Moreover by temperament Amoghavarsha liked the pursuit of religion and literature much better than that of war. A verse in the Sañjan plates (No. XIX, v. 48) states that out of a disregard for worldly effects, Amoghavarsha had abdicated his throne more than once before the date of those plates (A.D. 871). He is counted by the Jainas among the most prominent followers of their faith, and a small Jaina catechism entitled Praśnottara Ratnamālikā contains a verse stating that it was composed by king Amoghavarsha after he had given up the kingdom in consequence of the growth of the ascetic spirit (viveka) in him.\(^{51}\) It seems probable that Amogavarsha occasionally took leave of his royal duties to spend his time in the company of Jain monks and other forms of religions meditation. It is probable that on such occasions the affairs of State were looked after by his only son, who afterwards succeeded him as Krishna II.

It may be doubted, however, if Amoghavarsha became a Jaina in the full sense of the term and abandoned the Brahmanical religion. A verse in the Sañjan plates (No. XIX, v. 47) refers to the sacrifice of his finger by the king to Mahālakṣmī in order to free the world from an impending calamity, and compares this act to the similar acts of the son of Jīmītakotu, of Sibi and Dadhichi, a comparison which is repeated in stronger terms in the Karnāṭaka Sābdānuśāsana of Bhaṭṭakalāṇika.\(^{52}\) The emperor also performed at tulāpurushadāna on the occasion of a solar eclipse in A.D. 862.\(^{53}\)

Amoghavarsha was himself an author. He was also a patron of authors. The Kacirājamārga, the earliest work on poetics in the Kannāḍa language, was either written or inspired by him. It now passes as the work of Nṛpatuniga, a title of Amoghavarsha. Jinasena, the author of Ādipurāṇa, was among the Jaina preceptors of Amoghavarsha; this becomes clear from a verse in the Ādipurāṇa itself, and another at the end of Pārśvābhyaudaya of the same writer giving expression to a wish that Amoghavarsha may reign for a long time.\(^{54}\) Amoghavarsha is celebrated in the inscriptions as the maker of Mānvakheṭa. He is said to have built the city so as to excel the city of Indra and thus curb the pride of the gods (Nos. XXIV, XXV, XXVI). Elsewhere he is said to have built an excellent palace full of fine workmanship including an extensive apartment for royal women and a beautiful

51 IA, XII, p. 218; XIX, pp. 378 ff; BG, I, pt. ii, pp. 200-1 and 203.
52 IA, 1904, p. 197.
53 SI, XI (i), No. 9.
tanks, all in the city of Mānyakheṭa (XXVIII). It is clear that Amoghavarsha must have been a great builder also.

A daughter of Amoghavarsha, Saṅkhā by name, became the chief queen of the Pallava ruler Nandi-varman III (c. 830-54) of Kāñchī, and bore him a son called Nripatuniga, after his maternal grandfather (Bāhūr plates). From inscriptions we get the names of the following important officials and feudatories in addition to those already named in the course of our narrative of the reign. A certain Kuppeya of the Yādavavaiśa is found ruling Purigere between A.D. 864 and 867;55 Devanayya in Belvole in the years A.D. 866-72;56 lastly, the Silāhāra ruler Phullaśakti and his son Kapardin II ruling northern Koṅkan from their capital at Purī, modern Elephanta. Three inscriptions57 are left by these monarchs at Kaṅheri. All of them are clearly dated in the reign of Amoghavarsha, and one bears the date S. 799, A.D. 877-8, the last recorded date so far known for Amoghavarsha.

V. CRISIS

The death of Amoghavarsha was followed by the definitive accession of his son Krīṣṇa II to the Rāṣṭrakūṭa throne, and it must have occurred about A.D. 880. Krīṣṇa had the titles Akālavarsa and Subhatauniga, and his name occurs in the inscriptions sometimes in the Prākrit from Kannara. As has already been noted, he was the son-in-law of Kokkala I, the Chedi ruler. The name of the Chedi queen of Krīṣṇa does not occur anywhere in the inscriptions.

In a verse which is repeated in a number of inscriptions (Nos. XXI, XXIV, XXV, XXVI) Krīṣṇa is represented as having frightened the Gurjara, humbled the pride of the Lāṭa, taught humility to the Gaudaś, and deprived the people on the sea-coast (sāmudra) of their repose, besides being worshipped by the Andhra, Kalūga and Magadha rulers standing at his gates. Though this looks like conventional praise which may not be accepted as history, parts of the account receive confirmation from other sources. That Krīṣṇa fought a war with the Gurjara ruler Bhoja I is clear from a fragmentary Pratihāra inscription58 which mentions Bhoja's attack on a king called Krīṣṇa Rāja, and refers to the Narmadā in this connection. Again the Nausari plates of A.D. 914 (No. XXI) state that at the date of that charter old men described the thundering fights of Krīṣṇa with the Gurjara. Lastly, the Bagumra plates of Krīṣṇa of the Lāṭa branch, dated A.D. 888 (No. XX), state
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that that prince spread his fame widely by conquering at Ujjayini, with his sword, before the very eyes of king Vallabha, the enemy of that monarch. We have seen that after a long period of hostility, peace had been established between the imperial line and that of Lāṭa in the reign of Amoghavarsha. Lāṭa had generally acted in the defence of the empire, particularly for the protection of Mālava. The ambitious Gurjara ruler Bhoja must have sought to aggrandize himself soon after the accession of Krishṇa, and invaded Mālava and Lāṭa. Krishṇa was lucky in having the co-operation of his Lāṭa feudatory and was successful in repelling the invader. But these friendly relations between the emperor and his Lāṭa feudatory must have come to an end soon after, for we find that by the date of the Kapadvanj grant, A.D. 910, Lāṭa had come to be ruled directly by Krishṇa himself, assisted by a new feudatory house, the family of Brahmavaka represented by Prachanda at that date. The resumption of Lāṭa by the emperor is clearly recorded in a verse (Nos. XXII, XXIII) which states that out of fear for the valour of Krishṇa, the whole of the Khetaka-manḍala was abandoned by those who were unfriendly to him.

Krishṇa's relations with Veṇī were marked by many vicissitudes. It is probable that Krishṇa's unfilial conduct towards his father during his lifetime had rendered him somewhat unpopular among his feudatories, and Gunaga Vijayāditya of Veṇī knew this and took full advantage of the situation. In any event Vijayāditya made an effort to repudiate Rāṣṭrakūṭa supremacy soon after Amoghavarsha's death, and Krishṇa's attempt to reduce him to subjection ended disastrously. Krishṇa had to seek the aid of his father-in-law, Kokkala, and brother-in-law, Saṅkila. In fact he was forced for a time to seek refuge in flight to the Chedi court. The details of the course of events have, however, to be gathered from a number of Eastern Chālukya inscriptions, particularly those which record the achievements of Panaṅga, the talented general who led the forces of Gunaga Vijayāditya. Krishṇa II, together with his ally and brother-in-law Saṅkila, made an attack upon Vijayāditya who had declared independence. The battle ended in a defeat for the allies, and Krishṇa had to leave his country and seek safety in the court of his ally at Kiranapura in the Chedi country. Encouraged by his success Vijayāditya planned an expedition against the Chedi country (Dāhala) and despatched it under the command of Paṇḍaraṅga. That general took the route through Kaliṅga towards the passes in the Eastern Chats leading to Southern Kosala and the Central Indian plateau. The kings of Kaliṅga and Kosala and


the Chālukya chief of Vēmulavāda—all friends of the Rāṣṭhrakūṭas and Chedis, attempted to oppose Pāndaraṅga’s advance, but in vain. Pāndaraṅga succeeded in reaching the Chedi country, devastated Dāhala, defeated Krishṇa and Saṅkila in battle, and set fire to Kīraṇapura and Achalapura (modern Kiranpur and Elichpur), two considerable towns in the Chedi kingdom. Vijayāditya’s victory was complete, and Krishṇa, unable to offer further resistance, sued for peace. Vijayāditya, content with the measure of success he had achieved against his quondam suzerain, satisfied himself with accepting Krishṇa’s submission. He took over from the vanquished monarch the pālidhvajā and the symbols of the rivers Gaṅgā and Yamunā, and assuming the title Vallabha, he proclaimed himself Lord Paramount of the entire Dākshināpatha together with the Trikaliṅga country. Krishṇa met him in person, propitiated him by offering worship to his arms, and was reinstated in the capital, Mānyakhetā.

But this was an untenable situation, and the mighty Balhara, as the Arab travellers describe the Rāṣṭhrakūṭa monarch, was bound to reassert himself. The death of Vijayāditya III in a.d. 892 was the signal for the attempt. The new ruler of Veṅgi was Chālukya-Bhīma I, a nephew of Vijayāditya III. Krishṇa invaded Veṅgi in strong force even before Bhīma could celebrate his coronation. The Rāṣṭhrakūṭas carried everything before them at first, defeated the Eastern Chālukya army, and occupied the greater part of the kingdom of Veṅgi. Krishṇa was ably assisted by Bāddega, the Chālukya chieftain of Vēmulavāda, who took Chālukya-Bhīma himself prisoner in a battle fought in the heart of the Veṅgi kingdom. But the Rāṣṭhrakūṭa success was not permanent. Chālukya-Bhīma I soon regained his freedom though it is not known, how; he was ably assisted by his sāmantas and hereditary servants who rallied under the leadership of Kusumāyudha of the Mudigonda branch of the Chālukyas. These allies of Chālukya-Bhīma succeeded in clearing the country of the Rāṣṭhrakūṭa forces, enabling Chālukya-Bhīma to celebrate his coronation in peace on 14 April, a.d. 892. Some years later Krishna II made another attempt to sujugate Veṅgi. He sent an expedition under his intrepid general Gundaṅya, comprising forces from Karnāta and Lāta. The expedition succeeded in penetrating the kingdom of Veṅgi, but was defeated in two battles, one at Niravadyapura, modern Nidadavol, and the other at Peruvāṅguru-grāma, modern Pedavaṅguru. In the second battle Gundaṅya lost his life and the Rāṣṭhrakūṭa forces were scattered. But Irimitigandha, the brave son of Chālukya-Bhīma, who had led the Chālukyan forces to battle, also fell in the fight.
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Krishṇa appears to have entered into matrimonial relationship with the rising power of the Cholas in the Tamil country. A Chola inscription, which may be assigned to the last regnal year of Aditya I, mentions a daughter or Vallava-arayar as the queen of the Chola monarch, and another inscription mentions a son of Aditya, Kannaradeva by name. It is clear that the Chola queen must have been a daughter of the Rāshṭrakūṭa Krishṇa II. Trouble arose as a result of this marriage between the Cholas and the Rāshṭrakūṭas when, at the death of Aditya I Parântaka ascended the Chola throne and prince Kannara was kept out of it. Krishṇa espoused the cause of his grandson, and invaded the Chola territory with the assistance of the Bānas, early in the reign of Parântaka I. Parântaka was aided by the Gaṅga ruler Prithivīpati II. The Sholingar rock inscription of the ninth year of Parântaka, 916, mentions that the Gaṅga Prithivīpati II distinguished himself in a battle at Vallāla and got the title Bāṇādhirája from Parântaka. The Udayendirām plates of Prithivīpati II state that Parântaka uprooted two Bāna kings and conquered the Vaidumbas. Lastly, the Kanyakumārī inscription of Viraraṇendra states that Parântaka earned for himself the title Virachola by his victory over the invincible Krishnaraṇa. Taking all this evidence together we may conclude that there was a Rāshṭrakūṭa invasion of the Chola country in which the Bānas and perhaps the Vaidumbas also took the part of their suzerain Krishṇa II, that the invasion was resisted by Parântaka I and his Gaṅga ally Prithivīpati II and that the decisive engagement in the war took place at Vallāla, modern Tiruvallam in the North Arcot district. The result was a disaster for the Rāshṭrakūṭa and his allies. The defeat in the battle was followed by the termination of Bāna rule and the annexation of their territory of the Chola empire under the rulership of Prithivīpati II who became a feudal of the Chola monarch (c. 910). The Vaidumbas seem also to have suffered for the support they gave to Krishṇa II.

The military record of the reign of Krishṇa II was thus by no means brilliant. The only success of the reign was the termination of the Lāṭa viceroyalty, an achievement of doubtful wisdom. The slight success against Prathihāra Bhoja was due largely to the credit of the
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Lāṭa viceroy. The wars Kṛishṇa undertook against Veūgī and the Cholas got him on the whole nothing but disaster and disgrace.

The inscriptions of the reign disclose the rule of a son of Baṅkēśa called Lokaṭeyarsa who governed in A.D. 902 a large tract of country comprising 31,102 (mistake for 30,102?) villages made up of Banavāsi 12,000, Palāsīge 12,000, Mānyakheṭa 6,000, Kolanū 30, Lokaṭupura 12 and Toregare 60. His correct name was Lokādīṭya and he ruled over the Banavāsi province for some years before the date above mentioned. He was the patron of the Jaina writer Guṇabhadra who says that he finished his Uttarapurāṇa in the Piṅgala Samvatsara (S. 820, A.D. 897) when Lokādīṭya of Chellaketana family, feudatory of Kṛishṇa II, was ruling from Baṅkēpura, modern Bankapur in the Dharwar district. Lokādīṭya appears to have had some minor conflicts with the Gaṅgas. But, speaking generally, the Gaṅga country continued to occupy a feudatory position in the empire under Kṛishṇa. A certain Vinayāmbudhi was ruling Belvōla in A.D. 902.

Kṛishṇa II had a son known to us only by his title Jagattuṅga. He married two Chedi princesses, both daughters of Saṅkaragāna Ranavīgrahā, a son of Kokkala I. He had a son by each of them, Indra III by Lakṣmī, and Amoghavarsha III by Govindāmbā, her sister. Jagattuṅga is said to have been led to heaven by fate before he obtained the kingdom as if at the particular request of the heavenly damsels (No. XXIV. One wonders if this is a covert reference to Jagattuṅga having lost his life in a battle-field.

VI. RECOVERY

The latest date for Kṛishṇa II is 912 and the earliest for Indra, the son of Jagattuṅga and successor of Kṛishṇa, is the date of his Nausari (Bagumra) grant (No. XXI) corresponding to 24 February A.D. 915, the day on which he is said to have gone to a place called Kurundaka, probably modern Kurundwad in 'Kolhapur state', for his coronation. Indra’s accession may therefore be placed early in A.D. 915. Indra had the titles Nityavarsha (constant rainēr), Raṭṭakandarpā (Eros among the Rāṭṭas), Kīrī-Ṭāṇāyaṇa and Rājaṃārtaṇḍa (Sun among kings). His queen was Bijāmbā, daughter of the Chedi prince Ammanadeva, grandson of Kokkala I (No. XXIII). A verse in the
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Nausari (really Bagumra)\(^{75}\) plates says that Indrarāja, who had lightly uprooted Meru, felt no elation at his conquest of Upendra who had lifted Govardhana. This clever conceit of the poet undoubtedly refers to events that most probably took place before the accession of Indra to the throne. The reference to Indra uprooting Meru is not easy to explain. Kielhorn suggested\(^{76}\) that Meru may be Kanauj. But we do not know of any occasion after the war of Krishṇa II with Mihira Bhoja when the Rāṣṭrakūṭas and the Gurjaras came into conflict. That war was fought before A.D. 888, and one may doubt if Indra III was then old enough to take part in it. The chances are that Meru was a Bāna prince of the south, most probably Vikramāditya I, Jayameru.\(^{77}\) Fortunately, there is no uncertainty about the identity of Upendra. He is beyond doubt the founder of the Paramāra line of Mālava. The Harasola grants, the earliest records of the Paramāras, show that they were the feudatories of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas, and the genealogy of the Paramāras found in these grants is certainly to be preferred to the longer pedigree of the later records which duplicate the first three generations.\(^{78}\) It seems probable that in the closing years of the reign of Krishṇa II, when he was engaged in the wars with the Chola Parāntaka, Upendra Paramāra who was establishing his power in Mālava, invaded the Rāṣṭrakūṭa dominions from the north and reached as far as Govardhana in the Nasik district. Indra III, who was then yuvrāja, met the invader, defeated him, and compelled him to acknowledge the suzerainty of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa power. The empire thus continued undiminished in the north, Lāṭa being once more incorporated in it and Mālava being held by a feudatory line.\(^{79}\)

Soon after he came to the throne Indra undertook an invasion of Northern India. This is prominently mentioned in the inscriptions. The Cambay plates (No. XXII) state that the precincts of Kālapriya (Kalpi)\(^{79a}\) were made uneven by the strokes of the tusks of the rutting elephants of Indra, that his horses crossed the Jumna resembling the ocean in its depths, and that after his expedition the enemy city of Mahōvana (great prosperity) was totally destroyed and came to be known to people as Kuśasthali (meadow), a clever play upon the well-known names of Kanauj, the Gurjara-Pratihārā capital.

The enemy against whom Indra fought was Mahipāla I (A.D. 913-43). Mahipāla had come to the throne after a war with his half-
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brother Bhoja II who had received support from the Chedi king Kokkala. The Rāṣṭrakūṭas had close ties with the Chedis and Mahipāla's enmity with the Chedis must have been the main cause of Indra's invasion. Indra was assisted in this expedition by Narasimha II, the Chālukya feudatory of Vēmulavāḍa, perhaps also the husband of his sister Jakkavve. The achievements of Narasimha II are detailed at some length by Pampa in the introduction to his Vikramārjunavijaya (vv. 31-38). Pampa mentions the Lātaś among the enemies of Narasimha and states that he burned and ravaged the seven Mālavas, defeated the Gurjararājā in battle, and seized his elephants. Narasimha descended on Mahipāla like a thunderbolt, says the poet, adding a picturesque description of Mahipāla's flight without food or rest. Narasimha then bathed his horses in the waters of the Ganges and finally came and camped in Kālapriya. It is clear that Mahipāla suffered a great disaster, lost his kingdom for a time, and had to seek refuge in flight. He appears to have regained his kingdom a little later with the aid of the Chandella ruler Harshadeva. The exact date of the invasion cannot be determined, but it may be placed between A.D. 915 and 920. The advance of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa forces through Lāta and Mālava right up to Kalpi and Kanauj and the dethronement of Mahipāla were no doubt great military achievements of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa ruler.

Indra III wanted to bring Vēṅģi under his control and with this object he gave support to some relatives and feudatories of the Eastern Chālukya king Amma I, and created serious trouble for him. But Amma was a brave prince and, with the help of a few officers who remained faithful to him, he was able to stand up to his enemies, establish himself firmly on the throne, and rule the kingdom for seven years till A.D. 929. Indra's reign came to a close towards the end of A.D. 927 and not in 918 or 919 as was believed till recently.

Indra was followed on the throne by his son Amoghavarsha II. He had a short reign of one year according to the Bhadana grant of Silāhāra Aparājīta (A.D. 997). Rāṣṭrakūṭa grants (Nos. XXIV, XXV, XXVI) state that Amoghavarsha followed his father quickly to heaven, as if to evince his filial love. All circumstances point to some foul play on the part of his younger brother, the ambitious Govinda IV. The
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earliest date for Govinda occurs in an inscription from Daṇḍapūr dated a.d. 918-919. The inscription does not give him any imperial titles but calls him Prabhūtavarsha, and in Govinda’s own Cambay plates (No. XXII) there is a tell-tale verse (v. 22) in which he affirms that he did not practise cruelty to his elder brother though it lay in his power to do so, that he did not attract ill-fame to himself by living with the wives of his relatives and other evil ways, and that he did not turn himself into a demon (piśācha) by being indifferent to the distinction between purity and impurity. Lastly, Govinda ignores Amoghavarsha’s rule in his inscriptions and describes himself as meditating on the feet of Nityavarsha-Indra III and not his immediate predecessor. There is no mention of Amoghavarsha at all in the Sangli (No. XXIII) plates. These facts are enough to show that there was no love lost between the two brothers from the beginning; though the younger son, Govinda, was the more ambitious of the two brothers and managed fairly early to get a hand in the administration of the kingdom; the throne went to the elder son by right on the death of Indra III, and possibly with his approval; but this was more than the impatient Govinda could bear. It is very likely that he intrigued in some way to shorten the reign and the life of his elder brother.

Govinda achieved the object of his ambition early in a.d. 930, and the Cambay (No. XXII) plates issued by him on 10 May of that year show the great pomp with which he celebrated his coronation soon after. They state that on that day the king had come from his capital Mānyakhetā to the village Kapithaka near the bank of the Godāvari, performed the tulāpurusha ceremony on the occasion of his coronation and made magnificent gifts to Brāhmanas and temples, six hundred agrahāras and 3,00,000 sucarṇas to the former, and 800 villages, 4,00,000 suvarṇas and 32,00,000 dranmas to the latter. Well did Govinda deserve his titles Suvarnavarsha (rainer of gold) and Prabhūtavarsha (abundant rainer). He had also the titles Chānakyachaturmukha, Vikrānta Nārāyaṇa and Nripati Trinetra. In beauty of person he is said to have excelled the god of love and borne the title Nityakandarpa on that account. The popular form of his name was Gojjiga which occurs in Kalas inscriptions and elsewhere. That inscription mentions the grant of a town in sarvanamasya tenure to the Brahmin Daṇḍanāyakas, Revadāsa Dikshita and Visottara Dikshita, but says nothing of how they earned the gift. We hear little of Govinda’s achievements on the field, and the statement in his grants that Gaṅgā and Yamunā were serving in his noble palace does not seem
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to contain any history. It occurs in the midst of empty praise of Govinda in several verses in the Cambay (No. XXII) and the Sangli (XXIII) plates.

In later Rāshṭrakūṭa grants (Nos. XXIV, XXV, XXVI) Govinda is said to have succumbed to the snare of women, led a dissolute life, alienated all the elements in the State, and ultimately lost his kingdom. By a clever double entendre the verse also hints that the king lost his health and the natural beauty of his person and contracted consumption. This is confirmed by the Kharepatan grant of Śilāhāra Raṭṭarāja (A.D. 1008) saying that Govinda was the abode of the sentiment of love, and always surrounded by a group of dancing women.

After the death of Amma there was confusion in Veīgī again as his son Bēta Vijayāditya V, a mere lad, was ousted from his throne within a fortnight of his accession. This was the act of Tāla I, son of Yuddhamalla I. Tāla must have owed his success, to some extent, to Rāshṭrakūṭa's help. In his turn he was overthrown within a month by Vikramāditya II, uncle of Amma I. Vikramāditya came to a violent end in less than a year at the hands of Bhīma II, one of the sons of Amma I. These dissensions in the elder branch of the Eastern Chālukyas furnished an excellent opportunity for Govinda IV. He supported Yuddhamalla II, son of Tāla I, and enabled him to displace Bhīma II and seize the Veīgī kingdom. But Yuddhamalla became king only in name; he had very little power and a good part of the kingdom passed under the occupation of the Rāshṭrakūṭa officers and nobles who paid little heed to his authority. An Eastern Chālukya inscription states in so many words that the commanders of the Vallabha and others apportioned the territory among themselves and held it for seven years.

Light is shed on the revolution that terminated the rule of Govinda by the inscriptions of the Chālukyas of Vēmulavāḍa and Pampa's poem. We learn from the inscriptions that Arikasī II of Vēmulavāḍa, the patron of Pampa, had married Revakaniradī, the daughter of Indra III, and that he gave protection to a certain Bijja or Vijayāditya who sought refuge with him from the anger of Govindarāja. Pampa adds some further details. He says that the Vijayāditya, who fled to Arikasī from Govinda's wrath, was a Chālukya, and that Govindarāja was Sakala-Chakravartī, meaning probably that he was the suzerain both of Vijayāditya and Arikasī. When Arikasī gave shelter to Vijayāditya, Govinda sent many sāmantas against him and Arikasī
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fought and won against all of them and became the crest jewel of the sāmantas. He then fought against Govinda himself, ruined him, and bestowed the empire on Baddega who had come to him for aid. Lastly, with only one elephant he overthrew Bappuva, the younger brother of Kakkala, when Bappuva came and attacked him with a host of elephants.

To complete the picture we must recall the statement in the Rāshtrakūṭa grants (Nos. XXIV, XXV) that feudatories of the empire requested Baddega Amoghavarsha III, the son of Jagattunga, to accept the Rāshtrakūṭa crown and save the honour of the Raṭṭa kingdom. They also state that Amoghavarsha was persuaded to accede to the request of the feudatories by God Pinākī (Śiva) who wanted to promote the fame of family of Vishṇu, i.e. the Rāshtrakūṭas. Amoghavarsha, it may be noted, had married Kundakadevi, the daughter of Yuvarāja I of Chedi (No. XXIII), and he is known to have spent some time in the Chedi court as he is said to have been there at the time when his daughter Revakanirmado was married to Gaṅga Būtuga II.91

The course of events is now fairly clear. Govinda was a wicked king and a reckless debauchee. His life and rule, quite in keeping with the method by which he acquired the throne, provoked universal resentment. It seems probable that the noble and saintly Amoghavarsha III sought to correct Govinda’s ways, and failing in his endeavour, which led only to differences with the ruling monarch, withdrew to the court of his father-in-law in the Chedi kingdom. There were rebellions in the Rāshtrakūṭa empire, and the feudatories banded themselves together against the monarch. Pampa’s version of the events is naturally calculated to glorify the part played by his patron Arikeśarī II in the events. But behind all exaggeration we can detect that that chieftain took a leading part in the revolution which ended in the defeat and dethronement of Govinda IV and the transfer of the crown to Amoghavarsha III, who was invited to return from the Chedi court to Mānyakheṭa and accept the Rāshtrakūṭa crown. The identity of Chālukya Vijayāditya, whose flight from Govinda’s anger starts the revolution according to Pampa, is by no means clear at present, though the suggestion may be made that it was Bijayata, the son of Kusumāvudha I of Mudugonda, or even the Eastern Chālukya Vijayāditya V who continued his struggle for the throne for some years after his deposition. As for Bappuva, the brother of Kakkala who fought on the side of Govinda and was defeated by Arikeśarī, it is best to accept the identification of Kakkala with a prince who,
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according to an unpublished Silāhāra grant, the was defeated by Amoghavarsha.

The transfer of the crown must have taken place some time in 934-35. Govinda is mentioned as the ruling monarch in the inscriptions of his Santāra feudatories of Banavāsi in A.D. 934. But Santāra inscriptions of 935 do not refer to him. Eastern Chālukya king Bhima II took advantage of the confusion due to the revolution and succeeded in expelling the Rāṣṭrakūṭas from Veṅgi and restoring its independence and peace. In the Eastern Chālukya grants, Bhima is said to have defeated the terrible and fierce army despatched against him by Govindarāja, slain several Rāṣṭrakūta generals, beaten the valorous Yuddhamalla II, and proclaimed himself king, and celebrated his coronation in A.D. 934-35.

It seems probable that the chief queen of Govinda IV was a Chola princess by name Viṭāmadēviyar, the daughter of Parantaka I. This becomes evident from two inscriptions of the thirty-first year (A.D. 938) of Parantaka I found at Takkolam. What happened to Govinda himself at the end of the revolution is not known, and by the date of the Takkolam records the unfortunate queen of Govinda might have found it prudent to withdraw to her father's court. At any rate it is not easy to accept, without further evidence, the suggestion that has been made that Govinda IV withdrew to the court of Chola Parantaka I, that that ruler made an effort to restore his son-in-law to the Rāṣṭrakūṭa throne, and that the invasion of the Chola territories by Kṛṣṇa III was of the nature of a reprisal. There is not even the remotest hint of all this in our sources and Kṛṣṇa's invasion of the Chola country can very well be explained, on other grounds.

VII. THE LAST PHASE

Amoghavarsha III had a short reign of four to five years. His character seems to have been gentle and peaceful and strongly marked by a religious turn of mind. He is described as the foremost among the wise men (Nos. XXV, XXVI) and a well-behaved and peaceful muni. The pressure of the sāmantas, the need to save the fair name of the royal family, and possibly the ambition of his young and energetic son Kṛṣṇa III, must all have had a share in inducing Amoghavarsha to step out of his retirement in his old age to occupy
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the Rāśṭrakūṭa throne, and he did so only after getting in some form divine approval for the course.

The earliest date for him found in an inscription is 7 September A.D. 937. The only facts recorded about him are that he gave away many villages to Brahmins and built many temples of Śiva, and thus his fame spread throughout the world. But the practical conduct of government appears to have vested in his son Krishṇa III who became yuvarāja very early in Amoghavarsha's reign, if not at the time of his accession; and we shall be justified in placing in Amoghavarsha's reign all the events ascribed to Krishṇa as yuvarāja in his records. The Deoli plates (May, A.D. 940, No. XXIV) compare Krishṇarāja to Kumāra, Kumāra meaning both crown-prince and Subrahmanya, and state that his enemies who disobeyed him fell of their own accord; that he killed the wicked Dantiga and Vappuga, uprooted the poisonous tree Rachchhāyamalla, and planted in Gaṅgavādi the sacred tree of Bhūtārya; and that after destroying numbers of Gaṅgas who were his enemies, he defeated the Pallava Anniga and reduced him to a bad plight. Hearing of his conquests of all the strongholds in the South, the Gurjara lost all hope about Kālanjara and Chitrakūṭa; feudatories in all India from Himālayas to Simhala bowed to him out of fear, though he was himself subject to his father's orders; it was after seeing his fame well established that his father, the best of sages, ended his life. It is thus clear that Krishṇa assisted his brother-in-law Būtuga II in a war against Rājamalla and enabled him to attain the Gaṅga throne. This fact is confirmed by the Chitaldurg inscription already mentioned as giving the earliest date for Amoghavarsha III. The reference to many Gaṅga enemies is, of course, rhetorical, and the identity of Dantiga and Vappuga is not clear, though we may surmise from the context that they were the generals or feudatories of Rājamalla. Anniga was of course the Nolamba-Pallava who must have taken the side of Rājamalla, too.

The reference to the Gurjara losing all hope of gaining Kālanjara and Chitrakūṭa has not been correctly understood. The question has been complicated by a verse occurring in the Karhad plates of 959 (No. XXV), though not in the much earlier Deoli plates (No. XXIV). This verse, which is a mere literary conceit of the writer of the praśasti, has been mistaken for the record of a historical fact and a conquest of the Chedi kingdom by Krishṇa has been postulat-

---

97 EC, XI, Chitaldurg 76.
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In view of the close and continuous friendly relations between the Chedis and the Rāshṭrakūtaś such a conquest must be regarded as very unlikely. On the contrary the strength of the Rāshṭrakūtaś was the strength of the Chedi kingdom, and the reference to the Gurjara ruler losing hope of Kālaṅjara and Chitrakūta must be interpreted to mean that the successes of Krishṇa in the South produced reactions in the politics of Northern India, and forced the chief enemy of the Chedi kingdom, viz the Gurjara king, to think twice before undertaking an expedition against that country.

The earliest inscription giving the imperial titles for Krishṇa III is dated 23 December, A.D. 939¹⁰¹, and Krishṇa is known to have become king only after his father’s death. The Deoli and Karhad plates (Nos. XXIV and XXV) leave no room for uncertainty on this point. Therefore Amoghavarsha’s death and Krishṇa’s accession must have taken place some time before 23 December, A.D. 939.¹⁰² The name of Krishṇa often appears in inscriptions in its Prākrit form Kannara, and his special title was Akālavārsha. The Gaṅga Būtuga is said to have helped Krishṇa soon after the death of Amoghavarsha in attaining the throne by putting down an opponent by name Lalleya, wrestling from his hands the State elephant, horses, the white umbrella, and the throne, and bestowing them on Krishṇa.¹⁰³ We have no indication from any other source that Krishṇa had any difficulty at the time of accession, and nothing is heard of Lalleya’s identity also; this statement about Būtuga’s aid to Krishṇa occurs in a record which is generally considered spurious. The Deoli plates (No. XXIV), issued by Krishṇa in May 940, record a gift of land for the merit of his younger brother, Jagattuṅga Deva, and say nothing of any military undertakings of Krishṇa after his coronation. We hear nothing more of Jagattuṅga who is said to have been dearer to Krishṇa than his own life. Krishṇa, as we shall see, was succeeded on the throne by Khoṭṭiga, and he by the son of his brother Nirupama. Khoṭṭiga and Nirupama were doubtless step-brothers of Krishṇa.

In the Karhad plates (No. XXV) Krishna is said to have undertaken the conquest of the southern quarter, to have uprooted the Chola dynasty, distributed the Chola kingdom among his servants, to have

¹⁰⁰ Altekar, Rāshṭrakūtaś, p. 113. A similar mistake was made for long over verse ⁸² of the Tiruvāṅgādu plates of Rājendra Chola I. See JOR, XVI (1948), p. 155.
¹⁰¹ EC, VII, Sb. 476.
¹⁰² EI, XXI, pp. 281-92. I am inclined to accept that the date of the Isamudra inscription (EC, XI, Cd. 77) has to be regarded as incorrect. See also EI, XXVI, pp. 184-65.
¹⁰³ EI, III, p. 150, lines 52-53.
levied tribute from the Chera, Pândya and Siínhala, and erected a pillar of victory proclaiming his fame at Râmeśvara. The plates themselves were issued from the king’s camp at Mélpaḍî in the North Arcot district. Two years later he was still in the same camp when the Kolhâpur plates (No. XXVI) of Akâlavarṣha were issued. The extent of Krishṇa’s conquests, as detailed in the Karhad plates, is confirmed by the testimony of Somâdevasûri who finished his Yaśastilakâ within a few months of the date of the Karhad plates (No. XXV) and at the end of the work speaks of Krishṇarâja’s conquest in almost the same terms.

Krishṇa’s southern expedition was in fact one of the earliest military enterprises and the most extensive of his reign. We have seen that the rising power of the Cholas under Parântaka I had already led to conflict with the Râshṭrakûṭas and their feudatories, the Bânas and the Vaidumbas, in the reign of Krishna II. On that occasion the Râshṭrakûṭas suffered a defeat, and the Bânas lost a good deal of their territory, and Parântaka was very ably assisted by Gaiga Prthivîpati II. The accession of Bûtuga II to the Gaiga throne with the aid of his brother-in-law Krishṇa, followed within a short time by the accession of Krishṇa III himself to the Râshṭrakûṭa throne, and the death of Prthivîpati II, altered the balance of political forces to the disadvantage of Parântaka; and the Bânas and the Vaidumbas were doubtless urging Krishṇa to aid them in recovering their lost territory and teaching the powerful Chola a lesson. Krishṇa was in the prime of life, and not reluctant to seize the favourable moment to make an advance to the south. Parântaka in his turn was not unmindful of possible trouble from this quarter, and he stationed two of his sons Râjâditya and Arikulakesari in the north-western frontier of the Chola empire to co-operate with Prthivîpati II in resisting the reaction to the aggressive policy that he had followed against the Râshṭrakûṭas and their vassals. When Prthivîpati died, the defence of this quarter passed entirely into the hands of Râjâditya and his brother.104

The chronology of Krishṇa’s campaign can be determined only roughly. The exact year when the invasion began is not known, but there is no doubt that the turning point was reached in A.D 949 when a decisive engagement took place at Takkolam, six miles to the south-east of Arakonam in the North Arcot district. The Ātakûr inscription of Bûtuga tells us that Kannaradeva ‘was making a display of triumph after fighting against and killing the Mûvadi Chola Râjâditya at a place called Takkola’. It also adds that ‘when Kannaradeva

104 Colas, I, pp. 154-55.
was fighting the Chola, Bütuga made the howdah the battle-field, and aimed at, pierced, and killed Rājāditya—an act for which Krishna rewarded him by granting him the district of Banavāsi 12,000, Belvola 300, Purigere 300, Kisukad 70, and Bagenad 70. Lastly, Bütuga was ably assisted in the fight by his lieutenant Manalera whom he rewarded with the gift of Atakur 12 and the village of Kādiyūr in the Belvola district as a military fief (bālgale). The Chola records confirm the manner of Rājāditya’s death, and say that Chakravartin Kannaradeva Vallabha entered Tondaimandalam after the overthrow of Rājāditya in S. 871 (A.D. 949).

Even the decisive battle at Takkolam did not mean the total collapse of resistance to Krishna’s advance, and he had some years of hard fighting before he could establish himself in the south. Inscriptions bearing his name and regnal years do not appear in the Chola country till his 15th year, A.D. 953. There is indeed one record from the South Arcot district which purports to be dated in his 5th year. But as the record is a later copy, its date must be presumed to be a mistake. Inscriptions from South Arcot, dated in the years A.D. 952-54, record gifts of minor chieftains who do not acknowledge either Chola or Rāṣṭrakūta supremacy—clear evidence of political dislocation, consequent on the Rāṣṭrakūta invasion. We have no Chola records from North Arcot, South Arcot, and Chingleput for many years after the battle of Takkolam. Krishna’s records, with dates ranging from the 15th to the 28th regnal year, are found in the same area, justifying his claim that he captured part of the Chola country, distributed it among his servants, and built temples in it. By assuming the title Kachchiyum-Taṅjāiyum-konda Krishna claimed to have captured Kānçhipuram, and Taṅjāvūr (Tanjore). The spurious Sudi plates state that Bütuga after conquering Rājāditya assaulted Tanjore, Nalkote, and a number of other fortresses, and handed over to Krishna elephants, horses, and a vast amount of treasure captured from them. The Karhad (No. XXV) plates, we have seen, take him as far as Rāmeśvaram and Ceylon. We cannot say for certain if these are merely empty boasts or the record of a triumphant raid across the southern countries. No inscription of Krishna or his vassals has been found south of the latitude of Pondicherry. But there can be no question that the effect of his invasion on the Chola empire was ruinous in the extreme.

Krishna found occasion, like most of his predecessors, to interfere
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in the affairs of Veṇgi. There Chāluṅya-Bhima II was succeeded by his second son Amma II, a lad of twelve years, his elder half-brother Dānārṇava being passed over for some reason that is not clear. Though Dānārṇava apparently acquiesced in this arrangement for a time, Amma was not left undisturbed. Soon after his coronation in 945, the two sons of Yuddhamalla II, Bādapa and Tāla II, encouraged by the support they received from some disaffected nobles in the Veṇgi kingdom and from Rāṣṭrakūṭa Krīṣṇa III, invaded Veṇgi with a strong army. Amma II abandoned the struggle and fled the country. Bādapa proclaimed himself king under the title of Vijayāditya and was succeeded by his younger brother Tāla II, Vishnuvardhana. The rule of Tāla I lasted only a short time. The disloyal nobles of Veṇgi now changed their attitude towards Amma and favoured his return. Nripakāma, the chief of Kolam, gave him one of his daughters in marriage and espoused his cause warmly. Amma slew Tāla II in battle and took possession of the kingdom. But this was not the end of his troubles. Krīṣṇa III began to espouse the cause of Dānārṇava and sent an expedition about A.D. 956 against Amma. Amma had once more to seek safety in exile and fled to Kaliṅga. Dānārṇava became king of Veṇgi under the aegis of Krīṣṇa. But the Rāṣṭrakūṭa power in Veṇgi was only shortlived at this time. Amma once more returned from exile when the Rāṣṭrakūṭa armies withdrew, wrested the kingdom from Dānārṇava and ruled it until A.D. 970, when he was slain in battle by Dānārṇava who had headed another rebellion against him. It is not clear what part the Rāṣṭrakūṭas played in the last stages of this confused struggle.

Towards the close of his reign Krīṣṇa undertook an expedition to Northern India of which, however, the details are far from clear. The expedition must have started some time in or after A.D. 963; for Māraśimha II, the son of Būtuga II, not by the Rāṣṭrakūṭa princess Revakāniradā, but by a Kollabbarasi, came to the throne in that year after the death of his father. We learn from his Kudul plates (963) that Krīṣṇa crowned him king before undertaking the northern expedition. The undated Jura prasasti (No. XXVII), which clearly refers to the completion of the southern campaigns of Krīṣṇa, is clear proof of the reality of the expedition, but who the enemy was against whom Krīṣṇa proceeded can only be surmised. The Gaṅga Māraśimha seems to have taken part in this expedition and his Sṛvana Belgola epitaph says that he became known as the king of
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the GurJaras by conquering the northern region for Krishnaraja, destroyed the pride of the mighty Alla who set himself in opposition to Vanagajamalla (i.e. Krishna III), preserved by his prowess the throne and all the other insignia of royalty of Gandamartanda (Krishna), and dispersed the bands of Kiratas who dwelt on the skirts of the forests of the Vindhya mountains. Two captains of Marasimha's forces bear the name Ujjayinibhujangas.\textsuperscript{113} It seems clear from all this that the chief enemy of Krishna III at this time must have been the Paramara ruler of Malava, Harsha Siyaka. Siyaka acknowledges Krishna's supremacy in his Harsola copper plate grant of A.D. 949 when the sphere of his rule included Khetaka (Khaira). He must have taken advantage of Krishna's pre-occupation with the southern expedition to throw off his allegiance to the Rashttrakutas and form alliances against them. Krishna, with the aid of Marasimha, was evidently able to re-establish his supremacy, though only after a hard struggle with Siyaka and his allies in the course of which the Rashttrakuta armies advanced up to Ujjain, the capital of Malava on the one hand, while on the other Krishna himself was about to lose his royal insignia to the enemy and rescued from the fate by the plucky Marasimha.

Before leaving Krishna's reign we must say something about his feudatories, particularly of the position of Ganga Buituga in addition to what has been stated already. An inscription from Ro\textsuperscript{n}\textsuperscript{114} shows him ruling Belvola 300 and Purige 300 besides Gangaavadhi 96,000 already in A.D. 942. If this is correct, the statement in the Atakur inscription\textsuperscript{115} that these districts were included in the reward that Buituga got from Krishna III for his loyalty and bravery in the field of Takkolam becomes questionable, and the Hebbal inscription of A.D. 975, which says that Buituga got these districts as well as Kusukad 70, and Bagend 70 as dowry from Amoghavarsha III on the occasion of his marriage with Revakanirmadi becomes more trustworthy than has been so far considered. It seems probable that after Takkolam Krishna handed over to Buituga Banavasi 12,000 and at the same time made him the absolute proprietor of these other districts instead of his holding them merely as the dowry of his wife.\textsuperscript{116} The Ro\textsuperscript{n} inscription also records that Buituga attacked that place, and that a certain Pampayya of the Vaji family fell in the fight that ensued on 24
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April A.D. 942. The occasion for the attack and the fight is not clear. But the record is a clear testimony that the peace of the Rāshtrakūṭa empire was liable to be disturbed by local disputes in which the feudatories of the empire felt free to employ their forces as they liked. Another record from Kurttkotī,117 Gadag district, Dharwar taluk, shows Būtuga II still ruling Belvola and Purigere in October 946, while yet another record from Naregal,118 dated A.D. 950, states that Būtayya Permāḍi was ruling Gaṅgavāḍi 96,000 extending as far as Peldore (the great river), i.e. the Krishnā. This series of records shows the great power of Būtuga in the Rāshtrakūṭa empire. His sway extended over much of what should really have been regarded as home territory and directly administered by the emperor himself. Būtuga’s son, Mārasinīha II, continued to rule over all these districts like Būtuga himself. How neglectful Krishnā III was of feudal developments likely to endanger the stability of his empire is also seen from the fact that he gave the province of Tardavāḍi 1000 near the heart of the empire as anuṅgajīcita (military fief) to Āhavamalla Tailaparasa of the Satyāśraya family some time before March A.D. 965.119 This favour shown to Tailaparasa spelt the ruin of the Rāshtrakūṭa empire; for within a few years of Krishnā’s death, Tailapa felt himself strong enough to overthrow the Rāshtrakūṭa ruler, and establish his own sway as independent monarch, thus laying the foundations of the Western Chālukya empire of Kalyāṇī.

Krishnā’s reign was thus marked by visible signs of disintegration of the empire. His greatness as a soldier is indeed attested by the early wars he waged as crown prince on behalf of his brother-in-law Būtuga, and perhaps by the successes of Rāshtrakūṭa arms in the confused struggles that went on in the Vengi kingdom. But in the wars against the Cholas and the Paramāras he seems to have depended more on the martial abilities of his overmighty Gaṅga feudatories than on the strength of his own arms. However that may be, Krishnā cannot be credited with even the primary elements of statesmanship. He allowed momentary personal feelings to betray him into courses of action which proved politically disastrous to the empire. The way in which he rewarded Būtuga and Tailapa shows Krishnā to have been a grateful friend but by no means a wise emperor.

The latest regnal year of Krishnā, mentioned in his Tamil inscriptions from Tongaimandalam, is the 28th, and this accords with the
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date of the Kolagallu inscription, 120 17 February A.D. 967, engraved
soon after the death of Krishña III. He died therefore late in A.D. 966
or very early in 967.

He was succeeded by his half-brother Khoṭṭiga, the son of Amogha-
varsha III by Kandagadevi, the daughter of Yuvarājadeva of Chedi. 121
Krishña III had a son, the father of the prince who afterwards be-
came Indra IV, but he seems to have predeceased his father.

Khoṭṭiga had the titles, Nītyavarsha and Raṭṭakandarpa. 122 Jagat-
tunga, the younger brother of Krishña mentioned in the Deoli plates
(No. XXIV), is also described as being the god of love by his beauty.
It seems possible that Khoṭṭiga was identical with Jagattunga, though
we may not be sure of this, Khoṭṭiga was also known by the title Amo-
ghavarsha. 123

In Khoṭṭiga’s reign the Rāṣhṭrakūṭa power suffered a serious re-
verse and virtually came to an end. The Paramāra king Harsha Siyaka,
who had sustained a reverse towards the close of the reign of Krishña
III, now wreaked his vengeance. He is said to have taken in battle
the wealth of king Khoṭṭiga. 124 A later Paramāra inscription 125
mentions a certain Kaṅkadeva who overthrew the array of the king of
Karṇāta on the banks of the Narmadā and died a hero’s death, ex-
hausting the enemy forces in fighting on the side of king Śrī Harsha,
the lord of Mālava. Lastly, Dhanapāla, who wrote his Paiyalachchāri in
Dhārā in A.D. 972-73, says that in that year the king of Mālava plun-
dered Mānyakhetā. 126 The statement of Dhanapāla finds confirmation
in the Śravana Belgola epitaph 127 of Mārasinīha II which says that
by the strength of his arm he protected the camp of the emperor who
had been forced to abandon Mānyakhetā. 128

It is not clear if the war was started by Khoṭṭiga or by Harsha him-
self, but its main incidents stand out prominently—a battle on the
banks of Narmadā in which the Rāṣhṭrakūṭa forces sustained defeat,
the dash of the Paramāra forces on the Rāṣhṭrakūṭa capital Mānya-
kheta which was abandoned by Khoṭṭiga and thoroughly sacked by
his enemy, and the prevention of utter disaster by the defence being
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organized by Mārasiṁha II, who enabled his overlord Khoṭṭiga to arrest the progress of the enemy and perhaps regain his hold on the capital after the retreat of the Paramāra forces. The empire was rudely shaken by this Paramāra inroad and the result was seen very soon after.

Mārasiṁha was the chief feudatory and friend of Khoṭṭiga, and several inscriptions\(^{129}\) attest the importance of his position. His Adarragunchi inscription, \(A.D.\ 971-72\), mentions his subordinate Pāṇchāladeva, afterwards famous as the opponent of Chālukya Taila II, but at the time ruling over a small division Sebbe 30 under Mārasiṁha.

Khoṭṭiga died about the middle of \(A.D.\ 972\), and was succeeded by Karka II, son of Nirupama, the younger brother of Kṛishṇa III and Khoṭṭiga (No XXVIII). Karka had the titles Amoghacarsha, Nātana-Pārtha, Ahīmatārāṇa, Viṣṇu-Nārāyaṇa, Nṛpatunga, and Rājatrinetra (No. XXVIII). He is said to have mastered the entire science of politiy even as a boy. Malkhed is mentioned as his permanent capital, and in a number of high-flown verses he is said to have conquered the Gurjaras, the Cholas, the Hūnas and the Pāṇḍyas, doubtless conventional praise of no historical value. The Gaṇḍūr inscription,\(^{130}\) of his reign bears the date Jūly \(A.D.\ 973\) and mentions the Gaṅga Mārasiṁha as the ruler of Yeraḍārānuru, i.e. Belvola and Purigere, besides Pāṇchāladeva and some other feudatories. Very soon after, Karka was overthrown by Taila II, Chālukya. The Bhadana grant\(^{131}\) (\(A.D.\ 997\)) of Aparājīta states that the light of kings, Karka, was extinguished by the violent wind named Tailapa and the Raṭṭarājya ceased to exist.

The Kharenpatana plates,\(^{132}\) dated \(A.D.\ 1008\), state that Tailapa, the Chālukya, became king after defeating Karka in battle, and the much later Mangoli inscription\(^{133}\) gives a more embellished account of what happened, summarised by Fleet in the following terms:

'And then prosperity returning to the Chalki family which had suffered mishap through being bruised by the race of the Demons in the shape of the Raṭṭa kings; Taila II, a very incarnation of Kṛishṇa, fought a hundred and eight battles out in the open country and captured 88 fortresses. None of the hostile kings could shake off this Āhavamalla Taila who, resembling Death, annihilated in war king Kakkara and king Ranakambha, the sun and moon in the Rāṣṭrakūṭa sky, and amidst the applauses of the whole world.

\(^{129}\) \(SII.\ XI, i.\ Nos. 41, 42 and 43.\)

\(^{130}\) \(IA.\ XII, p. 271.\)

\(^{131}\) \(EI.\ III, p. 272.\) lines 17 to 20

\(^{132}\) \(EI.\ III, p. 372.\)

\(^{133}\) \(EI.\ V, p. 20.\) Also VI, additions and corrections to V. See also Sogal ins., \(EI.\ XVI, p. 1.\)
with an exceedingly great effort acquired the sovereignty of the land of Kuntala.'

The Chālukya Taila must have slowly built up his position and influence from the days of Krishna III, taking advantage of the increasing weakness of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa empire, and completed its overthrow when he found a suitable opportunity after the Paramāra invasion had shaken the empire to its foundations. Karka II and his ally, another Rāṣṭrakūṭa prince named Raṇakmbha, fell on the field of battle, and the Rāṣṭrakūṭa empire ceased to exist. Mārasimha II tried to revive Rāṣṭrakūṭa power by setting up Indra IV, the issue of a son of Kṛṣṇa III by a sister of Mārasimhā himself,134 but the attempt met with no success. Mārasimhā starved himself to death by sallekhana in a.d. 975. His feudatory Pāṇchāladeva, who claims soon135 after Mārasimha's death to have ruled the whole country south of the Kṛṣṇā river, was also killed by Taila in battle; Indra IV also performed sallekhana some time later in a.d. 982.136

From the collapse of the Chālukyas of Bādāmi to the revival of Chālukya power under Taila II is a period of roughly two centuries, and during this long interval the line of Rāṣṭrakūṭas, started by Dantidurga, continued to rule Western Deccan with conspicuous success. Their direct rule was confined to the area that is called 'Raṭṭa-pāḍi seven and a half lacs' in Tamil inscriptions long after they quitted the stage; but the weight of their arms was felt literally by the whole length of India from the Himālayas to the Cape Comorin. In the North the Pratiñhāras and Pālas were defeated in wars by the Rāṣṭrakūṭas, and the Paramāras became their vassals; in the South the Gaṅga country was a viceroyalty under them for many years and the rising empire of the Cholas suffered a severe curtailment for a time; in the eastern half of the Deccan, strenuous efforts were made repeatedly to bring the Chālukyas of Veṅgī under control. The daring pursuit of the glory in so many directions not only meant occasional failure even on the field in the midst of notable success, but strained the resources of government and gave rise to feudal conditions and the growth of mighty vassals who disturbed the peace of the realm and ultimately overthrew the suzerain power itself. But in spite of everything, the memorials of Rāṣṭrakūṭa rule in art, architecture and literature claim an important place in the heritage of India. The administration of the empire won the admiration of foreign visitors by its justice and liberality, and by promoting industrial and com-
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merce added to the wealth and happiness of the people. The history of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas is indeed a bright chapter in the history of India.
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