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goddess Padmāvatī of Saśakapura. When a tiger sprang out and threatened to interrupt and spoil the efficacy of the penance, the sage cried out "poy, śaḷa", "Slay, O, Śaḷa". Śaḷa slew the tiger which was no other than the goddess who, pleased with his valour, gave him the boon he wanted. Hence his descendants acquired the name Poyśāḷa (Hoysāḷa) and the tiger became the emblem of the dynasty. As this occurred in spring, Śaḷa gave the goddess the name of Vāsantikādēvi and, among the Hoysāḷa titles accordingly, there occurs the expression Vāsantikādēvi-labhda-vara-prasāda.² But the legend in some form appears to have been of a very ancient origin as one of the Vēḷir chieftains of Tamil country, Irungōvēḷ, is described as

He is also said to have belonged to a family which issued from the fire-pit of an ancient sage of northern India and to have ruled in Tuvarai (Dvārakā) for forty-nine generations before migrating to the Tamil country. The historical connection between the Vēḷir of the early centuries AD and the Hoysāḷas, if any, cannot now be traced.

VINAYĀDITYA (c. 1045 - 98)

The earliest mention of the Hoysāḷas occurs in a record of 1006 which states that a general Aprameya, an officer of the Cōḷa monarch Rājarāja I, defeated a Hoysāḷa minister named Nāgaṇṇa and pursued or repulsed the Hoysāḷas in war.⁴ But as Kielhorn has pronounced the date of this record as "of no value for historical purposes", the inscriptions mentioning Nṛpa Kāma and a war between him and Rājendra Cōḷa Kongāḷa, who claims victory in a battle at Maṇḍi, must be taken to commence the history of the Hoysāḷa line.⁵ These records are dated 1022 and 1027, but it seems likely that Nṛpa Kāma continued to rule much longer, as the reign of his puli-kadī-māḷ, the chieftain who felled the tiger in a verse in the Purāṇāṇūṇḍu.³

2. The story became so popular with the Hoysāḷa poets and sculptors that it figures in a great many inscriptions of the dynasty and sculptures. It also adorns many Hoysāḷa temples. But it is worth noting that such depictions figure, though not frequently, in the temples of the Cāluḷiyas of Kalyāṇa, which are much earlier than the rise of the Hoysāḷas to prominence. It appears as though the Hoysāḷa poets were so inspired by this sculpture that they created a story which became very handy in explaining the term Hoysāḷa by splitting it into poy or poy and seḷa. Tracing the origin to the mythical Yadu and the association with Dwārakā is also in consonance with the contemporary practice of claiming supremacy and supernaturalness by the ruling families. The fact, however, seems to be that the family owed its origin to an individual named Poysa or Hoysa who might have been a local petty chief much before the Hoysāḷas rose to power. It is significant that the word Poyśāḷa figures in relation to a Noḷamba chief in about the tenth century — Eds.

3. Purāṇ, 201.
4. AFSIE, 353 of 1901; EI, VI, 1900-01, pp. 67-68.
5. EC, V, Mjl. 43, 44; A. 76; VI, Mg. 19. K.A.N. Sastri rightly takes Nṛpakāma as the point of commencement of the rule of the Hoysāḷas. But he dismisses an inscription of 1000 which refers to the ruling of a Hoysāḷa chief by Aprameya, a general of the Cōḷa, Rājarāja I. But it is not unlikely that this unknown Hoysāḷa chief could be Nṛpakāma or Kāma himself. He had a long reign from c. 1000 to 1041. This Kāma described in the inscriptions as Nṛpakāma fought two other battles with the Cōḷas, in about 1022 and 1028. A suggestion is also made
son Vinayāditya does not begin much before 1048. A record from Halebid bearing the date 1062 states that he had been ruling Gaṅgavāḍi for long from his capital at Dorasamudra and describes him as a Rakkasa-Voysāla in his terrible determination. Yet, the provenance of his inscriptions and those of the Cōlas of the period suggest that his rule was confined to Hassan and Kaḍūr districts and parts of Nāgamaṅgaḷa taluq. Besides the Kongāḷvas of Coorg and Hassan who were the feudatories of the Cōlas, the other enemies against whom Vinayāditya waged war were the numerous mountain chiefs (the Malepas) in the neighbouring ghats and their protectors the Kadambas of Manjarabad. Victory over them is commemorated by the title maleparolgaṇḍa assumed by Vinayāditya. The Senavaras of Cikmagaḷur were also subdued early in his reign, and the turn of their northern neighbours, the Asandi chiefs, came soon after.

Vinayāditya had a long reign which lasted till 1098 and was more on the side of the contemporary Cāḷukya monarchs of Kalyāṇa than that of the Cōlas. Some of his records do not contain any reference to an overlord. Vinayāditya is said to have been born at Saśapura (Sosevur, in Kaḍūr district, now called Argaḍ), the Saśakapura of the Śaṅga myth, and to have owed his rise to a Jain teacher Śaṅtideva. His queen was Keleyabbe or Kelayadevi, mother of Ereyaṅga, who was associated with his father as yuvarıṇa from 1063. Ereyaṅga is often described as the “strong staff of the arm of the Cāḷukya king”, and later records say that he took Dhārā, the stronghold of the lords of Malwa, made prosperous by king Bhoja, struck terror in the camp of the Cōla, laid waste Cakragoṭṭa and broke the power of Kaliṅga. These statements mean that as yuvarıṇa Ereyaṅga took part in the numerous campaigns of the reign of Cāḷukya Sōmēśvara I and Sōmēśvara II, and that he aided Vikramāditya VI in his war against Kulōttūṅga.

Ereyaṅga (1098-1100)

After the death of Vinayāditya, his son Ereyaṅga had a short reign of less than two years. He was followed on the throne by Baḷāḷa I, the eldest of his three sons by Echadalou (1100).

Baḷāḷa I (1100-1108)

Baḷāḷa I had the title Tribhuvanamalla, a sign of his feudatory relation to the effect that Sala of the legend and Kāma were one and the same person. But this possibility has to be ruled out for lack of any evidence (cf. P. B. Desai, S. H. Ritti and B. R. Gopal, eds, A History of Karnataka, p 290).

6. BG, I, ii, p 492. R. Narasimhachar (MAR, 1916, p 51) postulated two Vinayādityas on the strength of a record apparently dated in the Vikrama era 1060, but his view has not gained acceptance. See also MAR, 1932, pp 177-78.

7. MAR, 1929, p 73.

8. EC, VI, Cm. 7; Kd. 161; Tk. 62. Also Kd. 148 for some generations of Asandi-chiefs.

9. Ibid, II, 349 (138); V, Bl.58; Ak. 117; VII, Sh. 64.

10. Ibid, V, Bl. 199
to Vikramaditya VI, the Cālukya emperor with the same title. Ballāla’s younger brother Bittiga, better known as Viṣṇuvardhana, was made yuvārāja early in his reign with titular rule over Gaṅgavādi as well as the title Tribhuvanamalla. Tradition avers that Ballāla was the victim of an incurable disease which made it necessary for his brother to carry on the government in his name. Inscriptions of Ballāla I appear till 1108 and those of Viṣṇuvardhana as sole ruler begin in a series from 1111. Ballāla must have died in the interim. He is said to have ruled from Belāpura (Belur) and married three sisters (Paddockevel, Carevaldevi and Boppadevi), daughters of Dānḍanāyaka Marīvē who received from Ballāla the lordship of Sindigere as a marriage gift on a day in Šaka 1025 roughly corresponding to 13 October 1103. The sisters were highly accomplished in the sciences and in singing and dancing.

No doubt, the rule of Ballāla I was dominated by the active participation of his younger brothers Viṣṇuvardhana and Udayāditya. But it was Ballāla who first raised the banner of revolt against the ruling monarch Cālukya Vikramaditya VI. Backed by his enthusiastic brothers, particularly Viṣṇuvardhana, Ballāla dared to function almost as an independent king and indulged in territorial expansion. Vikramaditya noticed the moves of this southern subordinate and sent his vassal Paramārā Jagaddeva to show Ballāla his place. But the Hoysāla chief had an upper hand in this scuffle. Encouraged by this, the Hoysāla stepped up his expansionist activities and soon overpowered the Cērgāvas and occupied Āvachekala. The Pāṇḍyas of Uccangī became the next target and the Hoysāla army crossed the Tungabhadra. Vikramaditya thought that it was time to curb the unruly chief. He sent his general Sinda Ācuṇī II for the purpose. Ācuṇī successfully put down the Hoysāla and made him withdraw to his capital, conceding to the victor the newly acquired territories.

When Viṣṇuvardhana succeeded Ballāla in 1108, he renewed the expansionist activities as the circumstances had become more favourable to him. Under his leadership the Hoysāla power rose from a feudalatory rank to that of an almost independent sovereignty and crossed swords on equal terms with the Cōlas and Cālukyas. The wars of Viṣṇuvardhana lasted for almost half a century. During this time he gave no rest to himself or his

11. MAR, 1925, 52.
12. Rice, Mysore and Coorg, p 99. The arguments advanced for reckoning Viṣṇuvardhana’s reign from 1095 (JRAS, 1915, p 1534) will not bear scrutiny. The traditional date of Rāmānuja’s visit, Bahudānya corresponding to 1099, has little bearing on the question, as Bittiga might have embraced Vaiṣṇavism as yuvārāja or some years after Rāmānuja’s arrival in Kamataka. The date of the Kuntamaduru record is irregular, and the titles which the king gets in it include the capture of Talakād and Hangal, events which took place later than 1113. Lastly, in the record of the Dundubhi year 1142, the significance of the figure 45 is by no means clear; cf. EC, V, Ak. 34 dated Šaka 1022 Vikrama samvat 536 ippattarāgenaya Īvva samvatayya, where the first Šaka and cyclic year are correct, but the remaining entries 22 Īvva samvat deal are a puzzle. A Tamil inscription from Doḍballāpur (EC, IX, Db. 11) which cannot be earlier than 1113 when the area passed under Viṣṇuvardhana, is dated in the twelfth reignal year.
opponents. There are many accounts of his achievements in inscriptions. Nevertheless, it is by no means easy to follow his progress step by step, as the authors of the praśastis bestowed more attention on imaginative and picturesque writing than on the temporal sequence of the events they described. The more picturesque details occur in inscriptions of relatively later dates and often it is difficult to distinguish facts from the fancy of the panegyrist. And the convention of ascribing to any ruler of a family the known achievements of all his predecessors is another complicating factor. An inscription of 1160, for instance, says that Viṣṇuvardhana conquered Mālwa and Cakrakoṭṭa and captured the elephants of Sōmēśvara. This may be at least in part a repetition of the work of Ereyāṅga or even Vinayāditya in the reign of Cālukya Sōmēśvara I. But an earlier inscription of 1117 describes him specifically as "a powerful lion in devouring the fierce elephant Sōmēśvara," and as having "displayed his valour before Mānīkyadevī of the Cakrakoṭṭa throne". Another record says that he "terrified Sōmēśvara, the lord of the mighty celebrated Cakrakoṭṭa", and we know that Sōmēśvara, the Sinda ruler of parts of modern Bastar died in 1111-12. It seems probable, therefore, that there was a fresh war waged by Cālukya Vikramāditya VI against the Sinda rulers of Bastar in which Viṣṇuvardhana distinguished himself greatly while he was yet yuvarāja.

Another early campaign of Viṣṇuvardhana, while his brother was still ruling, was directed against the Pāṇḍyas of Uccaṅgi. Starting as rulers of a part of Noḷambavāḍī in modern Bellary district, these rulers had gradually penetrated into Karnataka and by the time of Ballāla I, had made themselves masters of the greater part of Chitradurga district. Like the Hoysālas, they too owed their rise to the favour of Vikramāditya VI, whom they aided in his wars against his brother Sōmēśvara II allied with the Cōla Kuiōttunga I. The progress of these two neighbouring feudatory powers naturally brought them into conflict with each other and the Hoysālas, who found their expansion blocked on the east and south by the powerful Cōla empire, seem to have been the aggressors. Ballāla and Viṣṇuvardhana claim to have "beaten without mercy the pride of the Pāṇḍya and seized the wealth of his kingdom", and this was apparently no empty boast. But Cālukya Vikramāditya VI who began to view with concern the expansion of Hoysāla power naturally befriended the victims of their aggression and caused a diversion by sending an expedition under Jagaddeva, a Paramāra prince from Mālwa who had entered his service. An inscription of this prince from


15. Ibid, VI, Mg. 22.

16. EI, IX, 1907-08, pp 160f.; also ARE, 1909, pp 111f.


18. EC, V, B1, 58.

19. Jagaddeva was identified by Fleet (DKD, p 494) with reservations with a Santāra chieftain of that name, a feudatory of Jagadekamalla II and Taiḷa III or some ancestor of his. But the Hoysāla inscriptions clearly call him the ruler of Mālwa, and there is no doubt that Jagaddeva, the son of Udayāditya, is meant.
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Jainad says that he conquered the Andhra king, subdued the king of Candradurga and entered the city of Dorasamudra. The Hoysāla inscriptions likewise mention the Mālāvesvara Jagaddeva among the commanders sent against the Hoysāla by the Cāukuya emperor. They also portray a spirited engagement between Jagaddeva riding on an elephant and Baḷāḷa I on horseback in which Jagaddeva hailed Baḷāḷa as a “fine horseman”, to which Baḷāḷa answered that he was no mere cavalier, but Vīra Baḷāḷa, and then wrought great havoc among Jagaddeva’s troops. The talk of Jagaddeva losing his kingdom (Saptāṅga) to the Hoysālas is, of course, exaggeration. Not perhaps a success in the military sense, the expedition of Jagaddeva against the Hoysāla kingdom served its main strategic purpose of relieving the pressure on the Pāṇḍyas who are seen to continue their rule in Noḷambavāḍi for many years more.

About the same time or a little earlier, the Santāra chieftains of Pombucca (Humcha in Nagar taluq) were attacked and subjugated to Hoysāla power. Santāra inscriptions are rarely found in the area of their rule, Santalige-1000, between the years 1103 and 1147 and there are clear references to Viṣṇuvaradhana as the capturer of Pombucca from the very commencement of his separate reign. The overthrow of Pombucca was followed up by hostilities against the Kadambas of Banavāsi. These led to no decisive results immediately, though inscriptions from 1113 onwards include Banavāsi, Belvola, Palāsige and Hāngal among the conquests of Viṣṇuvaradhana.

VISNUVARDHANA (1108-52)

The war against the Cōla power and the conquest of Gaṅgavāḍi was doubtless among the first achievements of Viṣṇuvaradhana after he became the sole ruler on his brother’s death. He is described as the capturer of Talakād and Bhujabala Vīra Gaṅga Pratāpa Hoysāla-deva in 1112, but the conquest must have been the result of several hard-fought campaigns lasting over several years. Gaṅgavāḍi was then being administered as a province of the Cōla empire of Kulōttuṅga I, and the ancient line of Adigamāns of Tagaḍur (Dharmapuri) in the Koṅgu country acted as the representative of the Cōla power in this region. The leading Hoysāla general was the celebrated Gaṅgarāja, often described as the abode of Jina-dharma and the chief agent in increasing the prosperity of Viṣṇuvaradhana by his counsel, energy and influence. The Cōla Sāmanta Adiyaman (Adigamān), who “was stationed like the bolt of a door above the ghats, in the camp at Talakāḍu” on the frontiers of the Gaṅgavāḍi-nādu, refused to surrender at the call of Gaṅgarāja and told him to fight and take it.

22. EC, II, 132 and 143.
24. MAR, 1908, para 37; EC, IV, Ng. 30.
25. EC, II, 240 (90).
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The battle that followed, was probably fought near Taḷakāḍ. It decided the fate of the Gaṅgavāḍi province. Besides Adiyaman, two other generals, Dāmōda and Narasimhavarman, fought on the Cōla side but they all fled from their stations after defeat, leaving the Hōysāla forces to sweep across the Cōla province in triumph. Jananāṭhapura (modern Malingi), opposite Talakāḍ on the other side of the Kaveri, was captured. Gaṅgarāja's assistant Pūnisa dandaṇāṭyaṇakara reduced Nīlāgiri, defeated its ruler Kāḷapāla and carried his arms as far as Kērāla. Another division of the army marched across Koṅgu.

On reaching Sankerl, the Cengiri of the inscriptions effected the deposition of an unfriendly Adigaramn chief and put in his place another Patti Perumāla, more friendly to the conqueror. In the east, Irungōla, the lord of Rodda and chief of Sire-nāḍ in modern Turnkur district, was conquered and Vallūr and Tereyūr reduced. Irungōla was obviously the Teḻugu-Cōda chieftain of Nīḍugal who had been friendly to the Cōla power.

This was followed by the capture in succession of Kolar and Naṅgilī and of Koyāṭṭūr in the Punganūr zamindari of Chittoor district, which appears to have marked the real limit of the Hōysāla advance in the east, though Viṣṇuvardhana is often described in the inscriptions as having captured Kāṇcī and squeezed the southern Madhūrāpura in the palm of his hand, besides advancing as far as Rameswaram. But we hear that sometime before 1122, a temple at Āduturγai in Trichinopoly district suffered in consequence of the "war of Periyaavaḍugan" when the images of gods and nāyanaṁs were removed by the invaders, most probably Hōysāla forces, and sought to be carried to Dorasamudra. These were rescued and reinstated in the temple by a band of Pāḷlis who also undertook to bear the expenses of the worship to be offered to these images and received special honours in the temple in recognition of their heroism and liberali ties.

This evidence of a Hōysāla raid into the heart of the Cōla country gives some colour to Viṣṇuvardhana's claim that he marched up to Rameswaram. In any case, the disappearance from the Karnataka country of Kulōttunga's inscriptions after his forty-fifth year (1115) is sufficient proof that Gaṅgavāḍi passed under the Hōysālas about that time. But even here the reappearance of Vikrama Cōla's inscriptions in the Kolar region shows that the Cōlas managed either to retain or recover part of the province.

Besides Gaṅgarāja and Pūnisa, there was another Hōysāla general known as Irumāṇa dandaṇāṭyaṇakara Bittiyaṃma who took part in the Cōla war. When he was still very young, he is said to have burnt Rājarājapura (Taḷakāḍ).

26. ibid, III, Ml. 31; V, Bl. 58.
27. ibid, IV, Ng. 76.
28. ibid, IV, Ch. 83.
29. ibid, XII, Sl. 7.
30. ibid, V, Ak. 30; VI, Cm. 160.
31. ARE, 1913, II, 48-47 and ARSIE, 35 of 1913.
and strewn the battlefield with the brains of the elephants of the Kongu army. He also uprooted brave kings on the shores of the ocean, captured Nilācala and cut off the head of king Kaḷa.\textsuperscript{32} These are clearly references to events in Gaṅgarāja’s campaigns against the Cōḷa Viṣṇuvardhana, Gaṅgarāja celebrated his victory against the Cōḷa by the consecration of two Viṣṇu images in 1117, viz., of Kirtinārāyaṇa at Talakāḍi and of Vijayanārāyaṇa at Beḷūr. Tradition credits him with having set up three other Nārāyaṇa images at Mellekōṭe, Toṇṇūr and either Gadag or Guṇḍūlpet.\textsuperscript{33} When the Cōḷa war was drawing to a close, Viṣṇuvardhana renewed his aggression in another direction and started a war against the Pāṇḍyas of Uccaṅgi and their allies, the Kadambas of Banavāsi. In 1116 he gained a victory against the Pāṇḍya (known only by the title of his suzeraṇ Tribhuvanamalla) at Dumme on the western borders of Chitradurga district.\textsuperscript{34} Vikramāditya VI either did not or could not go to the aid of his feudatory. The Pāṇḍya seems to have held his own, and evidently Viṣṇuvardhana did not have everything his own way though he succeeded in forcing his will on the Pāṇḍya for a time as we shall see. In fact, the Pāṇḍyas kept up their independence almost till the end of the century when they were finally overthrown by Ballāḷa II. There were other campaigns directed against the Pāṇḍyas in the reign of Viṣṇuvardhana himself but there is no means of deciding whether they followed immediately after Dumme, or after an interval. It seems likely that some of them at least must be assigned to the period after the close of Cāḷukya Vikramāditya’s reign in 1127. They may, however, be noted here together for convenience. Uccaṅgi itself, the capital of the Nolambavāḍi province, was stormed by general Cāmādeva\textsuperscript{35} and, in another engagement at Emmaganūr, the Pāṇḍyan armies were defeated by Sāmantā Caḷṭṭa.\textsuperscript{36} The huge forces of the Pāṇḍya resembling the rolling sea are vaguely said to have been dried up by the heroism of general Boppa.\textsuperscript{37} Pāṇḍyan inscriptions run in a series up to 1128 and begin again in 1143, and in 1137 Uccaṅgi is counted among the rajadhanis of Viṣṇuvardhana. These facts show that in spite of reverses, the Pāṇḍyas held their own as long as Vikramāditya VI was alive and suffered a setback thereafter.\textsuperscript{38} Even the occupation of the Pāṇḍya capital by Viṣṇuvardhana seems to have been an episode with no permanent results. His inscriptions are not found in Nolambavāḍi and evidently he was never able to establish his authority firmly over the province. The title Nolambavāḍi-gonda\textsuperscript{39} assumed as early as 1113 had thus little foundation in fact at any time throughout the reign

\textsuperscript{32} EC, IV, Hs. 137; V, Bl. 17.
\textsuperscript{33} MAR, 1912, paras 22 and 83.
\textsuperscript{34} EC, VI, Cm. 99.
\textsuperscript{35} Ibid, XII, Ck. 29.
\textsuperscript{36} Ibid, XII, Ck. 35; MAR, 1910, para 76.
\textsuperscript{37} Ibid, 1925, p 40, ins. 30.
\textsuperscript{38} Pāṇḍyan ins. of 1128, EC, XI, Dg. 90; XII, Tp. 14 for Uccaṅgi as rajadhāni.
\textsuperscript{39} EC, V, Hn. 149; MAR, 1913, para 75.
of Viṣṇuvardhana. It simply registered his unwillingness to respect the integrity of the Pândyan power and furnished a pretext for his hostilities against it. Inscriptions which speak of his capture of Masavāḍī (parts of modern Harpanahāḷi, Hadagali and Raichur) and of Kummaṭa\(^{40}\) are doubtless greatly exaggerating the achievements of the Hoyśāḷa monarch in this direction.

After his conquest of Gaṅgavāḍī from the Cōḷas, Viṣṇuvardhana was not content with the position of a feudatory in the Cāḷukya empire. He began to proclaim his new-born ambition by his attacks on some of the other feudatories; he also carried on intrigues with others against the suzerain. The renewal of his war against the Pândyas was thus part of a wider plan. Its scope is understood from the inscriptions which describe the boundaries of his empire as going up to Kāṇci on one side and the Perdore (big river, ie, Krishna) in the North. In the pursuit of his ambition Viṣṇuvardhana spent many years in hard fighting and at one time even seems to have come very near realising it. But the ancient house of the Cāḷukyas was represented at the time by a ruler of uncommon ability, Vikramāditya VI, who exacted a heavy price from Viṣṇuvardhana for his attempt at independence and effectively checked the completion of his designs.

One of the earliest events in the direct conflict between the Cāḷukya emperor and his mighty Hoyśāḷa vassal was the battle of Kaṇṇegāḷa, fought in Hassan taluq in the heart of the Hoyśāḷa home country. It is mentioned in an inscription of 1118,\(^{41}\) which states that the celebrated Gaṅgarāja put to flight twelve generals of the emperor in a well-planned night attack.

Another undated record, a vīraqāḷ (hero-stone) also alludes to a Hoyśāḷa victory against Bhogachāṭṭa, the general of the Baḷḷāḷa, and this may well refer to the same campaign.\(^{42}\) The battle might have taken place sometime earlier than the date of the inscription which mentions it and might have been the result of Vikramāditya’s efforts to relieve his Pândya feudatory. The scene of the battle in the heart of the Hoyśāḷa home territory may well be taken to explain the failure of Viṣṇuvardhana to pursue his victory at Dumme immediately. But he soon renewed his aggression in another direction, and the Gaṅgas of Maṇḍali and the Kadambas of Hāṅgal, both feudatories in the Cāḷukyan province of Banavāsi, were chosen for attack. The Hoyśāḷa general Boppāṇa led the attack against Tribhuvanamalla Bhujabala Permačideva of Maṇḍali and fought a great battle at Halasūr in 1120-21 in which the Gaṅga’s son Nanni Gaṅga lost his life.\(^{43}\) This was accompanied by incursions into Banavāsi country which started a longdrawn conflict with the Kadambas. The Gaṅgas of Maṇḍali had to acknowledge Hoyśāḷa supremacy.

The successes of Viṣṇuvardhana appear to have roused the ambition of

\(^{40}\) *Ibid*, IV, Ng. 70; V, Bl. 124.

\(^{41}\) *Ibid*, II, SB. 73(59).

\(^{42}\) *MAR*, 1913, para 75.

\(^{43}\) *EC*, VI, Sh. 12, 15, 4.
other feudatories in the Cālukya empire, and the Kadamba Jayakēśi II of Goa, either independently or more likely in collusion with the Hoysāla ruler, began to entertain ideas of independence. It was time for Vikramāditya VI to make his power felt by his rebellious vassals, and he had many loyal feudatories to assist him in his task, particularly the Sindas of Yelubārga, Ācūgi II and his son Perma. With their aid, the Cālukya emperor dislodged Viṣṇuvardhana from his advanced positions in the north, and then turned against Jayakēśi II to secure his rear. Goa was sacked and burnt, but the campaign was concluded by an alliance with Jayakēśi sealed by his marriage with a daughter of the emperor, Mailaladevi, who is seen holding joint rule with him in the Goa kingdom in 1124.44 The Pāṇḍya who had joined the Hoysāla voluntarily or otherwise was pursued and pressed with great rigour. And Viṣṇuvardhana found himself compelled not only to withdraw from all his fresh acquisitions in the north, but to seek safety in the mountain fastnesses and passes of his home territory where he was pursued in strength by the imperial troops.

We learn from an inscription45 that Permaḍīdeva went to the mountain passes of the marauder Bittiga, plundered him, besieged Dorasamudra and pursused him till he took the city of Bēḷapura. A fragmentary inscription46 bearing no date mentions a battle at Hoseviḍu in which, in spite of the fierce fight put up by the Hoysāla forces, victory was decided with Permaḍīdeva, either Vikramāditya VI himself or his Sinda feudatory. Vikramāditya himself was encamped at Banavāsi in 1122-23,47 and it is clear that after settling affairs farther north, he had come down south to guide the operations against Viṣṇuvardhana if not lead them himself. Thus, Viṣṇuvardhana had to eat humble pie and abandon his grandiose schemes at least for sometime. But there is no doubt that he had come very near complete success in his designs until his suzerain curbed him. This is clear from Vikramāditya assuming the title Viṣṇuvardhana in token of his triumph over the Hoysāla ruler,48 a procedure usually reserved for an independent monarch subjugated for the first time.

The death of Vikramāditya VI in 1126-27 gave Viṣṇuvardhana a free hand and he renewed his incursions into Kadamba territory. Māṇḍalika Masanāyya, the feudatory of Taila II of Hāṅgal, offered stout resistance to the Hoysāla forces, and many viragals attest the fall of soldiers in the fight49 and possibly of Taila himself. Once again the Cālukya emperor, now Sōmēśvara III, went to the aid of his hard-pressed feudatory (1130) and fixed his camp at Hŭluniya-tīrtha in Shikarpur taluq of Shimoga district,50 and Viṣṇuvardhana
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was compelled to quell his ardour for a time. Three years later he renewed his efforts with greater vigour, and defeated and slew Masanayya in battle. Simultaneously, he attacked the Kadamba ruler of Goa and proved a "terrible gale to the cloud Jayakēśi". In 1135 he put his two year old Narasimha in nominal charge of his ancestral dominions and himself proceeded north for a final trial of strength with his enemies in that quarter. From the very next year, inscriptions affirm that Viṣṇuvardhana destroyed Masanā. He also annexed Banavāsi-12000, pursued Jayakēśi and gained possession of Paḷāsige-12000 and Hayve-500. But there was prolonged fighting which lasted almost till the end of Viṣṇuvardhana's reign.

His hold over these northern territories was never strong, though his armies were in constant occupation of these lands and engaged in incessant fighting. From 1137 onwards, Viṣṇuvardhana resided practically in Bankāpura and engaged in many fights with the Kadamba rulers of Hāṅgal and Goa. Taila II himself seems to have died during a siege of Hāṅgal in 1135. The Hāṅgal territories were plundered again in 1137 and Hāṅgal itself besieged once more in 1138. We hear of another skirmish ending in a victory for the Hoysāḷa in 1139 after which Bankāpura and Hāṅgal came to be counted among his rājadhānis by Viṣṇuvardhana.

The year 1140 might be taken to mark the zenith of Viṣṇuvardhana's successes against the Kadambas, for in that year we find him resident with his queen Bambaladevi at Hāṅgal. He also appointed his own governor to collect the royal dues from the province of Banavāsi, a right which belonged to the then Cālukya emperor Jagadēkamalla II. But in the same year, Jayakēśi II attacked Hāṅgal, when Viṣṇuvardhana was absent at Bankāpura. And three years later, the combined forces of the Kadambas and Cālukyas inflicted a defeat on the Hoysāḷa in 1143, and the emperor Jagadēkamalla II resumed the practice of appointing his own governor over the Banavāsi province, where his authority came once more to be acknowledged by feudatories. Despite reverses, Viṣṇuvardhana seems to have retained his hold on Bankāpura till the end of his reign and certainly kept up his pretence to rule the entire country up to the Krishna.

Elsewhere the Cengāluvas, who held sway over parts of Coorg and our Hunsur taul of Mysore district and were at first feudatories of the Cōḷa power, felt the weight of Hoysāḷa arms after the disappearance of the Cōḷa
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power from Karnataka. The earliest Hoysala inscription in Hunsur is a *viragol*
of about 1126.61 Four years later, Vishnuvardhana sent an expedition against
Wainad, next to Coorg; it attacked Hanneraçubidu in Cengaluvu territory.62
This expedition seems to have been directed against the Kongaluvas, as
can be seen from an inscription of the same date referring to Vishnuvardhana
as a wild-fire to the forest, viz., the Kongaluva king.63 Towards the close
of Vishnu’s reign, another battle with the Cengaluvas is mentioned and the
king is said to have routed a confederacy of hill chiefs in 1145.64 Goyideva,
the younger brother of Sāmanta Caṭṭa, and the young prince Narasimha
took part in the campaign which ended in the defeat and death of the
Cengaluvu king on the battlefield.65 Occupying an easily defended hilly
country, the Cengaluvas thus proved a constant source of trouble to
Vishnuvardhana throughout his reign.

The reign of Vishnuvardhana was thus full of war and strife due to the
restless ambition of the monarch. The lateness of some of the records and
the confused chronology of the others renders the task of presenting a
connected account of even the major wars of the reign next to impossible.
There is also much evidence in several other inscriptions not noticed here
that the inhabitants of the Hoysala kingdom did not enjoy undisturbed
peace for long, and that border raids, cattle lifting, and quarrels among
the feudatory chieftains were matters of everyday occurrence. And there is
little evidence forthcoming on the details of the daily government of the
kingdom and the condition of the people.

Tradition avers that Vishnuvardhana was originally a Jain and that he
was converted to the Vaisnava faith by the great reformer Rāmānuja who
had fled from the persecution of the Cōla monarch and taken up residence
at Yāḍāvapura (Tonṇūr).66 Jain tradition gives the date of conversion as
Śaka 1039 (1117) and this does not seem unlikely. The chronology of the
Vaisnava accounts is very uncertain and no account is free from legends.
There is much indirect confirmation from the epigraphy of Rāmānuja’s stay
in Karnataka, and the Jain admission that Bīḍiga deserted their religion
for Viṣṇuism cannot easily be set aside. With whatever reservations, therefore,
the conversion of Bīḍiga must be accepted as a historical fact and the
establishment of the two Nārāyaṇa images of Taḷakāṭ and Beḷūr must have
followed soon after.67

Śantalādevi, daughter of Periya Pergade Mārasiṅgayya, was the chief
queen of Viṣṇuvardhana. She is described as *pertiya raṣi* (senior queen) and

---
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pattamahadevi (crowned queen-consort) who was perfect in song, music and dance. She was a lay disciple of the Jaina teacher Prabhacandra-Siddhantadeva and she died in 1131. She earned the title udvrtta-savati-gandhavara, a “rutting elephant to ill-mannered co-wives”, and seems to have gloriéd in the title as she built a Jaina temple called Savati-gandhavara Jina laya at Srawana-Belgola. Her place was taken after her death by Laksmadevi, mother of Narasimha I. 68

Despite his continuous wars against the feudatories of the Calukya empire, Vishnuyardhana continued to recognise Calukya suzerainty long after the death of Vikramaditya VI and perhaps right up to the end of his reign. In 1137 he is described in an inscription as Calukya-manimandalika-Cudamani, “crest jewel among the feudatory chief-tains of the jewel of the Calukyas”, and employs the characteristic feudal expression tatpaddapadmopajivy, “dependent at the lotus feet of the suzerain”, in describing his relation to his overlord. That this was, however, not much more than a formality may be inferred from the employment of the full imperial style of independent sovereignty and the dating of records in his own regnal years in many records, though the Calukya-Vikrama era is also cited in them sometimes. The position was not clearly defined, but on the whole closer to independence than subordination.

The duration of Vishnuyardhana’s reign is involved in much obscurity. His records seem to run in a series up to 1152 69 or even later and yet an inscription from Nagamangala bearing the date 1145 refers to Vishnuyardhana’s son Narasimha as ruling after that great monarch (a mahanubhavana baliyam). 70 The suggestion that Vishnuyardhana ruled alone till 1145 and associated his son in the rule after that date is precluded by the statements in other inscriptions that Narasimha began to rule from the very day he was born. 71 As a child, he was put in formal charge of the kingdom during his father’s absence in the north in 1135. Rice held that Vishnuyardhana died at Bankapura in 1141 on the strength of an inscription from Havali recording the death of Hiriya-arasa Bitidiva at Bankapura, the removal of his body in some place, a fight on the occasion ending in the death of a soldier followed by the setting up of a hero-stone bearing the record and the gift of some land to the son of the fallen man with the sanction of Narasimhadeva. But the fact that the record is dated in the reign of Vishnuyardhana himself clearly shows that Hiriya-arasa Bitidiva was not the Hoyasala monarch; and the suggestion of Rice that Vishnuyardhana’s death was kept a secret till Narasimha came of age is not only far-fetched and unconvincing, but contradicts the record itself which says that Narasimha
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was already ruling in some capacity and gave permission for a grant of land. And Narasimha’s inscriptions start in 1135 and offer no criterion for fixing the date of his father’s death.

NARASIMHA I (1152-73)

The reign of Hoyśāla Narasimha I, which lasted up to 1173, forms a more or less peaceful interlude between two war-like reigns—that of his father Viṣṇuvardhana and that of his son Ballāla II. His inscriptions indeed enumerate a string of countries as among his conquests, viz., Talakād, Koṅgu, Nāṅgli, Köyāṭūr and Uccāṅgī, sometimes giving place to Gaṅgavāḍī, Nolambavāḍī, Banavāsi and Hānūngal as well. However, since the list is the same as that given for Viṣṇuvardhana and there is nothing to indicate the need for a fresh conquest of all this territory, and since the list reappears in Ballāla II’s inscriptions too, we may assume with Fleet that it rests on the successes of Viṣṇuvardhana and has no historical value for subsequent reigns. The expression dāyāda dāvānala, forest-fire to his relatives, applied to him in one of the records is too vague to warrant the inference that his succession to the throne was disputed. In fact, he had been recognised as heir-apparent many years before his father’s rule came to an end. The reign of Narasimha witnessed in the suzerain court of Kalyāna that political revolution which resulted in the transfer of power from the Cālukyas to Kalacuri, Bijjala, and from about 1158-59 Narasimha began to feel the presence of Bijjala’s arm. Bijjala appointed his own governor over Banavāsi and began subjugating the mountain chiefs in the north-west of Kamataka, the Manḍali chief Nannaiya Gaṅga among them, in a “victorious expedition in the region of the south”. Many conflicts ensued along the line of the Tungabhadra. Among them, the famous Kalacuri commander Bamararasa sought to impose Kalacuri overlordship on Narasimha, but with indifferent success, as the Hoyśāla forces were able to hold their own in home territory and even inflict some reverses on the enemy. Gaṅgavāḍī proper, therefore, continued to remain Hoyśāla territory but Narasimha had to give up all pretensions to dominion north of that area and recognise once more Sāvimalai rather than Perdore (Krishna) as the northern limit of his territory. The expression daksāṇa-mahīmanḍala sometimes employed in the records to describe the area of his rule was taken by Fleet to apply to the entire country to the south of the Varadā and of the Tungabhadra river after the confluence of the Varadā with it. But the area was much more restricted as there are no inscriptions from Shimoga district that can properly be
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ascribed to Narasimha. The Kolar region would appear to have passed definitely under the Hoyśālas about 1153, and in another direction, that of Coorg, Narasimha’s general Bokkaṇa led a punitive expedition to Cengāluva territory and re-established Hoyśāla supremacy in that quarter in c. 1155.

Towards the close of his reign differences seem to have risen between Narasimha and his son Ballāla II, and hero-stones bearing the date 1172 mention the names of soldiers in Narasimha’s forces who fell in fights with the army of Kumāra Ballāladeva who had risen in arms against his father. The cause of the rebellion and the manner of its termination are untraceable. It is clear, however, that the Kongāluvas and Cengāluvas of Coorg made common cause with the rebel prince and that Tantrapāla Hemmādiyanāna played a part in restoring mutual understanding between Narasimha and his son, which was followed by the coronation of the latter as king on 22 July 1173. The queen of Narasimha, who bore Ballāla II, was named Ecaladevi. Among the important officers of state in his reign was Huillā described as mahāpradhāna, sarvādhi-kāri, hirya-bhandāri and danaṇāyaaka, and reputed as a prominent supporter of Jainism. He is also mentioned in the records of the next reign as a prominent and loyal officer of Ballāla II.

Ballāla II (1173-1220/30)

The coronation of Ballāla II, better known as Vira Ballāla, on the 22 July 1173 was signalled by profuse gifts to the learned and endowments to religious institutions. He had been declared yuvarāja many years earlier, long before his rebellion against his father, and his inscriptions begin to appear from 1154 onwards. His reign was marked by unprecedented success and glory; he was the first Hoyśāla to raise his family to the status of a sovereign ruling power. His dynasty was called the Ballālas after him and his kingdom the Ballāla kingdom.

Early in his reign, he undertook operations against Vijaya Pāṇḍya, the ruler of Nolambavāći, and after a sanguinary battle on the banks of the Tungabhadra, captured his stronghold of Uccanṭi durg which had defied the Cōla king Narendra for twelve years. The campaign ended with the submission of Vijaya Pāṇḍya (also known as Kāma Pāṇḍya), and his
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restoration as a Hoyāla feudatory to rule his province. Since, according to Baliāla's claims, Uccanōhi had become his capital (rājadhanī) by 1177, the war must have ended before that date. This was, however, by no means the definite establishment of Baliāla's rule in Nolambavāḍi. Pāṇḍya inscriptions become rare after 1177, but one or two exist that show that the chiefs of Uccanōhi still owed allegiance to the Cāḷukya power in the 1180s, when there was a brief revival of that power under Sōmēśvara IV. Baliāla's rule became firmly established in these regions later in his reign about 1191, and Pāṇḍyan inscriptions altogether cease to appear soon after.

The epithets anivārasiddhi and giridurgamalla become prominent among Hoyāla titles from about this time onwards and some of Baliāla's inscriptions explain them as due to his having captured the hilly fortress of Uccanōhi on a Saturday. However, as these titles occur in the inscriptions of Bijjala and his successors as well, it seems more probable that they were first assumed by the Kalacuri and subsequently appropriated by the Hoyālas when they ousted the Kalacuri power from Nolambavāḍi.

The Kalacuri were usurpers of the Kalyāna throne, and Bijjala, the founder of the line and the only able ruler in it, had died some years before Baliāla II began his rule. He was succeeded by three of his sons in this order: Sōmēśvara (1167-75), Sāṅkama (1175-80) and Ānavamalla (1178-83). None of them were reputed for statesmanship or any martial ability. The campaign of Baliāla against Uccanōhi in Nolambavāḍi must have been directed as much against the Kalacuri ruler as against the Pāṇḍya. All the same, policy or necessity appears to have compelled Baliāla to recognise Kalacuri overlordship for a while, and Fleet notices a record of 1179 from Kaulur near Koppal around Hyderabad mentioning a gift to a temple by Baliāla and his senior queen Remmādevi in the fourth year of king Sāṅkamadēva.

Another record of the same year and month shows Sāṅkama himself encamped at Belagāmi a few days later, while one of his generals Kāvanayya distinguished himself by displacing the Hoyāla.

Glimpses into the events of the war are furnished by Hoyāla inscriptions of about the same date. A gallant soldier Babbeya-nāyaka fought bravely against Sāṅkama's forces and fell on the field of battle. Again, a little later, Hoyāla forces won a battle at Māṭavallī in which Sāṅkama's own elephant was disabled. The fort of Uddhre, modern Udri in Sorab taluq, was taken by Baliāla though at the cost of the life of one of his great
officers, Tōyi Sin'gēya Daṇṇāyaka by name. By 1181 the whole of Shimoga district had changed hands and passed under Ballāla, though the Kalacuri power lingered a few years longer in parts of Chitradurga district. All the important forts in the region like Guṭṭi (modern Candraguttī in Shikarpur taluq), Kelādi, famous afterwards as the capital of the nāyaks of Kēkēri or Bednr, and Bāṇḍanike (Bandalike) were taken by the Hoyśāḷas. Ballāla did not owe his successes, however, altogether to his military prowess and obviously adopted other means to break the enemy’s morale. We hear of general Recarasa, who once earned encomiums as the establishe of Bījāla’s power, now transferring his loyally to the Hoyśāḷa monarch. In fact, the Kalacuris had fallen on evil days and Recarasa was not the only deserter from their cause. A greater general Brahmadeva also left their service for that of the last Cālukya emperor Sōmēśvara IV on whose behalf he fought against Ballāla himself some years later.

The hard won success against the Kalacuris only landed Ballāla in further wars against even more powerful enemies in the north, viz., the newly restored power of the Cālukyas and that of the Sēṇas or Yādavas of Devagiri, the most formidable rivals of the Hoyśāḷas for the Cālukyan inheritance. But before tracing these developments, we should note that Ballāla made himself free to deal with them effectively by entering into a definite alliance with the contemporary Cōla emperor Kulōttuṅga III who had come to the throne in 1178. While Ballāla was engaged in war with the Pāṇḍyas of Uccāngī and the Kalacuri, the petty chiefs of the Kolar district on the frontier between the Hoyśāḷa and Cōla kingdoms showed an inclination to quarrel with the neighbouring Hoyśāḷa feudatories and engage in desultory raids on Hoyśāḷa territory. These chiefs owed a vague allegiance to the Cōla power, and an alliance with that power was the best means of rendering these chieftains innocuous when Ballāla was engaged in the pursuit of his ambitious designs on the northern frontier. The clue to Ballāla’s policy in this direction is furnished by a very significant inscription from Āvani in the Mulbagal taluq of Kolar district. It is dated in the twelfth regnal year of Kulōttuṅga III (about 1189) and states that Ballāladēva was ruling the earth at the time. Cōḷarāmahādevī, a queen of Ballāla, is also mentioned. It is clear that Ballāla married a Cōla princess to seal his alliance with Kulōttuṅga III. This alliance served its purpose very well and Ballāla was immune to any trouble in the rear while he was engaged in heavy fighting in the western Deccan. What is more, the beginning of Hoyśāḷa interest in the affairs of the Tamil kingdoms grew in importance with political consequences under the successors of Ballāla.
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THE HOYSĀLAS

We may turn now to the great campaigns which secured Ballāla II his position as the first independent ruler of the Hoyśāla line. Ballāla’s successes against the Kalacuris brought the Hoyśālas face-to-face with Cāḷukya Sōmeśvara IV and his great general Brahma Daṇḍanāyaka. Brahma had been in the service of the Kalacuris certainly till 1175, the year of Saṅkama’s accession, and possibly some time longer. But inscriptions bearing the dates 1184 and 1185 describe him as the general of Sōmeśvara IV and fire to the Kalacuri races. Elsewhere Brahma, with the aid of only one elephant, is said to have overcome sixty of the Kalacuris and thereby, with a gesture of contempt, to have drawn off from the Kshatriya family of the Kalacuris the prosperity they had owed to his father, Kāma or Kāvana. In 1185 Sōmeśvara IV bears the title Kalacurya-Kula-nirmūlana, uprooter of the Kalacuri race. Ballāla, on his side, wavered for a time in his allegiance to the Cāḷukya power represented by Jagadēkamalla II for some years in Chitradurga and Tumkur districts and by Sōmeśvara IV in Shimoga and the rest of the Cāḷukyan kingdom. Some of Ballāla’s inscriptions acknowledge the Cāḷukya hegemony while others describe him with full imperial titles, including even those of the Cāḷukyas such as samajabhubanāśraya and śīrṇthiśvallabha. But eventually his attitude settled down to definite hostility to the suzerain power, now exposed to depredations not only from the Hoyśālas in the south but from the Sēṇas of Devagiri in the north as well. An inscription of the fourth regnal year of Sōmeśvara IV (1183) mentions an attack on a village in Sorab taluq by Hoyśāla forces in which the women of the place are said to have suffered hardships. Possibly this was followed by the extension of Hoyśāla power into Masavādi, roughly including Hadagalli and Harpanahalli taluqs to the south of the Tungabhadra and parts of Raichur district on the other side, an area which had been occupied by Ballāla even under the Kalacuris. Meanwhile the aggressions of Sēṇa Bhillama from the north forced Sōmeśvara and his trusted general Brahma to abandon Kalyāṇa to the invader and go to the south. Consequently we find Sōmeśvara in Jayantipura (Banavasi) in 1186 and Kalyāṇa is not mentioned again in his inscriptions. The final encounter with Ballāla must have come within a few years thereafter and the only near contemporary reference we have to it occurs in the Gadag inscription of Ballāla II, where we read: that Brahma whose army was strengthened by an elephant corps, Ballāla overcame with only a cavalry division and deprived him of his kingdom. We do not know the place of the battle and though only the name of Sōmeśvara’s general and not that of Sōmeśvara himself appears
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in this account, this was the virtual end of the Cālukya empire.

After settling scores with Sōmesvara, the Hoyšāla monarch had to prepare for an encounter with the Sēuṇa Bhillama who was also busy, like Ballāla II, raising the political status and extending the territorial possessions of his family at the expense of the rapidly crumbling kingdom of the Kalacuris and Cālukyas. Some remarkable verses in the introduction to the Vratakhaṇḍa of Hemādri's great legal digest trace the course of Bhillama's conquests and describe him as the founder of Devagiri, the capital of the Sēuṇas. Among other things, we learn that Bhillama obtained the sovereignty of Kalyāṇa and put the lord of the Hoyšālas to death—Kalyānasūryam apyavāpya vidadhhe yo Hośālaśam vyasam. The identity of the Hoyšāla who suffered death at the hands of Bhillama is obscure in the extreme. He certainly was not Ballāla, and he could not have been Narasimha I, as R. G. Bhandarkar surmised, for Narasimha died fourteen years before the earliest date we know for Bhillama (1187). The final result of the conflict between Bhillama and Ballāla was very different from that implied in Hemādri's prāsasti, and possibly even the exact reverse of what he says. That in the beginning Bhillama's efforts were crowned with a large measure of success becomes clear from his inscriptions. An inscription of the third year of his reign (1189) at Anṅigere, and his Gadag inscription of June 1191 show not only that he held all the country north of the Malaprabha and Krishna rivers, but his sway extended to some districts lying south of those streams as well. But soon after the last mentioned date, Ballāla overthrew Bhillama in a decisive battle by which he "attained the lordship of the Kuntala country after destroying Jaitrasimha who was, as it were, the right arm of Bhillama". 

Not only Jaitrasimha, the minister of Bhillama, but Bhillama himself seems to have fallen on the battlefield. Though the Gadag inscription of Ballāla makes no mention of the fact, another record from Anṅigere dated ten years later seems to state that Bhillama himself was killed on this occasion and this is in conformity with the reign of Jaitugi I, the son of Bhillama, commencing in 1191-92. Again an inscription from Belur extols "Ballāla as having moistened his sword with the blood of the Pāndya king, whetted it on the grindstone (the head of Bhillama) and sheathed it in the mouth of Jaitugi". The meaning of the last statement will presently become clear. The scene of the battle lay near Soraṭūr, twelve miles south of Gadag, whence Ballāla pursued the beaten Sēuṇa forces to Lokkūṇḍi (Lakkūṇḍi,
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six miles east of Gadag), a distance of some sixteen miles. Jaitugi with the remaining troops took refuge in the fortress of Lokkigundi, which “with high ramparts, lofty bastions and astonishing flag staves” looked proof against all attack. But Ballāla took even this stronghold and Jaitugi had to come to terms with the victor. Ballāla was still in his vijaya-skandhāvara (victorious camp) at Lokkigundi, when his Gadag inscription of 1192 was written and stayed there for some time longer.116

More details of the campaign are furnished by later inscriptions.117 The army of the Sēuna king consisted of two hundred thousand men with twelve thousand cavalry, and was pursued by Vira Ballāla from Soratūr to the banks of the Krishnavena and was destroyed there. Ballāla also reduced a number of forts including Erambarage (Yelubarga in Raichur district of Kamataka); Halluve (Hallur in the Rameswaram taluq of Dharwar) referred to also as Vijayasamudra and Vijayapura on the banks of the Tungabhadra in Hoyśāla inscriptions; Manuve; Raṭṭahaḷḷi (in Hirekum taluq), Beḷḷattige (possibly Beluhatte near Lakshmesvar), and Virātanakoṭe (Hāngal). Hāngal must have been taken from the Kadamba ruler Kāmadeva, who had evidently allied himself with Bhillama. Another ally of Bhillama, the Gutta ruler Vikramāditya II of Guttal (in Dharwar), also felt the weight of Ballāla’s arm about the same time. At the end of the war Ballāla found himself master of all the territory south of the Krishna and Malaprabha rivers, thus realising the ambitious dreams of his grandfather Viṣṇuvardhana. With pardonable exaggeration, Ballāla’s inscriptions about this time claim that after the destruction of the Sēuna forces his rule extended up to Kalyāṇa.118

Other records register even better claims such as that he ruled over all Kuntala, and over the whole of the Raṭṭa country or even all the land from Himālaya to Setu.119 A literary work, Rukmini Kalyāṇa, states that Ballāla caused the fame of the Sēunas to vanish in the waters of the Godavari.120 Such hyperbole apart, there is no doubt that the year 1191 marked the highest point attained by Ballāla’s achievement and fame. Accordingly, he established a new era of his own rule as paramount sovereign counting 1191-92 as the first year of the reckoning and adopted the full imperial style with titles like samastabhuvanāśraya, śriprthivivallabha, mahārajaśchira, paramesvara and paramabhaṭṭāraka, and the style of pratāpacakravartin, bhujabala-cakravartin, Hoyśāla-cakravartin and Yādava-cakravartin with many variations in the manner of their combination. He maintained this position intact for the rest of his reign in spite of reverses: “it was enjoyed also, though with a more limited extent of territory, by his successors”.121
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TERRITORIES RULED BY THE HOYSĀLAS

Territories ruled by the Hoysālas. It must be observed that the bold line indicates the farthest known boundaries of all the Hoysāla kings: "no one of these ruled all the areas."
In fact, Ballāla seems to have had only a short respite after his resounding victories and his troubles in the newly conquered territory began within a few years. The Kadamba Kāmadeva of Hāngal was the first to raise his head, and his efforts were soon seconded by the warlike Sēuṇa ruler Śīṅghaṇa, a grandson of Bhillama. An inscription at Hāngal dated September-October 1196 records that king Vira Ballāla II had pitched his camp near a large tank on the west of Hāngal and besieged the city. He was defeated and repulsed for the time by Kāmadeva’s forces under his general Sohani who, however, lost his life in the battle. The hero-stone (vīragal) on which this inscription is engraved also bears a vivid description of battle scenes. In 1203 the Kadamba ruler was still warring not unsuccessfully with Ballāla’s forces, and by this time Śīṅghaṇa had come to, occupy the Sēuṇa throne or at least begun to play an active part in retrieving the position lost by Bhillama after the battle of Soraṭūr. Although Śīṅghaṇa’s accession is usually placed in 1210, there are inscriptions of his pointing to a date much nearer 1200 for the event. This combination of the youthful Śīṅghaṇa with Kāmadeva evidently proved too much for Ballāla. In 1205, 1207 and 1208 several villages in Sorab taluq of Shimoga district suffered from Kadamba raids, and by 1211 the whole of Banavāsi-12000 passed into Kāmadeva’s hands and he penetrated still further south as far as Birū.

Śīṅghaṇa himself joined the fray soon after, and carrying fire and sword into the region already harried by Kāmadeva, advanced in force up to Arsikere in the heart of the home territory of the Hōysāḷas, less than 50 kms south-east of Birū in the Kadūr district. A general Mahādeva Daṇḍanāyaka by name is known to have carried on the defence of the Hōysāḷa kingdom, but with no conspicuous success. The provenance of the inscriptions of the two protagonists, Ballāla and Śīṅghaṇa, clearly reveals the loss of territory which Ballāla had to put up with as a result of Śīṅghaṇa’s hostility. The last inscription which mentions Vijayasamudra (Ranebennur taluq) as the residence of Ballāla is dated 1210. By 1215 Sikarpūr and Honnāli and perhaps also Masavādi had been lost to the conqueror, though the earliest record of Śīṅghaṇa’s suzerainty over Masavādi seems to occur only in 1228. Thus, towards the close of his reign,

122. *ibid*, p 563.
123. *BK*, 51 and 55 of 1929 and 498 of 1915, the two first yielding 1199-1200 and the last 1204. In fact, Śīṅghaṇa II succeeded Bhillama in 1199-1200 in the northern parts of the erstwhile Cāḷukya kingdom and occupied the southern regions by about 1210 by ousting Ballāla from this region (see also Chapter IV above). This is indicated by the records of Śīṅghaṇa which give a wide range of dates for the commencement of his rule (cf. S. H. Ritti, *The Sēuṇas*, pp 12f.).
125. *ibid*, Sb. 403-4, 376, 4, and V, Ak. 137.
126. *MAR*, 1927, no 156 (n.d.).
Ballāla could retain only a very small portion of the extensive territory he had acquired in the north as a result of his wars with the Kalacuris, Cālukyas and Sēunas.

An old disillusioned man, Ballāla installed his son Narasimha II on the throne in 1220 and retired from active political life.\(^{128}\) Inscriptions continue to mention him occasionally for about a decade longer and the exact year of his death is not easy to ascertain.\(^{129}\) Two of his queens, Remmādevī and Cōlāmāhādevī, have been mentioned already. Another paṭṭa-mahādevī (senior queen) was Ketaladevi who, like Remmādevī, also figures in a Masavāḍi inscription. Yet another senior queen was Tūḷuvaḷa Mahādevī mentioned in 1189. The name of Narasimha II's mother was Padmāladevi, as we learn from an inscription of that monarch at Hanhar bearing the date 1224.\(^{130}\) Both successes and failures of Ballāla were quite remarkable and they settled the lines of policy for his successors. While they continued to retain the independent position he had secured for the dynasty by his prowess, they learnt the lesson of Ballāla's ultimate failure against the Sēunas and, taking advantage of the Tamil connections started by him, they developed an active interest in the affairs of the Tamil kingdoms in the south which offered ample scope for the exercise of their arms as well as of their diplomacy.

**Narasimha II (1220-33/34)**

Narasimha II, also known as Vira Narasimha, had been associated with the government as yuva-raja at least since 1209.\(^{131}\) The festivities that attended his coronation in April 1220 find particular mention in a number of inscriptions.\(^{132}\) Some of his records in the Tamil districts seem, however, to count the commencement of his reign a couple of years earlier.\(^{133}\) In fact, the earliest notable public act of Narasimha on record is his expedition southwards into the Tamil country directed against the rising power of the new Pāṇḍya ruler Māravarman Sundara Pāṇḍya I and for the defence of the aged Cōla power Kulottuṇga III with whom Ballāla II had concluded a political and dynastic alliance some years earlier.

The long-standing feud between the Cōla emperors and their Pāṇḍya vassals had taken a decided turn for the worse from the suzerain's point of view after the accession of Māravarman Sundara I in 1216. The new ruler was an able warrior bent upon avenging the insults heaped upon him and his elder brother Jāṭāvarman Kulasēkhara when Kulottuṇga invaded their country, seized their capital and demolished their coronation hall. Soon after his accession, Sundara marched into the Cōla country in strong
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force\(^{134}\) and threatened the Cōla empire with utter ruin. Kulötturūṅga naturally appealed to Baḷīḷā II who responded by sending out Narasimhā against the Pāṇḍya invader. The Hoysāḷa inscriptions that mention this expedition begin in 1217-18, and they bestow on Narasimhā the titles Maṇgarā-ṝaja-nimūlana and Kaḍava-kula-kālāntaka in addition to Cōla-ṝaja-pratīṣṭhācārya and Pāṇḍyaratṟaḷyakolahāla.\(^{135}\) It seems probable, therefore, that the Pāṇḍya was in league with the ruler of the Maṇgarā kingdom, a new principlality that had come up on the banks of the Pennar in Salem and south Arcot districts, and the Kaḍava Kopperūṅjīṅga, a chieftain of Pallava extraction who was just rising into prominence in the region lying to the east of the Maṇgarā kingdom. After dealing effectively with the opposition of these chieftains who blocked his way to the south, Narasimhā is said to have marched upon Śrīrangam, thereby threatening the rear of the Pāṇḍya forces in the Cōla country and the security of the home territory of the Pāṇḍya. The intervention was effective. Sundara retreated and entered into a settlement with the Cōla monarch who was summoned from his exile to the Pāṇḍya camp at Pon-Amaravati and restored to the rule of his kingdom. The return of the conquered country is mentioned in Pāṇḍya inscriptions from the third regnal year of Sundara (1218-19) onwards.

After he began his rule as king, Narasimhā evidently continued to keep up his interests in the Cōla kingdom which he had rescued from extinction by the Pāṇḍya power at the close of his father’s reign. The presence of his officers in different parts of the Cōla country is attested by inscriptions. Around 1226 a servant of Somaladevi, the queen of Narasimhā and mother of the heir-apparent, Sōmeśvara endowed a lamp at Tirugokarnam in Pudukkottai. A year later, a similar endowment is recorded at Kaḷiṣṭhūṭipuram from Bācaladevi, daughter of Bhūṭadeya-nāyaka of Dorasamudra.\(^{136}\) Āmmanā, Goppaya and Vallaya are the names of Narasimhā’s generals who bestowed endowments on temples at Kaḷiṣṭhūṭipuram and Tirumalavādī in 1230, 1231 and 1236.\(^{137}\) Narasimhā himself is said to have gone over to Kaḷiṣṭhūṭipuram, stayed there for some time and, before returning to his capital in 1229, left a section of his forces behind. He and his son Someśvara were said to be ruling from Koṇṇanūr, Kaḷiṣṭhūṭipuram and Paṅcāla in the Cōḷaṇāḍ in 1228.\(^{138}\) The Köyilōṭugū, a legendary chronicle of the Śrīrangam temple, mentions the construction of a maṇḍapa in the temple by Narasimhā.\(^{139}\) In a record of 1223, Narasimhā II is said to have pursued the king of Trīkaliṅga and penetrated his train of elephants displaying unexampled valour.\(^{140}\) The
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ruler of Trikaliṅga at this period was Aniyanka Bhīma III, whose forces seem to have advanced into the Tamil country as far as Śrīrangaṅam about the same date. From an inscription of Maṇavarman Sundara Pāṇḍya dated 1225, we learn that the Oḍḍas (people of Orissa) had been in military occupation of Śrīrangaṅam and its neighbourhood for two years, appropriating for themselves all the rich revenues of the shrine and impeding the proper conduct of worship in it, before Sundara Pāṇḍya drove them out and enabled the authorities of the temple to restore the old order.

Another record of the tenth year, most likely of Rājarāja III and hence of 1226, states that some time before Narasimha Hoyśāla had destroyed the country round about Tiruvāṭatturai in Vridhaṅcalam taluq of south Arcot, he desecrated temples and carried away the images of gods. This area formed part of the territory which Kopperuṅiṅga, the enemy of Narasimha and Rājarāja, had made his own. We may conclude that the Kāḍava rebel had persuaded the adventurous ruler of Orissa to come to his aid and that Narasimha undertook a campaign against both of them together in 1223-24. The site of Narasimha's encounter with the Kaliṅga elephant corps is not known, but the enemy forces were not stopped in their advance into the Cōla country and succeeded in securing a lodgement in Śrīrangaṅam for a time. Their atrocities at the famous shrine brought swift retribution from the powerful Pāṇḍya ruler Sundara. But they seem to have lingered in the region of Kāṅcipurām for some years longer and the victory claimed by Narasimha's soldiers (vīra-bhēruṅḍas) in 1230 against an enemy force as strong as the Vindhyas was most likely won against them. In an inscription of 1236 Aniyanka Bhīma recognises Rājarāja's supremacy in Kāṅcipuram.

The able but aged Cōla monarch Kulottuṅga III quit the throne, and possibly also the world, soon after Sundara Pāṇḍya's restoration of the Cōla country. The new ruler, Rājarāja III, who counted his regnal years from 1216, exhibited few traits of ability or statesmanship. Not only did he fail to arrest the influx of Hoyśāla officers and arms in different parts of his still extensive kingdom, but he overrated the value of their presence so far as to provoke a fresh conflict with his Pāṇḍyan suzerain. By withholding his annual tribute to that monarch and despatching an army to invade his territory, he provoked a war with Sundara Pāṇḍya which soon took a disastrous turn. Abandoning his capital and his family to the tender mercies of the invading enemy, he sought to reach the Hoyśāla forces stationed in Kāṅcipuram. However, he was prevented from gaining his object by the Kāḍava chieftain Kopperuṅiṅga, the Pāṇḍyan ally, who took him captive after a fight at Teliṟṟu and imprisoned him in the strong fortress of Šendamaṅgalam in south Arcot, the seat of Kāḍava power.
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When Narasimha got news of these occurrences in 1230-31, his one aim was to rush to the aid of his ally and justify the title he had already earned of Cōla-rāja-sthāpanācārya. So he left his capital, overwhelmed the ruler of the Magara kingdom who obstructed his path, captured a number of his elephants and quickly reached the banks of the Kaveri in a few days. He fixed his camp at Paccūr, about 4 kms to the north of the Coleroon opposite Śrīrangam. From there he despatched two generals, Appanā and Samudra Goppayya, with orders to carry destruction into the country of Kopperuṇjiṅga and reinstate the Cōla emperor on his throne. Accordingly, the two commanders sacked Elleri and Kalliyūr-mūlai held by Kopperuṇjiṅga, and Toludagaiyū held by Śolakan, evidently one of his lieutenants, and killed some of the mudaḷis of Rājarāja and Parākramabāhu of Śrī Lanka who had joined the enemy. Then, after offering worship at the shrine of Chidambaram, they devastated many places such as Toṇḍamāṇallūr, Tiruvadī, and Tiruvakkarai to the south of the river Vāraṇavāsī (Gaḍilam) and east of Śendamaṅgamal. They literally carried out the instructions they had received from Narasimha by burning crops, capturing women and plundering people. Finally, they made preparations to invest Śendamaṅgamal, when Kopperuṇjiṅga sent word to Narasimha that he was ready to restore Rājarāja III to liberty and his throne. Narasimha transmitted the offer to his generals, who thereupon received the Cōla emperor with honour and accompanied him back to his country.

Meanwhile Narasimha, who was also conducting operations against the Pāṇḍya monarch, inflicted a decisive defeat on him at Mahendrāmaṅgamal on the Kaveri. Narasimha compelled him to accept the terms dictated to him, which included the restoration of Rājarāja to the Cōla throne and mutual friendship among the three royal houses sealed by marriages of which the details are not known though we find later that Sōmēśvara, the son of Narasimha, is called māmadi (usually meaning maternal uncle or father-in-law) by the successors of both Māravarman Sundara Pāṇḍya I and Rājarāja III. The Hoyśaḷa war against Kopperuṇjiṅga, however, seems to have continued for some more years and Sōmēśvara is seen encamped at Maṅgamal, about 16 kms south-west of the Kāḍava capital in the course of campaign against that chieftain in 1236.145

On his northern frontier, Narasimha had to face the constant aggression of the warlike Sēuna king, Siṅghana, who had already deprived Baḷḷāla II of the best parts of his conquests in the north. Repeated skirmishes resulting from cattle raids became the order of the day, and though Narasimha is praised in his inscriptions for, some victories in which he is said to have slain generals like Vikrampaḷa and Pāvusa and dyed the waters of the Tungabhadra with the blood of the slain,146 the final result was by no means favourable to him. He had to leave the Sagar and Bellary areas, and his
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attempt to punish local chieftains like the Sinda of Belagavarti who went over to the side of Sīrghana met with no success.⁴⁴⁷ Hernādrī vaguely asserts that Sīrghana captured the whole of the territory protected by the Hoyśāla Ballālakṣitiśā-pāliśa-bhuvaṃ sarvapahāraśca yah. Sōmēśvara, who had become yuvarājasep⁴⁴⁸ by about 1228/29, is said to have led an attack against Kṛṣṇa the grandson of Sīrghana, who took part in his campaigns from a very early age. Another encounter with the same prince apparently met with better results and marked the early years of the reign of Sōmēśvara which began in 1233-34.

Sōmēśvara (1233/34-62)

The end of Narasimha II seems to be hinted at in a fragmentary Cōla inscription from Jambai in south Arcot.⁴⁴⁹ It is dated in the twenty-third year of Rājarāja III (1239) and states that Tikka went out (on war) in the month of Chittirai (April-March) of that year. Having stabbed Vallaḷādeva, he proceeded to Saṃbai (Jambai). From the date of the inscription we must conclude that this Vallaḷādeva could have been none other than Narasimha II. Tikka was the Telugu-Cōla ruler of Nellore, a vassal of Rājarāja III and a rival to the Hoyśālas for the title of "the establisher of the Cōla kingdom". His inscriptions are found in Kāncipūram from 1231, if not earlier⁴⁵⁰ and, evidently owing to his Cōla origin, he felt he had a better right to take up the Cōla cause against its enemies and incidentally keep out the growing influence of the Karnāṭakas in the Cōla country. In this plan he commanded the hearty support of the rising Cōla prince Rajendra III who was more able than his elder contemporary Rājarāja III and who, after some years, began to glory in the title of Cōla-kula-parbhava-nīrākaranā — the avenger of the humiliation of the Cōla dynasty. Seeing that the following decade (1240-50) is marked by the combined hostility of Tikka I and Rajendra III to Hoyśāla Sōmēśvara, it seems quite probable that this trend began a little earlier, and that Narasimha lost his life in the field in an attempt to check the new developments and retain the Cōla kingdom within the sphere of his own influence. He had saved the Cōla empire twice from extinction by the Pāṇḍya power and laid down his life in an endeavour to keep the position vis-a-vis the Cōla empire which he might have thought belonged to him by virtue of his services to it. His queen Kāḷaladeva was the mother of Sōmēśvara.

To come back to Sōmēśvara's war with Sīrghana, two stray inscriptions dated 1236-37 at Pandharpur and Hampi⁴⁵¹ speak of temporary successes won by the Hoyśāla ruler in his campaigns against the Sēuṇa. The Hampi
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inscription lays down rules for the daily supply of articles to the temple of Virūpākṣadeva and the annual payment of 181 pagodas to it — an indication that this region must have been held by the Hoyśāḷa ruler at least for a few years. In any event, Sīrghana’s power soon reasserted itself over practically the whole of what had been the empire of the Cāḷukyas of Kalyāṇa. His celebrated general Bicana, governor of the southern provinces, led a victorious expedition against the Hoyśāḷas and the Pāṇḍyas of the Nolambavāḍi province, and did not retrace his steps until he reached the banks of the Kaveri, where he set up a pillar of victory. An inscription from Shimoga district dated 1239 mentions the despatch of a large army to the south by Sīrghana and this may be taken to refer to Bicana’s campaign and give an indication of its probable date.

Clearly Sōmēśvara suffered heavy reverses and lost much territory to the Sēunas. Attempts to recover lost ground were made in 1242 and 1250, but met with little success, and Sōmēśvara had to put up with the loss of Shimoga and a good part of the Chitrādurga district. But the Sēunas were evidently in no position to make their authority effective so far away from their capital at Devagiri, and the southern marches of the extended Sēuna empire tended more and more to lapse into a condition of anarchy in which petty local chieftains were changing sides or proclaimed their independence and engaged in ceaseless squabbles. The details of these local skirmishes are of no general interest; but attention may be drawn to Jākhaladevi, queen of Jājalladeva of the “Kashmir Chowhān family” as he is described. In the twenty-first regnal year of Sōmēśvara (1254-55) she acknowledged the protection of the Hoyśāḷa emperor and bought land to be given over to the temple of Tiruvānaikkāval. Jājalladeva might well be the king who, according to Hemādri, had to surrender a number of elephants to Sīrghana, and Jākhaladevi figures in inscriptions from Kalasa less than 70 kms due west of the Hoyśāḷa capital Dorasamudra. The inscriptions of Jākhaladevi show clearly both the extent of Sēuna penetration into Hoyśāḷa country under Sīrghana and the recovery of Hoyśāḷa power in its home territory that followed soon after.

Attention has been drawn above to the recovery of Cōḷa power under the leadership of Rājendra II, the crown prince, assisted by the Telugu-Cōḷa Tikka I, who put an end to the life of Narasimha II in a battle near Jambai in south Arcot. Rājendra is in fact mentioned as the enemy of Sōmēśvara even as early as 1237, only six years after the release of Rājarāja III from captivity at Śendamaṅgalam by the intercession of Hoyśāḷa power. The
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new situation called for a change of policy on the part of Sōmēśvara. The Sanskrit poem *Rukminikālayānam* states that Sōmēśvara had a Pāṇḍya princess Bijalāmā for his queen. This marriage might have been contracted in 1218 at the end of the first campaign of Narasimha II against Maravarman Sundara Pāṇḍya I. That powerful monarch of the Pāṇḍya was no more, and his successor Maravarman Sundara II was a weak ruler who, if left unsupported, could fall a victim to the aggressive policy of Cōla Rājendra. And Sōmēśvara had to avenge the death of his father. He, therefore, strengthened the alliance with the Pāṇḍyan kingdom by accepting the daughter of his brother-in-law, the Pāṇḍya king, Paṭṭamāmbā by name, for his son, the future Narasimha III.  

Contemporary Pāṇḍya inscriptions bear clear evidence of the growing influence of the Hoyśālas in that country and of the frequent presence of Sōmēśvara himself at Kanṭanūr from 1238 onwards. Further, Sōmēśvara adds the title "upraiser of the Pāṇḍya kingdom" to his numerous birudas from this time. In his turn, the Pāṇḍya king institutes a religious worship named after Sōmēśvara in the temple of Alāgarkoil (near Madura) and confers the title of Vāṅi-vallabha on Vāsudeva, the court poet of Sōmēśvara. Besides strengthening his position in the southern kingdom, Sōmēśvara undertook an expedition against Tikka I in 1240, but evidently met with little success. For, while the Hoyśāla inscriptions mention the expedition and say nothing of its results, the Telugu poet Tikkana affirms clearly in his *Nirvacanottara Rāmāyana* that Tikka subdued the Kanṭa ruler Sōmēśvara and thereby easily established the Cōla in his position, earning for himself the title *Coḷaṭhapanaṇacārya*. An inscription from Nandalūr dated some years later in 1257 mentions Campāpurī (Jambai) as the scene of battle in which Sōmēśvara met his defeat. About the same time, another Hoyśāla army was operating on the banks of the Kaveri in Thanjavur district. Sīnhana Dandanāyaka's invasion of this area led to the cessation of worship in a temple near Vedāranyam which had to be reconsecrated at a cost of 50,000 kāsus, and about the same time the whole of Kāna-nādu (comprising parts of Thanjavur and Pudukkottah) was captured on behalf of Vira Sōmēśvara by another of his generals, Ravi-deva. But these successes were not enough to counteract the defeat at Jambai, and on the whole Rājendra held his own against the Hoyśāla intruder, thanks to the cooperation of Tikka.

Rājendra seems to have enlisted the cooperation even of Köpperunjīnga in his efforts to throw off Hoyśāla influence in the politics of the Tamil states. In his undated Tripurāntakam inscription, Köpperunjīnga is called
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"the sun to the lotus pond", viz., the Cōḷa dynasty. He is said to have raised fortifications on the north bank of the Kaveri against the Kannadiyas, apparently without being able to restrain their advance, as the festivals in the temple of Tiruvenkādu had to be stopped until they were revived by a fresh endowment by two Pāṇḍya princes several years later. In an inscription of his tenth year from Vriddhācalam, Köpperunjiṅga claims to have killed some Hoyśāla generals on the battlefield at Perambalūr and captured their womenfolk and treasure. Lastly, a general of Köpperunjiṅga by the name of Virajatapa claims to have taken the Hoyśāla captive and levied tribute from the Pāṇḍyas. All these events are clearly connected with the campaign led by Śiṅgana and Ravideva dāndanāyakas on behalf of Sōmeśvara. We may, therefore, conclude that in the generally hostile relations between the Kāḍava chieftain and his Cōḷa suzerain, there came about a change due to the new policy followed by Rājendra calculated to oust the Hoyśāla power from the Tamil country. The Hoyśālas were no friends of the Kāḍava, and he heartily joined in the war against them which resulted in a few years of real independence for Rājendra III. But the Kāḍava claimed his reward for his service, and, proclaiming his independence, he began to count his regnal years from 1243. Rājendra had necessarily to acquiesce to it.

Doubts regarding Köpperunjiṅga’s loyalty as well as the memory of the political and dynastic alliances with the Hoyśālas evidently forbade Rājendra from proceeding to extremes in his relations with Sōmeśvara and, after a demonstration of his readiness to resent too much interference from his Hoyśāla uncle, Rājendra seems to have been quite prepared for a resumption of friendship with him. Evidently, Sōmeśvara was not slow to respond. Accordingly, we find the officers of the Hoyśāla monarch assisting in the administration and making endowments in areas under Rājendra’s rule in the years 1250 and 1251, particularly on the banks of the Kaveri in Tiruchirapalli district. And the rise of the illustrious Pāṇḍya ruler Jaṭāvamma Sundara Pāṇḍya, who came to the throne soon after in 1251 and whose sweeping career of conquest affected all the south Indian states in equal measure, served to cement the alliance between the Hoyśālas and the Cōḷas. Before 1258 Sundara Pāṇḍya compelled the warlike Cōḷa monarch Rājendra III to acknowledge his overlordship and pay tribute. He also attacked the Hoyśāla forces in the region of the Kaveri and, after inflicting great losses on them, he besieged them in a fortress. The brave general Śiṅgana was captured on the battlefield and thrown before a rutting elephant. Many of Sōmeśvara’s horses and elephants were taken together with a
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large amount of treasure and women. Sōmēśvara was forced to retreat to
the Mysore plateau and the fortifications of Kannanūr-koppam were taken
by storm and occupied. Sōmēśvara made another effort to retrieve his
fortune and lost his life in battle in the neighbourhood of Śrīrangam. Sundara
Pāṇḍya is said to have sent to the other world the Moon of the Kamāta
country who had caused much trouble to Śrīrangam. The date of this
occurrence is open to doubt. Sōmēśvara’s Tamil inscriptions carry his reign
up to the twenty-ninth year (1262). But a Mysore inscription points to
1257 as the date of his death. It is possible to reconcile the Tamil
inscription with this by supposing that it counts the regnal years from 1228
when Sōmēśvara took up residence at Kannanūr as yuvārāja. However,
Sundara Pāṇḍya’s inscription of 1258 does not mention Sōmēśvara’s death
but only his flight into Karnataka, while his Śrīrangam Sanskrit inscription
which opens by mentioning Sōmēśvara’s death bears no date.

NARASIMHA III (1255-92) AND
RĀMANĀTHA (1234-95)

Three queens of Sōmēśvara find mention in his inscriptions — Somaladevi
(called pāṭṭa-mahiṣī or chief queen in 1253); Bijilarāni (the mother of
Narasimha III) and Devalamahādevī of Cāḷukya stock, the mother of Vira
Rāmanātha besides a daughter named Ponambalā. Sometime around
1255, Sōmēśvara himself appears to have effected a division of the
kingdom between his two sons. Narasimha being appointed to the rule
of the ancestral capital Dorasamudra and the northern half of the kingdom,
and Rāmanātha being put in charge of Kannanūr and the southern half
besides Kolar. The former had naturally to deal with the Sēnas while
Rāmanātha attended to the relations with the Tamil powers. The regnal
years of both the princes are counted from about the same time within a
few months of each other. The brothers continued to live on friendly
terms, each minding his own part of the kingdom and defending it against
its enemies in the early years of their reign. But when Rāmanātha lost
his Tamil possessions later in about 1280, differences arose between them.
Both of them enjoyed rather long reigns — Narasimha III ruling up to 1293
and Rāmanātha till two years later.
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The alliance between Cōla Rājendra III and the Hoysalas continued after the death of Sōmēśvara. The close association of Rāmanātha and Rājendra is attested by two inscriptions from Thanjavur district which couple the regnal years of both the monarchs at an interval of five years in 1265-66 and 1270-71.\textsuperscript{179} But the details of the relations between the allies and their Pāṇḍya foe are by no means clear. So long as Jaṭāvarman Sundara Pāṇḍya lived, Rāmanātha could not regain control of Kannanūr, and probably spent part of his time in the court of his Cōla ally, both of them exercising a kind of joint control over whatever territory was left under their authority, which included the districts of Bangalore, Salem, Trichinopoly (in part), Thanjavur and Pudukkottah. Some time after Sundara’s death in 1268, Rāmanātha regained Kannanūr which continues to be described as his capital for ten more years.\textsuperscript{180} But Māravarman Kulaśēkhara, the successor of Sundara on the Pāṇḍya throne, was no mean warrior, and he was bent upon consolidating the conquests of his predecessor and extending his dominion further. Already in 1272 there is mention of Kannāṭtarasār (i.e., the Hoysāla ruler) in one of his inscriptions.\textsuperscript{181} Six years later, one of his generals Ārīya Cakravarṭī makes an endowment at Śrīrangam.\textsuperscript{182} We hear of Kulaśēkhara encamping at Kannanūr in the fifteenth year of his reign (1293).\textsuperscript{183} An undated record from Tinnevelly mentions the construction by Kulaśēkhara of the prākāra walls of the temple there from the booty collected after defeating the Keralas, Cōla and Hoysāla kings.\textsuperscript{184} These facts, taken along with the cessation of the inscriptions of Rājendra III and Rāmanātha in the Tamil country after 1279, clearly indicate that Kulaśēkhara won a final success against them and destroyed their power altogether around that year.

During the years when Rāmanātha maintained his power in the Tamil country as best as he could in the face of increasing difficulties, Narasiṃha III was fully occupied with countering the hostility of the Sēuṇas. At Devagiri, Singhana was succeeded by his grandson Kṛṣṇa in 1247 and he was followed by his younger brother Mahādeva in 1261-62. After Mahādeva, his son Ārāṇa had, after a short reign, to give place to the son of Kṛṣṇa, the ambitious and powerful Rāmacandra in 1271. Border skirmishes in which local chieftains took part on either side were a constant feature. Hemādri says that Mahādeva reduced the king of Karṇāṭa to mockery. But a Hoysāla inscription states, on the other hand, that Mahādeva fled in a single night.\textsuperscript{185}

The decisive test came in the time of Rāmacandra when his son-in-law

\textsuperscript{179} ARSIE, 207 and 208 of 1931.
\textsuperscript{180} EC, V, Ak. 149.
\textsuperscript{181} ARSIE, 20 of 1912.
\textsuperscript{182} ARSIE, 7 of 1936-37.
\textsuperscript{183} Ibid, 328 of 1923.
\textsuperscript{184} Ibid, 29 of 1927.
\textsuperscript{185} DKD, App.C.I, v. 48; EC, IV, Ng. 39.
Harapāla and his famous general Sāluva-Tikkama penetrated the heart of the Hoyśāla country with the aid of several feudatories of the Sāunas. The Cōja chief Irungōla of Niḍugal was also among them. He encamped at Belavāḍi and threatened Dorasamudra itself. There followed a pitched battle in the neighbourhood of Belavāḍi, but its result is reported differently by the two contesting parties. The Harihar inscription of Rāmadeva describes Tikkama as a plunderer of the Hoyśāla king, and says that in March-April 1277, he had come to Harihar on the way back from a victorious expedition in which he had reduced the city of Dorasamudra, and had levied tribute, especially of elephants and horses. In celebration of this, he built a temple there of the god Nārāyana (Viṣṇu) in the name of his former master Mahādeva, and made grants to it. Hoyśāla records, on the other hand, state that after a hard fought battle, Tikkama was obliged to retreat in haste leaving his entire camp to the mercy of his enemy. He was hotly pursued by the Hoyśāla forces from the battlefield and driven beyond Dumme amid great slaughter. That the Hoyśāla claim is not altogether baseless, and that in spite of his own preoccupations, Rāmanātha cooperated with his brother in the crisis that was threatening to overwhelm the Hoyśāla kingdom becomes certain from two inscriptions of Rāmanātha bearing dates in 1276-77 from Kogali in Bellary district. We may conclude, therefore, that whatever temporary success attended Tikkama’s enterprise, including a raid on the Hoyśāla capital itself, in the final result Narasimha won such a victory that he was able to regain control of his possessions roughly as they stood in his father’s reign. He even organised a counter-invasion of the southern parts of the Sāuna empire. Irungōla II of Niḍugal who, in accordance with the time-serving policy dictated by the geographical position of his territory, had joined Tikkama. He had even raided Hoyśāla territories in Tumkūr earlier. However, he too felt the weight of Narasimha’s arms in 1285, and Niḍugal passed for a time, though only for a time, under Hoyśāla rule. It seems to have become free again in 1292.

Three years after the repulse of Tikkama, the Tamil area under Rāmanātha’s rule was lost as a result of his defeat by the Pāṇḍya Kulasēkhara. This was the signal for the rise of differences between Rāmanātha and Narasimha which culminated in a civil war that lasted many years. Even earlier, Rāmanātha had exerted himself to gain control over parts of Kolar and Bangalore districts where local chieftains had been successfully evading control from the Hoyśālas and the Cōjas, and maintaining a turbulent independence. As a consequence of this effort of Rāmanātha to establish
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his power in the eastern part of the Mysore plateau, clashes occurred between his troops and those of Narasimha even before he lost the Tamil country. After that, they become more frequent and developed into a regular war. The course of the war is not easily traced, but many hero-stones attest its duration and the dislocation caused by it in Hoysala dominions till the end of Narasimha’s reign and for some years later. Ramanatha carried on the struggle even after Narasimha’s death. His son Visvanatha kept it up for a few years after his father’s death in 1295. The kingdom was reunited under Narasimha’s son Ballala III in 1300 or a little before. After the loss of Kannanur and the Tamil possessions, Ramanatha fixed the seat of his rule at Kunjani in Devanahalle taluq of Bangalore district, not Kunjani in the Hosur taluq of Salem, as has sometimes been held.

Ballala III (1291-1342)

Narasimha’s troubled reign came to an end with his death in 1292, and he was succeeded on the throne of Dorasamudra by his son Ballala III whose earliest records are dated in 1291. In a grant dated 1279 Narasimha III made provisions, says Fleet, “for the tax which had to be paid to the Turushkas (i.e., the Muslim kings of Delhi) by all people from the Kanarese country residing at Benares”. Referring apparently to the same record, R. Narasimhachar says that the provision was for tax on “pilgrims from all parts of India residing in Benares”, that it comprised the entire income from the village of Habbale, Arkalgud taluq, which amounted to 645 varaha per annum, of which 402 went towards pilgrim tax while the rest was spent on certain services in the temple of Visvesvara in Varanasi.

In the first years of his reign, Ballala III had to engage in a ding-dong battle in the east with Ramanatha and his son Visvanatha until the latter disappeared from history some time before 1300. With this, the unity of the Hoysala kingdom was restored and Ballala attached to himself the new possessions that fell to him in east Karnataka by a policy of conciliation and liberality attested by a number of his inscriptions in these regions.

Ballala III was an energetic warrior and was not lacking in the qualities of statesmanship. Some factors in the political situation of south India (such as, the weakness of the contemporary Suna rulers and their increasing preoccupation with Turkish inroads from northern India as well as the war of succession in the Pandyyan kingdom following the death of Mavarman Kulasekhara) seemed to favour his ambitious designs. But the successive Turkish invasions of the south under the Khalji and the Tughlaq sultans of Delhi profoundly disturbed the political balance of the country and totally
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upset the calculations of Ballāla III. Even in the midst of this turmoil, Ballāla held his own, expanded the territory under his rule, and contrived to ensure that the north Indian onslaught on his kingdom left it with the least possible damage. The other aspects of the reign of Ballāla III may be reviewed before discussing the Turkish inroads in detail.

Within a few years of the commencement of Ballāla's reign, the Sēuṇas began to feel the pressure of Islam from the north and Ballāla was given a free hand to assert his authority over the southern marches of the Sēuṇa kingdom which had never been wholly brought under control by the rulers of distant Devagiri. Ballāla went against Koṭi Soma Nāyaka, a Santāra chieftain ruling in the Sagar taluq of Shimoga district, captured Hosagund and brought the area under his sway in around 1300. This was followed by some indecisive and repeated fighting with a combination of chieftains in the Kadamba territory; Gaṅgeya Sāhini, the minister of Kadamba Kāmadeva, was the soul of the confederacy and the Hoyśāla camp at Sirisi is mentioned. Kadambaḷigenāḍi is said to have been plundered and there was a pitched battle between the rival forces. But if Ballāla gained a victory in the battle, he was not able to press it far. This was probably because the Sēuṇa king Kāmadeva sent his general Kampilideva to cause a diversion by invading the Hoyśāla territory from the north-east. An inscription of 1303 records that the Sēuṇa army marched against Holalkere and killed in fight Someya Daṇḍanāyaka, the king's brother-in-law (mayduna) who was ruling there. Another battle was joined in 1305 in the Banavasi country in which "the tiger's cub, the king of the Kamāṭas" proved invincible.

An undated record from Belūr taluq mentions a terrible battle at Madavalli between Ballāla's forces and the army of his son, Saṅkamadeva or Sirghana. Now Saṅkama was Sēuṇa Rāmacandra's son who succeeded him on the throne of Devagiri and ruled for three years (1309-12). But as he is mentioned here without any royal titles, he must have been only a prince at the time of the battle of Madavalli, which must be assigned to about the same time as the other events of the campaigns detailed in the foregoing. The successes attained by Ballāla secured a small extension of his territory to the north and convinced Rāmacandra that it was no longer easy to aggrandise the Sēuṇa kingdom at the expense of the Hoyśāla. But Ballāla had to cry a halt to his northward expansion probably because of fear of reprisals from the Delhi sultanate, of which the Sēuṇa kingdom had become a vassal by then.
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In another direction, Ballāla made himself master of Niḍugal before 1308, and inscriptions refer to him as the ruler of that fortress for several years from that date. Soon after, Ballāla set about recovering lost ground in the Tamil country. In a Tamil inscription dated 1313, Ballāla is called Adiyama-yamapura-praveśa-daśika, clearly meaning that he killed an Adiyama chieftain in battle. This might have occurred some years earlier, and the conquest of the Köngu country from the Adigamān chieftain of Tagadur might have been a prelude to Ballāla’s attempt to extend his power further in the south by taking advantage of the succession disputes that had arisen in the Pândyān kingdom at the end of Kulaśekhara’s reign. But, as is well known, Ballāla had to abandon these designs at least for a time as the invasion of Dorasamudra by Malik Kafur in 1310 recalled him to the capital. When the Turkish danger passed, Ballāla renewed his efforts in the Tamil country and took sides in the Pândyān civil war. A record of 1318 mentions Ballāla’s march from Kanṭanūr. Another, dated four years later, records the death in battle of Sīrgeya, the son of Someya dannayaka — the mayduna of Ballāla who died in the battle of Holalakere. Sīrgeya is said to have been in the service of Vira Pândya of Kanṭanūr and lost his life in a battle between Vira Pândya on one side, and his son Samudra Pândya and Paraka Pândya on the other. The nature and extent of Ballāla’s gains from these intercessions are, however, by no means easy to determine.

Other famous generals of Ballāla III were Permāle-deva dannayaka and his son Madappa. Their titles Nilagiri-Sādhaka and Köngaramān indicate some fighting in the hilly regions of the Nilgins besides the war in Köngu already mentioned. Finally, Ballāla brought the Ālupas of south Kanara into the sphere of Hoysāla influence for the first time, and we find an Ālupa princess Cikkāyi Tāyigalū as Ballāla’s chief queen in 1333. As Ballāla bears the title Pândya Cakravarti two years later and Pândya is a title which figures frequently in medieval Ālupa records, we must assume that the marriage alliance was the result of a military conquest leading to the Ālupa recognition of Hoysāla suzerainty. Cikkāyi-Tāyi, also called Kikkāyi-Tāyi, survived Ballāla for several years and ruled the Ālupa principality in south Kanara with many high-sounding titles till at least 1348. Three years earlier, she had become the subordinate of the Vijayanagar ruler Harihara II as is clear from one of his inscriptions at Śringeri.

Besides the Niḍugal, Köngu and Tulu regions, a good part of the north Arcot district and even part of Chingleput passed into Ballāla’s hands. The Yādavārāyas of this area who had long been feudatories of the Cōlas were
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now obliged to acknowledge Hoyśāla supremacy, and Tiruvēnu[kaṇa]ṭathā[na] Ḍāḍavārāya raised from his subjects an annual levy called vallāladevar-varī for paying the tribute due to his suzerain.\textsuperscript{209} Tirūvaṇṇāmalai in north Arcot district became one of the subsidiary capitals of the Hoyśāla kingdom, and in the last years of his reign Ballāla III often visited the place.\textsuperscript{210} After Dorasamudra was demolished by the Turks in 1327, Ballāla retired to Virūpākṣa Ḍosas[adura]\textsuperscript{211} which continued to be the seat of the enfeebled Hoyśāla power for the rest of his reign and that of his successor. In 1340 Ballāla III anointed his son Vira-Virūpākṣa-Ballāladeva as his successor. Two years later, he fell fighting the forces of the Sultan of Madura in the neighbourhood of Kannanūr on 8 September 1342.\textsuperscript{212}

When Ballāla III kept himself busy with his northern and southern neighbours in endless battles and skirmishes which had no tangible effect except mutual weakness, the developments in far off Delhi were casting their shadow on the southern kingdoms.\textsuperscript{213}

In the middle of 1296, the Sēṇa kingdom fell prey to the attacks of Āla-ud-din. Rāmacandara was reduced to the position of a subordinate and forced to pay annual tributes to the Delhi sultan. Amidst the hostilities that were renewed between the Sēṇas and the Hoyśālas, Āla-ud-din planned another invasion through his general Malik Kāfūr. This time the Hoyśāla kingdom and further south became the target. In February 1311, Kāfūr reached Devagiri, the capital of the Sēṇas. Rāmacandara received the invader well and even lent the services of his general Paraśurāma Daḷavāyi to lead the invading army to Dorasamudra. A battle was fought towards
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\textsuperscript{213} For details of Turkish invasions in the south, see Habib and Nizami, eds. A Comprehensive History of India, V, pp 400-27, 433-36, 469-72. The editors gratefully acknowledge the help of Irfan Habib and Faiz Habib in the preparation of the following note and the accompanying map of Malik Kāfūr's campaigns: "The major source for Malik Kāfūr's expeditions to Warangal in 1309-10 and to the Hoyśāla (Dvārasamudra) and Pandya (Ma'bar) kingdoms in 1310-11 is Amir Khusrāu's Khasa'īn al-Futūḥ (ed. M. W. Mirza, Bi, 1953, pp 73-166), supplemented by later and brief narratives in Isāmīn Futūḥi-s Safāīn (ed. A. S. Usha, Madras, 1948, pp 289-91, 293-98) and Ziyā Barānīn Tā'īkh-i Fīrūz-shaḥīn (ed. Sayid Ahmad Khān, Bi, 1862, pp 326-34). The routes of the two expeditions were discussed in S. Krishnaswamy Ayangar's introduction to Mohammad Habib's translation of Amir Khusrāu's work The Campaigns of 'Allaūddin Khilji, Bombay, 1931, pp xx-xxxix. One may add to Aiyangar's place-identifications by pointing out that Iripur in Erach, and 'Gurgeam'/Khargara is a well-known place on the route between Ujain and Burhanpur, south of Narmada.

"It may be seen that Malik Kāfūr's campaign-route to Warangal was through difficult, forested country. This was probably done to achieve surprise. Similarly, the fact that Malik Kāfūr returned to Delhi from Warangal on 10 June 1310, and was again on the march to the south, on 18 November 1310 suggests that the intention was to catch the south Indian rulers by surprise again, since they could hardly have been expecting a fresh invasion so soon after the Warangal campaign."

MALIK KĀFŪR'S EXPEDITIONS

Place-names generally as given in Persian sources

Map on Malik Kafur's Campaigns
the end of that year. Ballāla had to finally succumb and even surrender not only the wealth but also his own son who was taken to Delhi only to be returned safely to the Sūna capital later. With the assistance of Ballāla, Kāfūr proceeded to the Pāṇḍyān kingdom where, however, he did not obtain the expected result. Yet, he was able to collect a lot of booty and returned to Delhi.

What is to be noted here is that these southern rulers — the Sūnas, the Hoyśālas, the Kākatiyas and the Pāṇḍyās — did not take these onslaughts seriously even when they cut at the very roots of their existence. It is obvious that the adventures of Ala-ud-din or of Kāfūr were not smooth and the military strength of these rulers was not inconsiderable either. Yet, strangely enough, they never thought of forging a united front. Instead, they even helped the Turkish army to weaken one another. Even when Ballāla had to quit the capital and shift elsewhere, he invaded the small kingdom of Kampili.

The invasions from the north were incessant. In the wake of a change-over from the Khalji rule to that of the Tūghluqs in Delhi, Ulugh Khan, the general of the latter, invaded the Kākatiya kingdom in 1323 and brought doom to that dynasty when its last ruler Pratāparudra committed suicide, unable to bear the humiliation. In 1327 another invasion swept Madurai, the capital of the Pāṇḍyās and it also became a vassalage of the rulers in Delhi. A little later, in the same year, the kingdom of Kampili fell to the invader and practically the whole of south India came under the Delhi Sultanate.

Ballāla was the sole survivor after this catastrophe. Wisdom appears to have dawned upon him after witnessing the havoc brought by the northern invaders. He now supported the moves to free the country, particularly those started under the leadership of the five sons on Sangama in the Hampi region. Prolaya Nāyaka and Kāpeya Nāyaka from the Andhra region joined this movement. Ballāla, though aging and powerless, encouraged and supported these attempts. His son, Virūpākṣa Ballāla IV, disappointed him by not being able to rise to the occasion. Ballāla identified a valiant hero in Harihara, the eldest of the five sons of Sangama. He handed over to him the authority of this territory which became the base for fighting for the cause which culminated in the foundation of the Vijayānagar empire in 1336.

Ballāla did not cease to be active even after this. He helped Kāpeya nāyaka in Andhra to oust the Muslim governor at Telingana. In 1340 he defeated Ala-ud-din Udousi, the governor of Madurai, and later besieged the fort of Kanṇanūr. But slight laxity on his part turned the victory into a defeat. He was captured by the Turkish army and murdered in 1342.

Thus came to an end the colourful personality of Ballāla. A major part of the eighty years of his life was spent in battle. His son lived up to 1346 by which time the new Vijayānagar empire had already made headway in political and cultural life, spreading its hegemony over a large area of the south.

214. EC, IX, B. 120.
215. For slightly modified genealogy and chronology, see P. B. Desai, S. H Ritti and B. R. Gopal, *op cit*, pp 314-15. Some other recent writings on the Hoyṣālas include the proceedings of the seminar organised by the Department of History, Mysore University, in 1970 to celebrate the Millenniary year of the establishment of the Hoyṣāla dynasty. These papers have been edited by B. Sheik Ali under the title *The Hoyṣāla Dynasty*. G. R. Rangaswamiaḥ made an attempt to trace contacts of Karnataka with northern India during the Hoyṣāla period; cf. *Proceedings of the Second Annual Conference of South Indian History Congress*, 1981.
Chapter VI

THE KĀKATĪYAS

ORIGIN AND THE EARLY SUBORDINATE CHIEFS

The Kākātiyas rose to power in the beginning of the twelfth century in the eastern Deccan with Anumakonda as their capital. It was later shifted to Orugallu just a few miles away.

There has been considerable difference of opinion among scholars regarding their origin and early home. The discovery of an inscription on the Bayyaram tank in Khammammet district throws fresh light on the origin and the history of the early kings of this dynasty. According to this epigraph of Kākāti Mailamba, the queen of Naṭavāḍī Rudra and the sister of Kākātiya Gaṇapati Deva, the genealogy starts with Durjaya, the originator of the line of these kings. The inscription gives in sequence the names of Vanna Guṇḍa I, Guṇḍa II, Guṇḍa III, Eriya, Pindi Guṇḍa (or Guṇḍa IV), Prola II, Rudra and Mahādeva, the latter’s son Gaṇapati Deva and daughter Mailambā, the queen of Naṭavāḍī Rudra. Among these, the names of Guṇḍa III, Eriya, and Guṇḍa IV occur in the Mangalalu grant of the Eastern Čālukyan king Daṇāmava² (wrongly attributed to Ammarāja II) dated 956 where, in addition to these, another name Beta is also introduced between Eriya and Guṇḍa IV. The absence of this name in the Bayyaram epigraph may be due to his premature death, whereas in the former record the donor of the grant Guṇḍa IV had necessarily to mention his father’s name after mentioning the names of his forefathers. Vanna, the founder of the family, is stated to have ruled the earth with Kākāti as his capital and hence the rulers of this line acquired the name of Kākātiyas. Contrary to this and the Garavapadu grant of Gaṇapati Deva,³ Kumārasvāmī Somapīthi, the commentator of Pratāparudra-Yaśobhūṣānam of Vidyanātha states that these kings are called Kākātiyas because they worshipped the goddess Kākāti, one of the forms of Durgā as their family deity.⁴ According to the Siddhāśvara-caritra,⁵ a later legendary account, their original home was Kandarapura, identified with the present Kandhar in Nander district of Maharashtra.⁶ The conflicting character

1. EA, I, pp 71-94.
2. EI, XIX, 1955-56, pp 35-44.
5. Canto 2.
6. N. Lakshminarayana Rao (The Kākātiyas) has suggested that Kākāti, a village near Belgaum in Karnata, might have been the original home of these Kākātiyas—Eds.
of the evidence is perhaps more apparent than real. It is not unlikely that Kandhar was the abode of the goddess Kākāṭi, the town or the particular locality acquired the name Kākāṭipura, which is not uncommon to Indian place names. Orugalu itself is referred to as Kākāṭipura in some of the inscriptions, of course by virtue of its being the capital of the Kākāṭiyas.

KĀKARYA GUNDYANA TO GUNḍA IV

The Bayyaram epigraph contains a valuable hint regarding the origin of the family. It seems to indicate that they belonged to Rāṣṭrakūṭa stock. Beta I is spoken of as Garudanka Beta because his anvaya or family bore that name. This occurs as Garudanu Beta (i.e., Beta, known otherwise as Garuḍa) in the Telugu portion of the Guduru inscription.7 Vidyanātha, in his Pratāparudra-Yaśodhruṣuṣanam, refers to the Sauparṇa-ketana of Pratāparudra of the Kākāṭiya lineage.8

It seems that all the Kākāṭiya kings from Beta I to Pratāprudra had the same Garuḍa banner. It is well known that Garuḍa was the banner of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa families. In the Mangallu grant, Kākaryya Gundiyana and Eriya were explicitly named as Rāṣṭrakūṭas. This term has been misinterpreted as cultivators for want of supporting evidence. In the Kazipet Dargah inscription,9 the Kākāṭiyas are said to have belonged to "Viṣṭi Varṇa". The title Vitti Nārāyana is also noticed in some of the inscriptions of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa subordinates. The word viṣṭi or vitti is a derivative of the Sanskrit word vṛṣṭi and was claimed by some Rāṣṭrakūṭas as their family name.10

The early Kākāṭiyas, as is evident from the Mangallu grant, seem to have come to the Telugu country as the commanders of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa armies. The first member Gundiyana Rāṣṭrakūṭa or the Sāmanta Votti (a mistake for Vitti) of the Kākāṭiya family is stated to have sacrificed himself in an encounter between Vallabha, that is Rāṣṭrakūṭa Kṛṣṇa II (880-912) and an Eastern Cālukya king, probably Cālukya Bhīma I (892-922). The latter’s son, Iirimartigaṇḍa, according to the Masulipatam plates of Cālukya Bhīma, is said to have slain in the battle of Peruvahguru a Rāṣṭrakūṭa commander named Gundiyana11 who, in all probability, was Kākaryya Gundiyana III of the Mangallu plates.

This is the earliest mention of the Kākāṭiya chiefs in the Telugu country. Gunḍana’s (Gunḍa III) son Eriya Rāṣṭrakūṭa12 was appointed governor of Kuravāḍi, or the present Kuravi in Warangal district on the south-eastern frontier of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa dominions. Kuravi formed the bone of contention

7. HAS, XIII, ii, p 78.
8. Nāṭakaprakaranam.
10. SII, IX, i, no 68.
11. ECV, p 14.
12. Eriya here would perhaps be the name and Rāṣṭrakūṭa would indicate an office. Eriya appears to have been transformed into Eṛṛa—Eds.
between the Eastern Cāḷukyas and the Rāṣṭrakūṭas. Eriya was succeeded not by his son Beta but by his grandson Gunda IV who, according to the Mangaillu grant, in his early career had been deputed by Rāṣṭrakūṭa Kṛṣṇa III in 956 to help the Cāḷukya prince Dānāmava in his attempts tooust his step-brother and the crowned king Ammarāja II (945-970) after the latter had ruled for eleven years. Gunda IV succeeded in driving away Ammarāja II to Kalīṅga and installing Dānāmava, though temporarily, on the throne of Veṅgi. In recompense of Gundoṇya’s service Dānāmava, at the former’s request, granted the village of Mangaillu included in the Natavāḍi-viśaya in the Eastern Cāḷukya territory as an agrahāra in the Eastern Cāḷukya territory as an agrahāra to the brahman named Dommana who performed a ritual called karpativrata for the merit of Gundoṇya. Thus, the Mangaillu grant dated around 956 is the earliest record of the Kākaṭiya chiefs.

Consequent on the fall of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas in 973, Kākartya Gundoṇa being a Rāṣṭrakūṭa subordinate both by birth and loyalty, refused to submit himself to the new Cāḷukyan emperor, Taila II, who was just then busy consolidating his position. He could not pay immediate attention to the recalcitrant attitude of Gundoṇa on his eastern frontier. During the period between 973 and 1000 there was an interregnum in the Eastern Cāḷukya kingdom, and there was no one to check the power of Gundoṇa. Availing himself of this opportunity, he carved for himself a small independent principality with Kuravi as its capital.

The Telugu portion of the Gudur epigraph of Viriyala Malla throws some light on the succession of events of this period, particularly regarding the early career of Beta I or Garuda Beta. Although the record is dated in the Cāḷukya Vikrama year 49 corresponding to 1124, it describes the greatness of the ancestors of Viriyala Malla, the donor. After describing his father and grandfather, Beta and Sura respectively, the record states that an earlier member of the family named Eriya helped a certain Bottu Beta in battle and established him in Koravi, while his wife Kamasani took the young Garuda Beta of the Kākaṭiya family to the emperor Bhāskaravibhu and established the line of Kākaṭi. These achievements of Viriyala Eriya and his wife Kamasani must have occurred at least four generations before 1124, the date of the record, that is around 1000. Though it is difficult at present to fix the identity of Bottu Beta and the emperor Bhāskaravibhu of this inscription, Garuda Beta can be none other than the son of Kākartya Gundoṇa IV. Being very young at the time of his father’s death, he was unable to face the situation, which threatened his position at Koravi. Challenged by his rival Bottu Beta, Garuda Beta was faced with complete extermination.

The Siddheśvara Caritra, a late Telugu legendary work already cited above, refers to one Erakasani, the paternal aunt of Garuda Beta, who perhaps was the same lady referred to as Kamasani in the Guduru record. She is closely related to Garuda Beta. She interfered on his behalf and took him
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to the emperor Bhāskaravibhū, probably the Western Cāluṭya king (Taillā II or his son and successor Satyāśraya), and influenced him to enroll young Beta as one of his subordinates in the Anumakoṇḍa-viṣaya.

BETA I

The Bayyaram tank inscription attributes the conquest of Anumakoṇḍa to Beta I. It states that after killing the two chiefs Anuma and Koṇḍa he made their town his capital, thereby suggesting that the place acquired its name Anumakoṇḍa after the two chiefs were defeated by Beta. The conquest of Anumakoṇḍa by Beta I appears to be nothing more than the allotment of that region as a fief in his favour, probably in place of the former holders by the Cāluṭya king. The historicity of the persons Anuma and Koṇḍa is also doubtful, as the name Anmakonḍa, a variant of Anumakoṇḍa, had been in existence at least since the time of Rāṣṭrakūṭa Amoghavarṣa I (814-78).14 The story of Anumakoṇḍa is a patent myth created specially to explain an uneventful conquest of the place. The Kazipet Dargah inscription15 of Beta’s great-grandson Durgarāja refers to a victory of Beta I over the Cōḷa army (Cōḷa-camu-vardhi-pramathana). Beta’s attack on the Cōḷas cannot be taken as an independent event as he was then a petty chief ruling a part of Telingana which was included in the dominions of the Western Cāluṭyas. He must have accompanied the Cāluṭyan expedition to the Cōḷa country, planned by Āhavamalla Sōmēśvara I, as a measure of retaliation for the burning of his capital Kalyāṇa by the Cōḷa king, Rājādhirāja I, in 1052. The Cāluṭyan army under Polakesi invaded the Cōḷa kingdom and captured Kāṅcī. Beta I, according to the Palampet inscription,16 assisted by his able commander Brahma of the Receria family, participated in this Cāluṭyan expedition and achieved victory. The statement in the Emaranatha temple inscription17 of Ganapatideva’s time, must also be taken to refer to this victory of Beta I but not to Beta II, who is otherwise not known to have captured Kāṅcī. Though old in age, Beta I might have undertaken the campaign with the assistance of able commanders.

PROLA I

Beta I was succeeded around 1055 by his son Prola I. The Bayyaram epigraph cites his title arigaja-kesāri, that is, lion to the elephants (viz. the enemies). This title is attributed in some inscriptions to Prola II, but it has a specific significance as a title of Prola I, since he constructed a big tank and named it Kesāri-tatāka after his title arigaja-kesāri. This tank is identified with Kesāri-samudram or Kesamudram near the village of the same name situated about 50 kms from Warangal. Further, the inscription states that
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as a mark of gratitude towards Prola, his successors adopted the symbol of boar or varāha on their coins as well as the cattle belonging to them, signifying his act of uplifting the earth by way of digging the tank. It may be noted here that the boar symbol did not belong to the Kākatiyas originally, but was adopted by them later, from their overlords the Cālukyas of Kalyāṇa. The original symbol of the Kākatiyas was the garuḍa and it continued to decorate their banner till the time of the last king Pratāparudra.

The political career of Prola I appears to have been more eventful than that of his father. The Kazipet Dargah inscription states that Kākatiya Prola I got Anumakonḍa-viṣaya, as also Sabbi-1000, as a fief through a charter from Trailokyamalla in recognition of the services he and his father rendered to the Cālukya in the latter’s wars with the Cōlas. The Sanigārana epigraph of Trailokyamalla Sōmēśvara I dated 1050 states that Mahāsāmanta Kākatiya Prolarasa acquired greatness by the kindness of the king. The Dargah inscription throws further light on his achievements. He set the affairs of the Cakrakūṭa kingdom in order, put to fight a chief named Bhadrāṅga and conquered the Konkān. The statement in the record is explicit in this connection that these military endeavours made his fame spread far and wide, but did not add to his material prosperity. They perhaps refer only to the Cālukyan expeditions to those countries in which Prola I played an important role.

According to Bilhaṇa,18 Vikramāditya VI, while he was yet a prince, conducted expeditions over the Cōla, Konkān, and Cakrakūṭa countries around 1066. Perhaps this was the occasion when Prola I took an active part and pleased his overlord Āhamallā Sōmēśvara I. The second set of his adventures, according to the same inscription, is mainly connected with the neighbouring chiefs, namely Anṇaya, the son of Dugga, the chief of Kadaparti and Gonna of Gunasāgara and lord of Purakūṭa. Purakūṭa may mean a group of villages and Gunasāgara may be the headquarters. The Jain vestiges near Karimnagar town include a tank Guṇārnavā which may be identified with Gunasāgara and a town of that name near it. Prola I conquered both the Kadaparti and Purakūṭa regions and annexed them to Anumakonḍa-viṣaya, for which he obtained ratification by means of an inscription from Trailokyamalla Sōmēśvara I. Pleased with the military ability and unwavering loyalty of Prola I, the emperor Sōmēśvara I granted him the Anumakonḍa-viṣaya with its new extensions as a permanent fief, probably with the right to mint coins with the boar or varāha symbol as noticed above. Thus, the reign of Prola I was significant in the revival of the Kākatiyas, which had suffered an eclipse during the early days of Beta I. He promoted irrigation works by digging tanks and providing agricultural facilities to farmers. These have been referred to in several inscriptions of Gaṇapati deiva and others.

BETA II

Beta II, the son of Prola I, is generally referred to as Tribhuvanamalla in the inscriptions, probably after his overlord Tribhuvanamalla Vikramāditya VI. Two of his inscriptions, one at Anumakonda and the other at Banajipet, have come to light so far. Apart from the Mangaḻu grant, these are the earliest of the Kākatiya records. Beta's Hanumakonda epigraph\(^{19}\) is dated 1079 and that Banajipet\(^{20}\) 1082. The latter refers to a Jinālaya built by a certain Meḍarāja of Ugravāḍi, who was a mahāmāṇḍalesvāra under Tribhuvanamalla Vikramāditya VI, and Beta II is said to have granted donations to it. According to the Anumakonda inscription\(^{21}\) of Prola II, Beta II is said to have acquired Sabbināḍu-1000 with the help of his able minister Vaijadaṇḍaḍhipa, who took him to the Cālukya emperor and obtained his ratification. This marks the extension of the Kākatiya territory over the entire Sabbināḍu-1000. The circumstances under which this new extension of territory was granted by the king are not known. But the Kazipet Dargah inscription indicates that Beta II also, like his father, participated in the Cālukyan expeditions to the Cōla and Malava countries and might have obtained from the king the Sabbināḍu. It is significant, for Beta II, formerly a subordinate under mahāmāṇḍalesvāra Meḍarāja I, was now elevated to a position superior to that of the latter. Prola II, in his Anumakonda inscription dated 1117, is represented as master of Meḍarāja II, grandson of Meḍa I, who was perhaps at that time ruling the Polavasa and Ugravāḍi regions. The Matedu inscription refers to one Beta and one Prola, who in all probability are identical with Beta II and Prola II, whose contemporaneity tallies with the date of the inscription, ie, Cālukya Vikrama Year 45, corresponding to AD 1120. It refers to an early event where a certain chief named Revā of the Vemabola family assisted Beta II in administrative affairs and in suppressing the internecine revolt, the details of which are not known at present.

DURGARĀJA (c 1098-1116)

Tribhuvanamalla Beta II was succeeded around 1090 by his first son Durgarāja, who also bears the title Tribhuvanamalla. Only one record\(^{22}\) of this king has come to light so far. It states that Beta, the son of Prola, constructed a hamlet named Śivapura in Anumakonda town and a temple there to the god Śiva and gave the hamlet as an agrahāra to Rāmeśvara Pandita, a Śaive ascetic of the Kalamukha sect and the pontif of the Mallikarjunaśīla matha of Śrīśaila, on the occasion of a solar eclipse in the Śaka year 1012 Prāmoda. The record also refers to the uttarāyana sārkrānti in the year Bahudhāyana, which obviously follows the former after either

years in the same cycle of sixty years. These two years correspond respectively to 1090 and 1098. Beta II was alive at least up to 1090 and was succeeded by his son some time before 1098. Very little is known about Durgarāja’s political career from this epigraph. He must have ruled till 1116 and his reign was comparatively insignificant. The Sanigārāma epigraph of an irregular date but equated with 1107 gives Beta II the latest date.

PROLA II (c. 1117-56)

Prola II succeeded his elder brother Durgarāja. His earliest record in the Padmakshi temple at Anumakonḍa is dated Cāḷukya-Vikrama 42 (AD 1117). It records the construction of a Jaina basadi named Kadalālaya by Mailama, the wife of Betana, a minister of Prola II and registers gifts of some land to the same basadi by Prola himself and his subordinate Meḍarasa of Ugrāvāḍi belonging to the line of Madhavavarman possessing eight thousand elephants. One Meḍarasa, the ruler of Ugrāvāḍi of the same family, is represented in the Banajjipet inscription dated Śaka 1004 (1082) as the overlord of Kākatiya Tribhuvanamalla Beta II. Ugrāvāḍi appears to be the name of the region comprising the present Mulugu and Narasampet taluks of Warangal district. An unpublished epigraph at Polavasa dated 1108 also refers to the same Meḍarasa, who may have been probably the grandfather of his namesake mentioned in the Anumakonḍa inscription cited above.

Another unpublished inscription found at Govindapuram near Banajjipet gives the genealogy of the family. According to this record also, these chiefs belonged to the lineage of Madhavavarman who had eight thousand elephants. Durgga, his son Meḍarāja, his son Jagga-nṛpa and two sons of the latter (Meḍa and Gunḍa) are also mentioned in it. Jaggarāja is also mentioned in another epigraph dated 1112 found at Meḍapaḷi in the same region. These chiefs were the followers of Jainism and seem to have constructed some basadis and endowed them with gifts of lands. It is now clear that one Meḍarāja figured as the master of Beta II in 1082 whereas his grandson Meḍa II appears as a subordinate of Prola II in 1117.

The Thousand Pillared Temple inscription of Rudra24 gives a detailed account of Prola II’s victories. He is said to have captured Taḷapadeva, the crest jewel of the Cāḷukya family, but touched by his devout and amicable bearing released him immediately. He captured Govindarāja, but released him from captivity and bestowed the kingdom upon Udayarāja. He disgraced Gunḍa, the lord of Mantrakūta, had his head shaved, branded his chest with the symbol of the boar and finally killed him. Frightened by him, Eda, another of his formidable enemies, though invited to fight in the presence of the emperor, ran in fear like a boy to his own town without giving battle while the general Jagaddeva, who came to capture Anumakonḍa with a host of chiefs, took to flight unable to withstand him in the fight.

23. EA, 1, pp 111f.
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These victories of Prola II are eulogised by his son Rudra, probably on the occasion of the commencement of his independent rule.

Prola II was a petty mândalika vassal under the Cālukyas, ruling over a small tract of the country comprising at the most the whole of the northern parts of Warangal district and the north-western part of Karimnagar district. The remaining portions of these two districts were fiefs of Meçarāja II, who also owed allegiance to the Western Cālukyan emperor of Kalyāna. The identity of Tailapa, whom Prola captured and released out of compassion, is a matter of controversy as there were two Cālukyan princes of this name during Prola’s time. One was Kumāra Tailapa, the son of Tribhuvanamalla Vikramāditya VI who, according to some inscriptions in Mahboobnagar district of Andhra Pradesh, was a mahāmaṇḍalēśvara ruling Kaṇḍūr-nāḍu with Koḍurupura as the capital during 1111-3425 under his father Vikramāditya VI and later under Bhūlokamalla Sōmēśvara III. The same prince held another fief in the Sindavadi region of the present border area between Kurnool and Antapur districts.26 The other was Tailapa III, the second son of Sōmēśvara III, who succeeded to the Cālukya throne in 1150-51 and was later ousted by Kalacuri Bijjala II in 1156. It is not clear which of these two Cālukya princes came into conflict with Prola II and died subsequently of atisāra (dysentry) caused by the fear of Rudra.

Similarly, the identity of Govindarāja or Govinda danḍēśa is not settled. There was a Govinda, an early contemporary of Prola II, a nephew (sister’s son) of Anantapāla danḍanāyaka, the famous general of Vikramāditya VI. This Govinda danḍanāyaka’s records occur at Tripurāntakam and Buruguggadḍa and are dated in the reign of Vikramāditya VI, that is, before 1125-26. The same Govinda danḍādhīpa, along with his brother Laksmana, danḍanāyaka is stated in the Drākṣarāmam inscriptions27 to have been defeated by the Velnāti chief Gonka II in the famous Godavari battle which took place around 1135. But he never appeared to have had any conflict with Prola II and much less with his master the Cālukyan emperor. Gunḍa is known to be the younger brother of Meçarāja II, the Polavasa chief whose fief lay near Manthena in Karimnagar district. Eda may be identical with Meḍa, as the word seems to have been figuratively used to suggest that he was as timid as a lamb (eda). A fragmentary inscription of Gunḍa found near Manthena specifically states that he was a loyal subordinate to Bhūlokamalladeva Sōmēśvara III. It is not clear whether these brothers Meḍa and Gunḍa had any conflict with the Cālukyan king Sōmēśvara III or his successor Jagadekamalla II. However, it may be noted that the absence of the name of their overlord in the unpublished Govindapuram epigraph dated 1122 and the earlier records of Polavasa and Meḍapa[,]I seem to indicate that they repudiated the authority of the Cālukyan overlord and started inscribing records in their own names.
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In this connection, the chronology of the later Cālukya kings of Kalyāṇa is to be reconsidered. Most historians believe that Jagadekamalla II's rule ended around 1150 when his brother Tailapa III succeeded him on the throne. The inscriptions of the period 1150 to 1162 mention two Cālukya kings, Jagadekamalla II in the Anantapur-Bellary region and Tailapa III in the Dharwar-Bijapur and Raichur-Gulbarga regions, both ruling from Kalyāṇapura. Jagadekamalla II, with his title Pratāpacakravarti, is noticed in the records as late as Śaka 1091 (1169). Some inscriptions ranging in date up to 1181 also mention Jagadekamalla without the above title, who is generally taken to be Jagadekamalla III. Quite surprisingly, nothing about his relation to his predecessors or successors is disclosed anywhere. These and other considerations make us believe that Jagadekamalla II still had a hold over the Noḷambavāḍi and Sindavāḍi regions (modern Anantapur-Bellary border areas) and was recognized as the ruling king rather than Taila III or even his successor Bijjala. Possibly he continued ruling parts of the kingdom till 1181, when Sōmēśvara IV succeeded and restored the lost fortunes of the family. Though we are not certain about the identity of the latter Jagadekamalla, the former with the title Pratāpacakravarti is certain to be identical with Jagadekamalla II who must have been alive till 1169, the date of the Madhuṭi epigraph in Maḍakasīra taluk of Anantapur district.28

Tailapa III had no legal claim to the Cālukya throne and his accession in around 1150 was by means of usurpation instigated by Bijjala, who took the reins of administration into his own hands later in 1156-57. This illegal occupation of the royal throne at Kalyāṇa, first by Tailapa in 1150 and later by Bijjala in 1156, was in fact not recognized by some powerful subordinates like the Kākatiyas in Telingana and Maḷḷideva Cōḷa Mahārāja29 in the Noḷambavāḍi region, who still remained loyal to Jagadekamalla II. This state of uncertainty in the political affairs of the Cālukyan kingdom continued till 1162, the last date of Tailapa III.

In the light of the facts stated above, the achievements of Prola II described in the Thousand Pillared temple inscription of Rudra need reconsideration. Among the enemies of Rudra mentioned in the record, Meḍa (Meḍa II of the Govinda-puram inscription dated 1122) was the ruler of Ugravāḍi-viṣaya. Dommarāja was the ruler of Nagurūr or Nagarā near Karimnagar which was an old Jain centre. Mailugi was one of the sons of the Kalacuri king Bijjala who, according to an inscription,30 shared with his father the burden of administration. He could not have been a contemporary of Kumāra Tailapa, whose last known date is 1134. Lastly, Bhima Cōḍa was the elder brother of Gokarna Cōḍadeva of the Telugu Cōḷa family of Kaṇḍuru who, according to their own inscriptions, flourished between 1105 and 1155. So the whole set of victories of Prola II or his son Rudra

28. Ibid. IX, i, no. 270.
29. Ibid. IX, no. 270.
30. Ibid. XX, no 135; BK, 50 of 1938-39.
recorded in the Thousand Pillared temple inscription must have taken place between 1150 and 1160, probably in 1150 itself, when Jagadekamalla II was ousted from Kalyāna.

A fragmentary inscription of Gaṅgādhara *mantri* states that he served both Prola and his son Rudra and participated in their battles against Meḍarāja. He obtained as a reward from Prola II the kingdom of Udayacōḍa after the death of Gokarna. 31 Gaṅgādhara *mantri*’s last known date according to his Karimnagar inscription 32 is 1171. His contemporaneity with Kumāra Taḷapa has to be ruled out on account of his late date. According to an unpublished Senagēveram inscription, Prola II remained loyal to Jagadekamalla II till 1149. The rebellion of Taḷapa III must have been at the instigation of Bijjala who cherished the ambitious desire of usurping the throne, taking advantage of the quarrel between the brothers. He could not achieve his desire while Jagadekamalla was sitting on the throne. Taḷa, who had no other achievements to his credit, was neither a great military general nor a statesman to overthrow his brother. At Bijjala’s instigation he declared war on his brother and attacked loyal subordinates like Prola II. The Kākatiya chief, on behalf of his master Jagadekamalla II, fought with Taḷa III and captured him but let him off on account of compassion and love. Meḍa and his brother Guṇḍa might have joined hands with Bijjala in ousting Jagadekamalla II. Similarly, Dommarāja of Nāguṇūru and Bhīmadeva Cōḍa of-Vardhamānanoagari may have also joined Taḷapa and Bijjala. This formidable combination was led by Mailugi, the son of Bijjala. Kākatiya Prola II and his son Rudra and Gokamaḍe Cōḍa (Bhīma’s brother) however sided with Jagadekamalla and Rudra as indicated by the phrase Śrīman Mailigideva *sariga samaya prodbhita darpapaham*, extinguished the *darpa* or pride of the kings, that rose at the time of joining Mailigideva. The other enemy of Prola II, who is said to have laid siege to Anumakonda was Jagaddeva, generally identified with the Sāntāra king of Paṭṭi Pombuccapura 33 of that name. This is not quite correct. However, another Jagaddeva who was a *daṇḍanāyaka* in the service of Bijjala is mentioned in the Telugu literary work *Basavapurāṇam* of Palkuriki Somanātha. He is said to have slain Bijjala later, being instigated by the king’s minister and preceptor Basava. 34 It is not improbable that the same Jagaddeva, having been deputed by Bijjala, beseiged Anumakonda but was repelled and put to flight by Prola II.

Prola II is also said to have installed at Kanduru the Telugu Cōḍa king Udaya on the throne of his father Gokarna who, according to the same record, was killed by his brother Bhīma. The Mamlapāḷi inscription of his grandsons Bhīma and Gokarna states that he died in a battle (with shyness of breaking away from the group of allies). 35 This implies that he took the

31. HAS, XVIII, p 128.
35. HAS, XVIII, p 62. “Yo mitra-manḍala-Bhida trapay eva yuddhe muktim gatah”. 
side of the enemy Prola II, for which act of treachery he was killed by Bhīma. Prola II installed Gokama's son Udaya on the throne of Kanduru after releasing Govindarāja, or Govinda dandaśa as he was called in the Gaṇapēśvaram epigraph. The identity of Govinda dandaśa or Govindarāja, who is said to have been captured and released by Prola II, cannot be satisfactorily established as no general of that name during his period is known to have existed. Nor do we know how this incidence of Govinda dandaśa is related to Prola bestowing upon Udayarāja the kingdom of Kanduru. If we suppose that Prola II's conflict was with Kumāra Tailapa, it must have taken place around 1138 when Jagadekamalla II succeeded his father. Prola II, standing by the side of Jagadekamalla II, might have seized Kumāra Tailapa, who might have attempted to capture the throne overlooking the legitimate claim of the former. Rudra's fight with Bhīma deva Cōḍa should be a later event, around the 1150s. When Bijjala finally usurped the Cāḷukya throne, Rudra found Jagadekamalla II too weak to recapture the throne, and hence may have finally decided to declare independence in the beginning of 1163. On this supposition Jagadekamalla's reign began with Kumāra Tailapa's rebellion and ended with the usurpation of Tailapa III. There is, however, no evidence in support of the former, whereas the latter is well supported by the simultaneous issue of the inscriptions of Jagadekamalla II, Tailapa III and Bijjala during 1150-63 in different regions.

The Anumakonda inscription of Rudra reveals certain facts which cannot be overlooked. Tailapa was an enemy of the Kākaṭiyas. Second, the phrase nṛpeśvarasya purataḥ significantly indicates that Prola II was fighting with Gunda and his brother Meḍa on behalf of the king and not on his own. Third, Mailigideva, identified as the son of Bijjala, was the leader of the confederacy of māndalikas whose pride was reduced by Rudra. Considering the external evidence which shows that the Kākaṭiyas remained loyal to their overlord Jagadekamalla till 1149, they must have opposed the illegal accession of Tailapa III to the throne. Further, the Kākaṭiyas did not allow Bijjala to extend his power into Telingana and foiled the attempts of Mailiṇi, followed by Meḍarāja, Dommarāja and Bhīmadeva Cōḍa. As a political successor to the Cāḷukyas, Bijjala would not have kept quiet when Kākaṭi Rudra was carving out an independent kingdom. But the political pressure exerted by Jagadekamalla II and his followers forced Bijjala to confine himself to Kalyāṇa and its adjacent Taradavādi-Banavāsi regions, which were originally under his control. So Bijjala, like Tailapa III, was also an enemy of Rudra. This period of twelve years from 1150 to 1162 was mostly spent in political uncertainty. Tailapa's death and Bijjala's usurpation of the throne at Kalyāṇa gave an opportunity to Rudra, who was for all practical purposes independent, to declare his independence openly in 1163.

37. B. R. Gopal (The Chāḷukyas of Kalyāṇa and the Kalachuris, pp 320-22) disagrees with
Prola II, according to an inscription at Drakṣarāmam,\(^{38}\) was slain by Gōdayarāja of the Kota family and the Hainaya chiefs Satya and Mallideva of the Koṇa country. This is confirmed by the Pittāpuram Pillar inscription dated Șaka 1117 (1195).\(^{39}\) Mahādevarāja, a Sūryavamśa chief and a subordinate of the later Eastern Cāлуkya king Malla Viṣnuvardhana of the Beta Vijayāditiya line who bears the title Prodari-baḍavānālaḥ, the submarine fire to the enemy named Proda, in the Madras Museum Plates of his

this reconstruction. He argues that the presumption that Cāлуkya Taila III revolted against his brother and assumed the throne instigated by Kālacuri Bijjala stands uncorroborated. In fact, Jagadekamalla and Bhūlokamalla are two princes of the family who figure in records of Chitrādurga and Bellary districts bearing all Cāлуkya titles and stated to be ruling. Jagadekamalla is stated to be ruling in two records from Bāgalī and Cinnathumbulam (Sīl, IX, i, nos 256 and 258). But these princes left the capital along with Sōmēśvara IV as a result of the Kālacuri revolt. 29 January 1151 is the last known date of Jagadekamalla II from the Tīlīvalī record. The Kaḷūr epigraph of Taila III is dated 19 March 1151 and this is his earliest known record within these months. Taila III succeeded his elder brother. There is nothing to show that Jagadekamalla had any issue at all. Further, there was a big chronological gap between the sons of Sōmēśvara III on the one hand and Bijjala on the other, and the latter was far too young when the former held power one after the other.

Prola II appears to have faced the attack of Pāramāra Jagadevā. N. Venkataramanayya had earlier surmised that Prola II fought against Taila on behalf of the ruling king Sōmēśvara III, Meḍarāja II and Gunda. The chiefs of Polavasa appear to have supported Taila. P. V. P. Sastri (Inscriptions of Andhra Pradesh: Kāmnaprār District) commenting on the Sāṅgīrārāma inscriptions of Vīramadhiya VI dated 1107 states that Jagadeva, being a favourite, enjoyed preferential treatment. As a consequence of some local politics, Beta asserted his superiority over Jagadeva leading to the latter’s invasion of Anumakonda. Prola II is credited with the achievement of repulsing the enemy with all his might and saving the town. But these are unconvincing surmises. The Sāṅgīrārāma epigraph is assigned to c. 1107, while the earliest known date of Prola II is only 1117. Further, the events might as well be reconstructed differently. Sōmēśvara III was administering Kollipaka-7000 before his accession. He was also supporting Jagadeva, the Pāramāra prince. The Sāṅgīrārāma epigraph might only show the disregard of the Kākatiya even by 1107. But when Prola II came to rule he tried to become independent and, as a consequence faced the army led by Jagadeva, prince Taila III and the subordinates in Manthana. It is possible that even Govindarāja, the nephew of Anantapāla-dāndarāya, joined them. Though the Anumakonda epigraph of Rudra credits his predecessor with victories against all these, it would appear that the truth was just the opposite. Prola was defeated and thereupon continued his allegiance to the Cāлуkya till the end of his career. It is probably in this connection that Sōmēśvara was given an auspicious date for proceeding on the expedition (see also chs II and III). Therefore, Prola continued to be loyal to the latter. That Taila III was defeated by Prola is based on the assumption that Tailapadeva mentioned in the Anumakonda inscription of Rudra was Taila III (cf. G. Yazdani, ed., Early History of the Deccan, I-VI, pp 376-77 and P. B. Desai, Bāsavesvara and His Times, pp’31-32). But it has now been shown that Taila, who was defeated by Prola, was a younger brother of Bhūlokamalla and not his son (JAHFS, XXXVI, p 3). The last known date of Taila coming from an epigraph from Pattadakal, ie., 17 June 1163 (Yazdani, op cit, p 377), is later than the date of the Anumakonda inscription of 1162-63. Hence it is clear that Taila mentioned in that inscription cannot be Taila III (JAHFS, XXXVI, p 3). In sum, therefore, there are reasons to think that Prola II and his successor Rudra continued to be loyal to the Cāлуkya king and that it is not correct to hold that they rendered assistance to Kālacuri Bijjala by overthrowing Taila III.

38. Sīl, IV, no 1242.
overlord claims for himself the credit of killing Prola. These references show that Prola II was killed in a battle by the above chiefs, probably in his attempt to conquer the coastal Ändhradeśa.

Prola II's wife was Muppamāmbā, the sister of Naṭavādi Durggarāja, who was also a subordinate of the Cālukyas of Kaḷyāṇa having his fief near Inugurī in Mahabubabad taluk, Warangal district. Among their sons, Rudra and Mahādeva were prominently known whereas the other sons Harihara, Ganapati and Repolla Durggarāja are known only from references in inscriptions.41

INDEPENDENT RULERS

RUDRADEVA (1157-95)

Prola II was succeeded by his eldest son Rudradeva some time before Śaka 1080 (1158), the date of the Drāksārāmam inscription of his minister Inaṅgaḷa Brahmi Reddi.42 In addition to the Śaka year 1080, the record mentions the thirteenth regnal year of the Cālukya Cōla king Rājarāja II. This need not be considered seriously, as it was customary at Drāksārāmam to date the records in the Cōla emperor's regnal years also, and it does not signify any political subordination of Rudra to the Cōla overlord. The name "Rudra", however, occurs without the usual epithets such as mahāmandalesvara. He is simply mentioned as Anumakoṇḍa Rudradeva. Rudra does not seem to have invaded that region but the death of his father by Kota Coḍayarāja, as stated above, indicates that Inaṅgaḷa Brahmi Reddi might have accompanied Prola II to assist the Cālukya-Cōla king Rājarāja II in suppressing a rebellion of the Kota chief Coḍayarāja and the Haihaya chiefs Manna Satya and Mallideva. Although the rebels were finally defeated, Prola II lost his life and the Kākatiya general Inaṅgaḷa Brahmi Reddi had to state simply Rudradeva of Anumakoṇḍa as his master.

The military achievements of Rudra along with those of his father have already been discussed while dealing with the incidents recorded in the Thousand Pillared Temple inscription. By the time this record was set up by Rudra in the beginning of 1163, Tallapa III might have died. The only other independent expedition led by Rudradeva was against Bhīmadeva, the Telugu Cōḍa chief of Kanduru-naḍu, who on a former occasion killed his brother Gokarnadeva and became the ruler of that region as a subordinate under Tallapa III. When Tallapa III died in 1162 Bhīmadeva might have become independent, which encouraged his nephew Udaya Cōḍa to follow suit. Thus, according to the inscription, it is to be understood that Bhīmadeva was ruling the region including Panūgalju and Vardhamāna-nagari with the latter as his capital, whereas his nephew Udaya Cōḍa (or Coḍodaya, as he was sometimes called) was ruling the northern part of their hereditary

40. CP, no 10 of AR, 1916-17.
41. SII, IV, no 1070 and X, no 254.
42. Ibid, IV, no 1107.
kingdom, with Kanduru as his capital. Rudradeva first attacked Vardhamānanagari and burnt it. Bhīmadeva fled to the woods leaving all his belongings. Rudra next proceeded against Cōdodaya who seems to have offered more resistance. The Ceraku chiefs, who had their appanage in Erūva-nāgu (Giddalur and Nandikotkur taluks of Kurnool district), assisted Kākatiya Rudra in defeating Udaya Cōḍa and his general Arasaḷu. The Panugalla and the Śrīśailam regions were conferred as appanage on the Ceraku chiefs, who ruled over them till the fall of the Kākatiyas. Udaya Cōḍa purchased peace by offering the hand of his daughter to Rudra and, consequently he was allowed to enjoy independent status in the Kanduru-nāgu. To mark his victorious expeditions over Panuγalla and other places, Rudra is said to have built suburbs with those names in his newly built capital city of Oruγalla.

Rudra's first attempt to invade the coastal region started, in fact, during the last quarter of the twelfth century i.e., after the death of the Velanāṭi chief Rājarāja Cōḍa II in 1181. These Velanāṭi chiefs were, in the beginning, faithful to their Cālukya Cōḍa kings so long as Rājarāja II was alive. But when Rājarāja II died in 1172, the Velanāṭi chief Kūḷottūṅga Rājarāja Cōḍa II repudiated the authority of the new Cālukya-Cōḍa emperor Rājadhirāja II and made himself master of the entire sea-board tracts extending from Darsi in Nellore district to Simhācalam in Vishakhapatnam district. Hence, Kākati Rudra could not exercise his authority over the coastal Āndhradeśa as long as the powerful Rājarāja Cōḍa II was supreme at Candavolu.

Due to his unexpected death in 1181 and due to the outbreak of a fratricidal war among the Palnāṭi chiefs, Rudra got an opportunity to interfere in the political affairs of coastal Āndhra by way of responding to the call of one of the Palnāṭi chiefs Naḷagāma for assistance. Rudra at once set out with an army accompanied by capable nāyakas of the Malyala, Komaravalli, Vipparla and Naṭavādi families. Apart from the outcome of the Palnāṭi internecine war, Rudra defeated the Koṭa chief Doḍḍa Bhīma and captured his town Dharaṇikōta. But as a conciliatory measure he installed Keta II, the son of Doḍḍa Bhīma, on the throne and gave him back his ancestral territories.

With the assistance of Keta II, Rudra proceeded against the Velanāḍu chief and subjugated the Koṇḍapadumāṭi chiefs who served as wardens of the western marches of the Velanāṭi kingdom. An inscription at Tripurāntakam dated 1185 registers his gift of the village of Revuru on the banks of the Krishna in Koṇḍapaḷināḍu to the god Tripurāntaka Mahādeva. It indicates that Rudra was actually in possession of the said Koṇḍapaḷināḍu originally belonging to the Koṇḍapadumāṭi chiefs. These military activities of Rudra in the Velanāḍu territories made Pṛṭhīvīśvara, the grandson of Velanāṭi Rājarāja Cōḍa II, leave his capital Candavolu and flee to Pithāpuram, the headquarters of his dominion to the north of the Krishna.

Rudra, after his victorious expedition to the coastal Āndhradeśa, seems to have busied himself during the last decade of his reign with preparations.
for an invasion of the Sēṇa kingdom in the north. This attempt, however, ended in disaster and Rudra was killed in a battle during the course of the invasion. The Patna inscription dated in the time of Sēṇa Singhana (1200-46)\(^{43}\) states that his father Jaitugi put an end to the pleasures of the beloved ones of the ladies of Andhra. This has been further corroborated by Hemadri, the śīkāraṇāhipa of Sēṇa Mahādeva, who boasted in the Vratkhaṇḍa of his Caturvarga-cintāmani that Jaitrapāla (Jaitugi) offered a human sacrifice by immolating a victim in the shape of Rudra the Trilīṅgādhīpa and thus vanquished the three worlds. Though the event is recorded in Singhana’s time, it actually took place during the time of his father Jaitugi around 1196.

Rudra was a great conqueror. Assisted by valiant warriors such as the Ceraku, Malyāla and Receria chiefs, he completed the task of carving an independent kingdom left unfinished by his father. Though he led two expeditions to the coastal Andhra country, one to Drāksārāmam and the other to Tripurāntakam, he could not succeed in conquering any part of coastal Andhra with the exception of Dharanikota. He was singularly lucky in his generals and ministers who spared no pains in enhancing the prestige and power of the ruling family. In wars and pious deeds he received special assistance from minister Gaṅgādhara, son of Govinda of Velanadu.

Rudra was a patron of art and letters. He was a great builder. He completed the stone fort at Orugallu which became the seat of Kākaṭiya power. He constructed the present Rudrasvara temple popularly known as veyistambhālagudi (Thousand Pillared temple) at Anumakonda on the architectural tradition of the Western Calukya. Emulating his example, other chiefs and ministers also built several temples and endowed them with gifts. Besides being the founder of an independent kingdom, Rudra was also distinguished as the founder of a school of sculptural art which was adumbrated in the Thousand Pillared temple at Anumakonda and later improved and embellished in the temples of Rāmappa, Piḷḷailamarri and Nāgulapadu, among others.

MAHÂDEVA (1196-98)

As Rudradeva left no issue of his own, his younger brother Mahādeva, succeeded him in 1195-96. Mahādeva was a faithful devotee of Śiva and took Śaiva ordination from Dhruvesvara Paṇḍita. Soon after his accession to the throne he too, like his brother Rudra, initiated wars of aggression in or around 1198, invading the Sēṇa country. He died at the hands of Jaitugi in a battle. The title Kaṭakacūrakāra attributed to Mahādeva in the Bayyaram tank inscription indicates that he plundered Kaṭaka, ie, Kalyāna, probably in the course of his expedition against the Sēṇa country. The enmity with the Sēṇa kings did not end with the death of the two Kākaṭiya kings. Jaitugi imprisoned Mahādeva’s son Ganapatideva. Later, the Kākaṭiya
nobles and ministers headed by Recerla Rudra managed to obtain the release of their young prince and crowned him in 1199.44

Besides Gaṇapati Deva, Mahādeva had two daughters—Mailamāmbā and Kuṇḍamāmbā—as known from their respective Bayyaram and Kuṇḍāvaram inscriptions. Both the daughters were given in marriage to the Naṭavāḍī chief Rudra, son of Buddhā and grandson of Durga who held their fief in the Inugurṭi region under the Cāḷukyas of Kalāṇa. The marriage of the two sisters with Naṭavāḍī Rudra still remains a puzzle. There is a possibility of their being step-sisters, Mailamāmbā being Gaṇapati’s own sister and Kuṇḍamāmbā a step-sister.

GAṆAPATIDEVA (1199-1262)

After consolidating his position on the throne with the assistance of the loyal commanders like Recerla Rudra and Malyāla Caunda, Gaṇapati Deva made preparations for an expedition against the coastal region.

The mere occurrence of a few inscriptions of Rudradeva in the Drākṣārāmam and Tripurāntakam temples cannot be taken as evidence to establish his suzerainty over the east coast. Their dating in the regnal years of the Cāḷukya-Cōḷa king Rājarāja II clearly shows that Rudra did not exercise any power in those parts, but only visited that land on some mission. The Velanāṭi chief Rājendra Cōḷa II died around 1181, and his son Goṅka III seems to have led a peaceful career without any political conflicts with Rudra, their neighbour in the north-west.

The authority of the Velanāṭi chief Pṛthviśvara, son of Goṅka III, as seen from his inscription at Pṛṭhāpuram45 dated Śaka 1108, was confined to the territory to the east of the river Godavari, though it is stated in a later literary work, the Simhāsana-dvātrimasati of Koravi Goparāju, that he ruled over the whole of the Velanāṭi kingdom from his capital Candavolu. Pṛthviśvara’s influence in the Krishna region also continued till about 1201, as is evident from his inscriptions and literary tradition, though the autonomous or semi-autonomous petty feudal chiefs of the Koṭa, Chāgi Kolāṇu and the Haihaya lineage limited his authority in the area.

44. The Telugu literary work Somadeva-vijayamu states (Āśvāsa, 2) that Mahādeva laid siege on the fort of Devagiri for over three months. This is corroborated by an inscription from Bidar (ARIE, 1956-57, App. B, no 181) which refers to his heroic fight at Devagiri. No details of the battle are forthcoming because of the fragmentary nature of this record. The result of the battle seems to be that Mahādeva died there and his son Gaṇapati was taken captive. A Kāṇaticya record also refers to the death of Mahādeva on the battlefield (EI, III, 1894-95, p 97, v. 5). The Kālegaon plates of Sāuna Mahādeva and the Paithan plates of Rāmacandra state that Jaitugi killed a king of Trikalinga and liberated Gaṇapati. This event must have taken place before 1199 when Gaṇapati commenced his rule. On the basis of the earliest known inscription of Gaṇapati dated 1202 (cf. Telangana Inscriptions, I), Rama Rao surmised that Gaṇapati was in the Sāuna prison till that year (Kāṇaticyas of Warangal, p 59). But this is not true because Jaitugi’s rule had ended by then (see also S. H. Ritti, The Sāunas, p 93).

45. EI, IV, 1896-97, pp 32-54.
The inscription dated 1201, in the Kanakadurga temple at Vijayawada\textsuperscript{46} of the Națavādī prince Vakkadimallā marks the beginning of the Kākaṭiya conquests in the east. The Kākaṭiya armies proceeded to the island of Divi near the mouth of the Krishna, which was then under the sway of the Āyya chiefs, probably subordinates of the Velanāṭi Prthvīśvara. In spite of the stubborn resistance offered by these chiefs, the Kākaṭiya armies penetrated into the island fortress and compelled its occupants to surrender. The two Koṇḍiparti inscriptions of Malyāla Caunda dated 1203 and that of his son Kāta dated 1241\textsuperscript{47} respectively state that these two generals had invaded the island and enriched Gaṇapati’s treasury with the precious diamonds plundered from the safe vaults of Prthvīśvara. In recognition of his services, the king conferred the title dvīp-īnūṭaka (plunderer of the island) on Kāta. Gaṇapati, for diplomatic reasons, not only did not annex the conquered territory to his kingdom but also allowed the Āyya chiefs to retain it and contracted a marital relation with them by marrying Nārāmbā and Perāmbā, the two daughters of Āyya Piṇa Cōdi. He also took their brother Jāya or Jāyapa into his service as a commander (senāpati). It is not improbable that as a consequence of these victories, the entire Velanāṭu along with the island might have passed into the hands of Gaṇapatideva before 1211, the date of the Gaṇapeśvaram inscription.\textsuperscript{48} The fact that like Gaṇapatideva the Telugu Cōla king Tikka-bhūpāla of Nellore, the Sēṇa chief Viṣvanāṭha and some other subordinates of Gaṇapatideva also bear the title Prthvīśvara-śiraḥ-kanduka- kararı-vinoda, suggests that they all participated in this battle in which Prthvīśvara was killed. Gaṇapatideva thus put an end to the power of the Velanāṭi kings and made Jāya-senāpati the governor of this newly acquired part of the country.

Southern Expedition

The Cēbroḷu epigraph of Jāya-senānī dated 1213 refers to an expedition of Gaṇapatideva against the southern kings who, in all probability, were the Telugu Cōla chiefs of Nellore. The Cōda emperor Kulōṭṭūnga III invaded the Telugu Cōda kingdom comprising the region between Nellore and Kāṇcī in or around 1180, defeated Manumasiddhi I and installed his younger brother Nallasiddhi on the throne. Nallasiddhi and his younger brother Tammusiddhi ruled till 1207-8 and were loyal to their suzerain. But Manumasiddhi’s son Takka, the rightful heir to the throne, solicited Gaṇapati’s help and joined the latter’s forces which were waging war against Velanāṭi Prthvīśvara who, as noticed already, was slain around 1206. In return for Tikka’s help, Gaṇapati marched against Nellore, put Tammusiddhi to flight, and installed Tikkaḥūpāla on the throne of Nellore. The Mattevāḷa inscription of Gaṇapatideva dated 1228 states that he had plundered the Cōla capital.

\textsuperscript{46} Ibid, VI, 1900-1, p 159.
\textsuperscript{47} HAS, XIII, ii, no 8, v. 55; and no 9, v. 53.
\textsuperscript{48} EI, III, 1894-95, p 91.
probably Kāñcī. A more graphic picture of this adventure of Gañapatideva is given in the Gañapēśvaram inscription of his commander Jāyapa-senānī, dated 1231, wherein it is stated that Gañapati, having subdued the countries of Cōḷa, Kaliṅga, Sēuṇa, Kamāṭa, and so on, made Velanāḍu his own, together with Dvīpa.49 So, by 1231, Tikka was well established by Gañapati in his ancestral kingdom which included Kāñcī.

This first phase of Gañapatideva’s expedition over the east coast includes his march in the modern tracts of Bastar, Čakrakūṭa, Kaliṅga and the Gpdavari regions. The Uparapaṭṭi epigraph50 of the Kākatiya general Rājanāyaka dated Śaka 1157 (1236) enumerates his victories in the centre. He is said to have reduced the rulers of the Maṇṭiyas (the country extending as far as the frontier of Bastar and Orissa), Bokkera in the Aska taluk of Ganjam district and driven away a certain Godhumarāṭi and Paḍiyarāya near Udayagiri in the Pedamkimiidi agency and annexed the territories. These rulers might have been the subordinates of the Eastern Gaṅga king Rājarāja III who was ruling the Kaliṅga country at that time. The Kākatiya general, after his victorious march into Kaliṅga, finally reached Drākṣārāmam where he made a gift for maintaining perpetual lamps to the god Bhīmeśvara in the Śaka year 1134 (1212). But the victory of Gañapatideva over these north-eastern rulers did not result in any territorial additions to the kingdom as the defeated kings soon became independent or remained subordinates to the Eastern Gaṅga king as before.

The Kākatiya conquest of coastal Andhra and south Kaliṅga appears to have been effected in phases covering a period of about three decades. The powerful principality of Kolāṇu (Sarasī-puri) did not come under his sway until 1231. Mahāmaṇḍalesvara Kolaṇi Keśavadeva, who came to the throne in 1292, ruled independently until 1228.51 After the death of this chief, Aniyanka Bhima III the ruler of Kaliṅga made attempts to subjugate Veṅgī.

Gaṅapati’s Kaliṅga expedition was more a measure of retaliation against the Kaliṅga king who, taking advantage of the preoccupation of the Kākatiya armies in the south, invaded Veṅgī, brought under his sway petty chiefs such as the Cāḷuṅyās of Pīṭhāpuram and the Maṇḍiyas of the Orissa border and posted one of his own officers at Drākṣārāmam some time before 1230.52 Gañapatideva dispatched an army under Indulūri Soma Pradhāṇi to conquer the Godavari region. Gañapati’s exploits in this region are vividly described in Śivayogasāra, a Viraśaiva treatise of the fifteenth century written by Kolāṇu Gañapati. It states that Indulūri Soma Pradhāṇi, one of the author’s ancestors, conquered Kolāṇu and Kaliṅga in a single campaign and re-established Kākatiya authority there.

An epigraph in the temple of Paleśvara at Iragāvaram in the west Godavari
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district dated 1231, which records that Kolânu (Veṅgi) was conquered by the Kâkatiyaas in that year, confirms the version of Śivayogasāra. After the death of the Kaliṅga king Aniyaṅka Bhîma, his son Narasimha I invaded the Godavari region to establish Gaṅga hegemony, but did not succeed in his efforts. The Kâkatiya power remained undisturbed in this part till the end of the dynasty. It may be noted in this connection that though the Kâkatiya armies are said to have invaded Kaliṅga, their sovereignty over that region beyond Drâkṣârâmam is not borne out by any epigraphic or other evidence.

Tikka, the king of Nellore, died in 1248 and the affairs of Nellore, which fell into chaos, again called for Ganapati’s intervention. Vijayagarga Gopāla, who claimed to be a scion of the Telugu Cōḍa family, first seized Chingleput and north Arcot districts which formed part of the kingdom of Nellore. Only the northern parts comprising present Nellore and Cuddapah districts remained under the authority of the rightful king Manumasiddhi II, son of Tikka. Vijayagarga Gopāla entered into an alliance with the kings of the Drāviḍa and Karnāṭa countries to strengthen his position. Added to this the paṭīhāris Bayyana and Tikkana raised the standard of revolt in Nellore against Manumasiddhi and drove him out of his capital. A Vaiḍūmba chief named Tikkaras Gaṅga alias Rakkasa Gaṅga occupied Manumasiddhi’s territory in Cuddapah district, after defeating Gaṅgaya-sāhini, the commander of Manumasiddhi’s forces. Thus deprived of all his kingdom, Manumasiddhi II appealed to Gaṅapatideva for help. The famous Telugu poet Tikkaṇa, author of the Telugu Mahābhārata, was sent as an emissary to Gaṅapatideva’s court. He was warmly received at the Kâkatiya court and a powerful army under Sāmanta Bhoja was dispatched to the south to reinstate Manumasiddhi II on his ancestral throne.

According to the undated Nayanapaḷḷi inscription in Guntur district, the Kâkatiya army reduced Nellore to ashes, played a game of ball with the heads of the paṭīhāris Bayyana and Tikkana and, having entered the Drāviḍa-mandala, captured Kulōttunga Rājendra Cōḍa. Sāmanta Bhoja fought a decisive battle at Pâḷaiyâru in Thanjavur district against the combined armies of Drâviḍa, Karnâṭaka and Vijayagarga Gopāla and captured Kâṛcī in 1250. But the provenance of Vijayagarga Gopāla’s inscriptions in Kâṛcī till 1282 indicate that Manumasiddhi failed to re-establish his power in Kâṛcī, though he did so in Nellore district. Then the Kâkatiya armies marched against the Vaiḍūmba chief Rakkasa Gaṅga who, as has been mentioned earlier, defeated Gaṅgaya-sāhini, the Kayastha chief, the commander of the forces of Manumasiddhi II in Pâkanâdu and seized the territory. Rakkasa Gaṅga was worsted in battle and the territory of Manumasiddhi II seized by him was taken away and given to the Telugu Cōḍa king. Gaṇapatideva, perhaps recognising the ability of Gaṅgaya-sāhini, the commander of the Telugu Cōḷa forces, took him into service, appointing him as a bâhattaraniyogâdhipati (the superintendent of seventy-two niyogas) at his court. This is recorded in one of the inscriptions at Tripurântakam dated
1254. He also conferred on Gaṅgaya the region of Marjavāḍī which was conquered from the Vañcumbha chief Rakkasa Gaṅga as a family estate. Although the great poet Tikkaṇa claims the entire credit of the victory for his master Manumasiḍḍhi II, the part played by the Kākatiya army cannot be overlooked.

Gaṅapatideva’s relations with the Sēṇas were normally amicable throughout his long reign of sixty years. Gaṅapati gave asylum to the Sēṇa princes and entertained them in his service. One Sēṇa chief named Viśvanātha, known from an unpublished inscription at Rahmantpur in Nalgonda district is said to have acquired the title Prthviśvara-śirha-kanduka-kriḍā vinoda which indicates his participation in the Kākatiya campaign against Velanaḍu in the coastal Andhradeśa in the early years of Gaṅapati’s reign when the Velanaṭi king Prthviśvara was killed by the former. In this connection mention may also be made of Permaḍi, another Sēṇa chief, who according to the Perūru inscription dated Saka 1181 is known to be a subordinate of Gaṅapatideva. Similarly, in his southern campaign against the Pāṇḍyas, Gaṅapati was assisted by some Ārya or Sēṇa chiefs as commanders of his armies.

Manumasiḍḍhi II, the Telugu Cōḷa king of Nellore alias Vira Gaṅḍagopāla, the friend and ally of Gaṅapati, was again involved in troubles in the last years of his reign due to the invasion of the Pāṇḍyan king Jatāvarman Sundara Pāṇḍya I from the south in or around 1257. The Pāṇḍyan attack on the Telugu Cōḷa chief formed part of the Pāṇḍyan invasion aimed against Rājendra Cōḷa III and his ally Vijayaganḍa Gopāla of Kāṛcī. The Pāṇḍyan army made its first attack on Vijayaganḍa Gopāla and his ally Kopperunjiṅga, a formidable Kāḍava chief. Both of them not only surrendered themselves to the victor but also joined hands with him in attacking the Nellore kingdom. Manumasiḍḍhi II, apprehending the danger, immediately appealed to the Kākatiyas, the Sēṇas and the Bāṇa rulers for help.

The occurrence of the inscriptions of Rājendra Cōḷa III and Kopperunjiṅga, now vassals of the Pāṇḍyas, at Tripurāntakam in the heart of the Kākatiya kingdom indicates that these chiefs were commissioned by the Pāṇḍyas to penetrate into the Kākatiya territory. Kopperunjiṅga proceeded up to Drākṣārāmam, probably with the object of establishing contact with the king of Kaliṅga, the enemy of the Kākatiya monarch but was defeated by Gaṅapati. The latter, perhaps to bring about a split in the Pāṇḍyan camp and win over the Kāḍava chief, is said to have honoured him with the decoration of virapāḍa-mudrā (presentation of the anklet of the heroes).

According to the Pāṇḍyan records, it is believed that while the expedition under Kopperunjiṅga was advancing in the north, the main Pāṇḍyan army led by Jatāvarman Sundara Pāṇḍya, Bhuvanaika-vīra Vikrama Pāṇḍya and Jatāvarman Virapāṇḍya captured Nellore and killed Viraganḍa Gopāla in a
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fierce engagement at Muṭṭukuru in 1263. His allies the Kākatiyas, the Sēuṇas and the Bāṇas were put to flight. The Telugu Cōla kingdoms of Nellore and Kāṅcī were annexed to the Pāṇḍyan empire and, as a mark of this great victory, Jāṭāvarman Sundara Pāṇḍya celebrated his virābhiṣeka, the anointment of his conquest at Nellore and Kāṅcī and issued special coins bearing the symbol of the Kākatiya boar on the obverse besides the Pāṇḍyan emblem of the fish on the reverse. This was the first and the last military defeat of Gaṇapatideva which coincides with his final retirement from active politics of the kingdom.

Though begun under unfavourable circumstances, the reign of Gaṇapatideva was one of the most brilliant epochs in the history of Andhra. At the time of his accession to the throne, the Andhra country was in a state of political disorder. The power of the Cāḷukya-Cōla and the Cāḷukyas of Kalyāṇa had finally disappeared, leaving behind several feudal states, small and big, engaged in a constant fight for supremacy. He set before himself the task of restoring the political unity of the country and by war or diplomacy Gaṇapatideva succeeded in a large measure in accomplishing this object.

An important event which redounds to the credit of Gaṇapatideva was the change of the capital from Anumakonda to Orugaḷḷu. The foundations for the new capital were laid by Gaṇapatideva’s uncle Rudradeva in the last years of his reign. Gaṇapatideva continued this work and built two forts, one within the other, constructed respectively in stone and mud. The new fort, according to tradition, was provided with seventy-five bastions, the protection of each of which was entrusted to a nāyaka in the service of the king.

Gaṇapatideva’s Vassals, Ministers and Commanders

The Recerla and the Malyāla chiefs were the oldest of the Kākatiya feudatories. Rudra, head of the Recerla family, played an important part in re-establishing the fortunes of the kingdom in the opening days of Gaṇapatideva’s reign. On the death of Kākati Rudra and his brother Mahādeva in their wars against the Sēuṇa kings and when Gaṇapatideva was imprisoned at Devagiri, the nobles rose in revolt and tried to destroy the very fabric of the Kākatiya kingdom. Rudra stood loyal and took upon himself the task of preserving the integrity of the kingdom. He put down
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the nobles with a stern hand, drove away the foreign invaders, and governed the kingdom until the return of the young king from captivity at Devagiri. Rājanāyaka, the commander of Rudra’s armies, led expeditions into Kaliṅga, and rendered distinguished service on several fields of battle.57 Among the Mālyālas, Caunda and his son Kāta deserve particular mention, for they played a leading part in the conquest of the Divi and Velanāḍu regions. Next in importance were the Āyya chiefs of Divi who were taken into royal service by Gaṇapati after subjugating them as a conciliatory measure. Jāyapa was a distinguished commander or senāṇī who appears to have been specially skilled in leading the elephant force as his title gaja-sāhini would indicate. Jāyapa was also a renowned connoisseur of art and man of letters. He composed a treatise on dancing and choreography called Nṛttaratnāvali which is considered to be the best extant work on the subject.

The Telugu Cōḷa king Manumasiddhi II of Nellore, Eruva Bhima and Opilī Siddhi of Konidiṇa are the most important and powerful among the subordinate allies rather than feudatories of Gaṇapati’s time. The Cakra-nārāyaṇa prince named Mādhava Mahārāja and his son Sārahgadharadeva were another line of subordinates who ruled the Addanki region in the present Ongole district. Certain chiefs of Eastern Cāḷukya, descent figure in the inscriptions of Gaṇapatiideva. Nothing of importance is known about them though his daughter Rudramā was given in marriage to Vīrabhadra, one of the members of this family.58 Among the ministers of the king, Somaya of the Indulūrī family was the most eminent. Though a brahman by birth and ranked as a mahapradhana at the court, he followed the profession of arms and by sheer dint of merit rose to the position of one of the foremost generals in the king’s service. The Śivayogasāra credits him with many victories in Gaṇapati’s Kaliṅga campaign of 1212. Another mahāpradhāna of Gaṇapati was Prola Bhima-nāyaka, who bore several distinguished titles, such as Aruvela-duṣaka (the destroyer of Velanāḍu) and Kāṇci-Cūrakāra (plunderer of Kāṇci).

Gaṅgaya sāhini of the Kāyastha lineage was another distinguished officer who was taken into the king’s service in the latter part of his reign. As already mentioned, he held the high office of bahattara-niyōgādhipati, i.e., the president of the seventy-two categories of royal services in which the senādhyakṣas, mahāpradhānas, pradhānas, and so on, were included. Besides this exalted position at Gaṇapati’s court, Gaṅgaya sāhini also held the post of a military rank as turaga-sādhanika, commander of the cavalry, as mentioned in the Tripurāntakam inscription.59 Gaṇapati also conferred on him an extensive tract of territory extending from Pānugal in Nalgonda district to Kaivāram in Kolar district of Karnataka, which he ruled from Vallūru-Pattana in Cuddapah district as his capital. He died in 1257 and
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was succeeded by Jannigadeva or Janardana, his nephew, the son of his younger sister Candaladevi.

RUDRAMÄDEVI (1262-95)

Gaṇapatideva, who had no male issue, nominated his elder daughter Rudramādevi as heir to the kingdom which she began to rule as co-regent from 1259-60 under the name of Rudradeva Mahārāja. Those were the days when the Kākaṭiya armies suffered defeat in the battlefield of Muttukūr at the hands of the Pāṇyās. Although Gaṇapatideva ultimately managed to repel the invasion which penetrated as far as the river Krishna, he had to forfeit his hold over the southern territories. This apparent weakness was misunderstood by some of the subordinates such as the Kāyasthas who tried to become independent.

There are a few inscriptions which mention Gaṇapatideva as the ruling king even after his retirement. One such record is of Jannigadeva dated Śaka 1191 at Duggi in the Pāṁṇāq taluk of Guntur district, which states that Rudramādevi was the paṭṭoddhati but not yet the queen. The term paṭṭoddhati is a scribal mistake for paṭṭoddhti (paṭṭa = royalty, ud-dhrti = chosen). This proves that in 1269 Rudramādevi was only the queen-designate and not yet an anointed sovereign. It is also evident that the old king was still alive. But the succession of a lady to the throne did not meet with the approval of some of her kinsmen and nobles. According to the Pratāpacaritra, certain chiefs named Harihara and Murārīdeva, Gaṇapatideva’s sons by other queens, revolted against Rudramā and seized the capital. Harihara is described in the Tripurāntakam inscription of Gaṇapati’s sister Maillama as one of the many brothers of Rudra and Mahādeva. The existence of Murārīdeva as Gaṇapati’s cousin or son is not known from any other source except the literary work Siddhesvaracarita. It is not improbable that some members of the royal family revolted against the queen. But she was able to tide over the difficulty and seize the throne with the help of some loyal supporters who put down the rebels. Among such loyal feudatories, mention must be made of the Kāyastha chiefs Jannigadeva and his younger brother Tripurārī. The Velama chief Prasāditya, according to the chronicle, Veḷuḷoṭivārī-vaṃśāvalī, is said to have assumed the title Kākaṭiya-rāja-sthāpanācārya and Rāva-pitāmahāṃka. There are several insizational evidences to show that other chiefs like Ambadeva Mahāpradhāna Kannaranāyaka, Mahāpradhāna Gaṇapatideva Mahārājulu, Niśānaka Malikarjuna, Malayāla Gundaiyāyaka and Mādhyānāyaka also bore titles such as Rāvasthāpanācārya and Śvānirvāna-gaṇḍa. The old king Gaṇapati-deva himself did everything to see Rudramādevi firmly established on the throne during his last days.

Gaṇapatideva’s last days, as we have seen above, were marked by the
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Paṇḍya invasion over the southern territories of the Kākatiya kingdom. The inscription of the Paṇḍya general Kopperuṇjiṅga at Drākṣārāmam and Tripurāntakam bear testimony to the fact that he had invaded the Telugu country. But he suffered defeat at the hands of Gaṅapatī and had to acknowledge his supremacy. Gaṅapatī, however, treated him with consideration and honoured him by decorating him with the anklet of the heroes. Nevertheless, the Kākatiya monarch could not re-establish his authority over the Nellore region, which remained under the Paṇḍyan suzerainty, being ruled by the brothers of Vira-Gaṅḍa Gopāla. Muliki-nāḍu and Mārjavāḍi (the governance of which was entrusted to the Kāyaṭha chief by Gaṅapatideva) were practically not under his control at the time of Rudramāṃba’s accession to the throne. The Ellāreḍḍipalle epigraph in Cuddapah district dated Prabhava in Śaka 1189 states that the Vaiḍumbha chief Bhujabala Viranārāyaṇa Somesvaradeva Mahārāja of Kalukada was at that time ruling Muliki-nāḍu-300, Honnavāḍi-90 and penḍeṭaḷu-200 from the Kāyaṭha capital Vaḷḷürü-pattanam. Another epigraph at Cintala-putṭuru in the same district dated Vibhava, Śaka 1190 refers to the rule of Mahāmaṇḍalesvara Murāri Keśavadeva Mahārāja and Somideva Mahārāja, which makes it clear that in spite of the Kākatiya support, the Kāyaṭha chiefs lost their hold on those parts.

In the coastal tracts of the kingdom, no trace of Kākatiya rule is found in any place until 1278-79. It is obvious that the Kākatiya power suffered an eclipse in the Godavari region at least for a period of sixteen years, after which some inscriptions referring to Rudramādevī appear in Drākṣārāmam and other places. An epigraph at Drākṣārāmam dated Śaka 1184 (1262) mentions the name of Narasimhanarāḍhīpa, who in all probability was Narasimha I, the Gaṇapatī king of Orissa. His son and successor Bhānudeva I invaded Vēṇgi in Śaka 1196 and set up two inscriptions in Drākṣārāmam, Rudramādevī sent her army to the east under the commandership of Poṭi Nāyaka and Proḷi Nāyaka to check the advancement of the Gaṇapatī armies, which appears to have succeeded in repelling the invaders. The river Godavari formed the boundary between the two kingdoms. Thus Rudramā’s power was re-established in the coastal Andhra country, which remained under the Kākatiyas till the end of the dynasty. In Telingana, the northern parts were under the rule of the Sēṇa kings. Thus the entire kingdom acquired by Gaṇapatideva was not intact by the time Rudramā took the reins of the government into her hands.

As soon as Rudramā consolidated her position on the throne, a serious threat to the capital Warangal came from the invasion of the Sēṇa king Mahādeva. It is stated in Mahādeva’s inscriptions that he captured the ruler of the Telinga country and his elephants. Hemādri, the renowned theologian of the Sēṇa court, states in his reputed work Vrata-Khaṇḍa that his master Mahādeva was credited with the title Telīṅguṝāya-śirāḥ-kamala-mūlotpāṭana,
ie, the remover of the head of the Telugurāya. But a close examination of this title reveals that it was borne by Jaitugi I as well, who had really killed Rudra in 1196. So far as Mahādeva is concerned, the title may be taken as hereditary. In order to enhance the greatness of his master, Hemādri attributed to him an exploit which actually belonged to his ancestor. But Mahādeva’s invasion of the Kākatiya kingdom was a fact. According to the seventeenth century literary work Pratapacarīta, the Sēuṇa king Mahādeva invaded the Kākatiya kingdom and laid siege to the capital Warangal. But queen Rudramā fought with him for fifteen days and destroyed three lakh Sēuṇa cavalry. Mahādeva was chased by the Kākatiya forces under the command of the queen herself up to the walls of Devagiri fort.

This victory of Rudramā is borne out by epigraphical evidence as well. An unpublished fragmentary inscription at the Bidar fort gives a lengthy description of the Kākatiya kings Rudra, Mahādeva, Gaṇapatideva and his daughter Rudramā. A subordinate of this queen named Bhairava of the Sinda family is introduced at the end of the existing portion. He is said to have accompanied Rudramā as a commander of her army in all her expeditions. The existence of this epigraph, though fragmentary, in the southern territory of the Sēuṇa kingdom, where no other Kākatiya record has been discovered so far, bears testimony to Rudramādevi’s attack on the Sēuṇa kingdom. The annexation of the area under Bedadakoṭa (Bidar) to the Kākatiya kingdom by her also indicates that the enterprise was successful. Unwilling to record bluntly the discomfiture of his master, Hemādri glossed over it by stating that his patron left Rudrama tree because of his reluctance to kill a woman. On the other hand, Rudramā was the only Kākatiya ruler who annexed portions of the Sēuṇa kingdom by establishing her power in their southern territory. Mahādeva sued for peace and agreed to pay Rudramā huge amounts of money and horses as war indemnity. It may further be noted that some Sēuṇa chiefs of the royal family such as Sārīṇapāṇideva obtained asylum in the Andhra country because of their differences with Mahādeva and gained fiefs by the grace of Rudramā. According to the Āḷapāḍu grant63 of the Sēuṇa prince Yellanadeva, he is said to have been born in the line of Bhillama and Jaitugi and was married to a daughter of Kākatiya Rudramā.

In the early period of Rudramā’s reign, the Kāyastha chief Janagaddeva was very loyal to the queen. From his inscription at Nandaḷūru in Cuddapah district dated Śaka 1186 it is evident that the Pāṇḍyas were dislodged from that area by him on behalf of the Kākatiya queen. He was succeeded by his younger brother Tripurāntaka or Tripurāri, who ruled as a subordinate of the Kākatiya queen for three years (1270-02). But his brother and successor, Ambadeva, resolved to carve out an independent principality for himself at the very start of his career. His constant engagement in warfare with his neighbours and his failure to mention his overlord in all his records
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indicate his defiant attitude towards the queen. His Tripurāntakam inscription\textsuperscript{64} dated Śaka 1212 Vikṛti (1290) gives an account of his victories over several māṇḍalikas, who were all subordinates of the Kākatiya queen. The same record mentions another group of kings such as the Pāṇḍyas and Sēunas with whom he made friends and obtained rewards from them in the form of titles, horses, elephants and jewels. The phrases Pāṇḍya-rājanya-priya-presaśita-caṇḍavetanda turaṅga-sārtha-virājamāna sampōsita-sauhārda (he whose friendship is nourished by the elephants and horses sent by the Pāṇḍya kings), Devagiriṇāja-prasthāpita-prabhṛta-mani-kanaka-bhūṣana (he who was adorned with ornaments of gold and gems sent as gifts by the king of Devagiri) deserve particular mention in this connection.

The first enemy whom he vanquished according to the Tripurāntakam epigraph\textsuperscript{65} was a chief named Śrīpati Gaṇapati, who bore the title Rāya-sahasramalla. The chief was identical with Gurinḍāla-Gaṇapati spoken of in the Nilagaṅgāvaram inscription\textsuperscript{66} of Ambadeva as one of the kings defeated by the latter. Gaṇapati was then ruling at Gurinḍāla or Gurijāla in Guntur district, obviously as a vassal of Rudradeva Mahārāja (Rudrāmba). The circumstances under which he came into conflict with Ambadeva are not known. But he was certainly worsted in the battle in 1273 and Ambadeva seized his possessions along with his title Rāya-sahasramalla. In this conflict, Ambadeva seems to have fought with many of the seventy-five nāyakas of the Kākatiya queen, whose heads he claims to have cut off in battle as indicated by the phrases pancaḥikā-saptati-kṣitibhṛtāṁ maulin-viḷūyājau and Sarvān-adhrā-mahipatinjetārane-vasa labdhayān\textsuperscript{67} in the Tripurāntakam inscription. Ambadeva next turned against the Kulukaḍa chiefs Keśavadeva and Somideva. Having vanquished them in battle together with their ally Aḷḷū Gaṅga, the Telugu Cōla ruler of Gūṭṭi won back from them all the Kāyastha country including the capital Vaiḷūrupattana which had been in their possession since the Pāṇḍyan invasion of 1263. He made Vaiḷūrupattana his capital and strengthened Gaṇḍikoṭa, a strong hill-fort on the banks of the river Pennar. Then he proceeded against Manu-Mallideva of the Eruva region. Having killed him in battle he made himself master of his territories. Similarly, Pemdekaḷḷu, a neighbouring region in Eruva, was also annexed to the Kāyastha territory by forming an alliance with the chief of the region named Bollaya to whose son Rājanna Ambadeva gave his daughter in marriage.

These victories of Ambadeva brought him into conflict with almost all the Kākatiya subordinates whom the queen might have deputed to check his advance. But, according to the inscription, Ambadeva vanquished all the kings of Andhra and acquired glory. According to the Attirāla epigraph
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dated Saka 1209 (1287), he ruled from his capital Vațūrupattana all the countries of Ghaṇḍikota, Mulikināḍu, Renāḍu, Pençeκalī, Sakīli, Eruva and Potṭāpi nāḍu.68 His authority in the west also extended as far as Jagatāpi-Guṭṭi or Guṭṭi in Anantapur district. Thus, the whole of the south-western parts of the Kākaṭiya kingdom south of the river Krishna became the territory of the independent state of Ambadeva. The death of Vijaya Gaṇḍagopāla in or around 1279 offered an opportunity to Ambadeva to extend his sway in the east as far as Nellore. The Telugu Cōla chief Nanuma Gaṇḍagopāla, who had been driven out of his kingdom on a former occasion by the deceased king, sought the help of Ambadeva. The Pāṇḍya general Kopperuṇjīrīna, who was also an ally of the Kākaṭiya queen, was guarding the Nellore kingdom. Ambadeva’s title Kāḍavarāya vidhvamsana in his Tripurāntakam inscription suggests that he might have killed Kopperuṇjīrīna alias Kāḍavarāya in a battle. He also reinstated Manuma Gaṇḍagopāla on the throne of Nellore some time before 1282, as known by the latter’s inscription at Koḍavāḷuru69 in Nellore taluk, dated in his third regnal year coupled with the Saka year 1206 (1284). Thus, Rudramādevī’s authority in the whole of the south beyond the river Krishna leaving some parts in the east of Guntur district suffered an eclipse temporarily. The Pāṇḍyas made fresh efforts to regain their lost fortunes in the southern Andhra country under the leadership of Jatāvarman Sundara Pāṇḍya, Māravarman Sundara Pāṇḍya and Māravarman Kulaśekhara Pāṇḍya, who marched into Potṭapināḍu in 1282-83, probably accompanied by Somideva and Keśavadeva, the Vaiḍūmba chiefs of Kaḷukada. Ambadeva collected all his forces and attacked the Pāṇḍyas and finally defeated them around 1286.

The success achieved by Ambadeva in the early part of his career did not last long. Kumāra Rudradeva, grandson (daughter’s son) and heir-apparent of the Kākaṭiya queen Rudramādevi, took over the administration soon after he attained a majority. His first measure was the reorganisation of the nāyaṁkara system, the backbone of the military set-up which appears to have lost its vigour and efficiency during the previous years. Ambadeva felt this danger threatening the security of his newly formed kingdom and took necessary steps to defend his possessions. Notwithstanding his continuous victories in several battles, he felt that his army was decidedly unequal to the Kākaṭiya forces and as hinted in his Tripurāntakam record, entered into an alliance with the Sēunas of Devagiri and the Pāṇḍyas in the south. The Nilagangāvaram inscription70 further states that the Pāṇḍyas assisted Ambadeva by sending elephants and horses. But Kumāra Rudradeva, who was fully aware that any attack upon Ambadeva would certainly involve the Kākaṭiyas in a war with his powerful allies, concerted measures to launch a three-pronged attack on Ambadeva’s territories and those of his allies.
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In the Śaka year 1213 an army was despatched by Rudramā to Tripurāntakam under the command of Manuma Gaṇṇaya, son of Kolāṇi Somamantri and his cousin Anṇayadeva, son of Indulūri Peda Gaṇṇaya-mantri. Although the details of the conflict are not known, it is certain that Ambadeva was defeated and forced to retreat southwards to Mulikinādu. The Śivayogasāram informs us that the Kolāṇi and Indulūri chiefs not only dispersed the enemy’s forces but also captured seventy-two of the enemy’s forts during a single campaign.\(^{71}\) As a result, Tripurāntakam and the surrounding parts fell into the hands of Rudramādevī. The latest record of Ambadeva at Tripurāntakam is dated in the month Nīja-Aśāchha of the cyclic year Khara of Śaka 1213,\(^{72}\) and the earliest Kākaṭiya record, that is, the inscription of Indulūri Anṇayadeva\(^ {73}\) is dated about two months later in the month of the Śrāvana cyclic year Khara of Śaka 1213. It is obvious that Tripurāntakam and its neighbourhood must have changed hands within this short period of two months.

Nellore was the venue for the second Kākaṭiya attack. While Rudramādevī personally led the armies in the Tripurāntakam front against Ambadeva and his allies, Adidam Mallu, the sakala-senādhūpi and the right-hand man (dakṣinabhuja-daṇḍa) of Pratāparudra, marched southwards along the coast towards Vikramasimhapura (Nellore) where Manuma Gaṇḍagopāla was ruling. The Kākaṭiya armies defeated Manuma Gaṇḍagopāla and killed him in battle. In his place, as is evident from his inscriptions in Śaka 1212 (1290), a certain Madhurāntaka Poṭṭāpi-Cōḍa Raṅganātha, also known as Rāja Gaṇḍagopāla, succeeded him on the throne.

But this alliance of Pratāparudra with Rāja Gaṇḍagopāla, perhaps a scion of the deceased king, proved most unwise as he soon turned out to be a traitor to his benefactor, by joining hands with the Pāṇḍyas. To punish him for his unfriendly attitude, Pratāparudra had to send a second expedition to Nellore which naturally involved him in a war with the Pāṇḍyas. The Kākaṭiya army was led by a certain Manuma Gaṇḍagopāla, another Telugu Cōḍa chief and ruler of the region in the neighbourhood of Narasaraopet in Guntur district. Rāja Gaṇḍagopāla and the Pāṇḍyan allies offered strong opposition to him. Nevertheless, they were defeated. According to the Narasaraopet inscription of Manuma Gaṇḍagopāla (Śaka 1219), he is said to have drunk like the badavānala fire, the ocean of the Drāvida army and, after disgracing Rāja Gaṇḍagopāla and his allies, assumed the high sounding titles Dravīla-bala-vardhi-Pariṣana-badavānala: Rāja Gaṇḍagopāla-vihitāhita-mānabharhga.\(^{74}\)

The Narasaraopet inscription also credits him with the titles Sēuna-katakata-venu Kabalanađeva-pāvaka (the wildfire to the bamboo—like army of the Sēuṇas) which obviously implies that he joined in an expedition
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of the Kākatiya monarch against the Sēṇa kingdom. Some of the important events which had taken place during this invasion are recorded in an inscription set up in the fort of Raichur by Goṇa Viṭṭhala, the Kākatiya feudatory ruling at Varadhamānapura in Mahbubnagar district. According to this inscription (1294), Viṭṭhala captured the forts of Ādavani and Tumbalamp in Bellary district together with Mānuva and Hāuva in the Raichur doab. After reducing to subjection the chiefs who held sway over this region, Viṭṭhala finally entered the city of Raichur where he erected a strong fort to protect its inhabitants. It is obvious that Goṇa Viṭṭhala must have wrested the Krishna-Tungabhadrā doab from the Sēṇas of Devagiri.

This expedition against the Sēṇas appears to be the last campaign of Rudramādevī’s reign as she seems to have died in Śaka 1217 (1295). Though a woman, she was undoubtedly one of the greatest rulers of Andhra. She took an active part in the government of the kingdom. Attired in male garments she presided daily over the durbar, gave interviews to foreigners, listened to the reports of the secret service, held consultations with her ministers, generals and other high dignitaries of state and instructed all of them to promote the best interests of the state. On occasions of emergency she did not hesitate to take the field in person to lead her troops against the enemy. She was a valiant and courageous fighter and a general of great ability who led her men in war.

SUBORDINATES AND MINISTERS

The Malyāla chiefs and the Recerlas, who played an important part during the period of Rudra and Gaṇapaticēva, had almost retired from active participation in the administration of the kingdom during Rudramā’s reign. Among the new generals, the Reddi chiefs of the Goṇa family and the Velamas are worth mentioning. Goṇa Gaṇṇaya and his general Viṭṭhala rendered valuable help to Kumāra Rudradeva in his conquest of the Bellary and Raichur forts in the western Andhra country from the Sēṇas. The Velama chief Prasāditya made his first appearance, commanding the south-western region of the Kākatiya kingdom. Till Ambadeva came to power, the Kāyaasthas remained quite loyal and helped the sovereign to suppress the enemies and consolidate the queen’s position on the throne. The title rāya-sthāpanācārya associated with his name in some of his inscriptions probably refers to his loyal services to the queen before he asserted his independence.

But the circumstances which forced him to rebel against the queen and assert his independence still remain obscure. The kshatriya families such as the Koṇa Haihayas and the Cāḷukyas ruling in the Veṅgī country do not seem to have accepted the overlordship of the Kākatiya queen. The total absence of any Kākatiya records between 1262 and 1278 in Veṅgī lends colour to the belief that during this period Rudramādevī had lost control over this region and the various kshatriya families were exercising independent
authority. The Nidadavolu branch of the Eastern C\u0161\u00f6kuyas was related to the K\u00e6katiyas as Rudram\u00e6devi's husband Virabhada hailed from that family.

Few records in the Tanuku and Narasapur taluks of West Godavari district refer to the gifts by Vi\u015f\u00e6nu, the minister of Virabhada of the C\u00f6kukya family. Several families of \u0131re or Mah\u00e6r\u0142stra descent appear to have migrated into the Telugu country from the western Deccan and to have settled in the hilly tracts of the S\u00e7\u00edslaia mountains which came to be known subsequently as \u0131re-bh\u00f6m\u015fi or \u0131re-v\u00edd\u015fu, the country or habitat of the \u0131re chief V\u00e4nage. The son of D\u00e1vula V\u00e4nage flourished during the reign of Ga\u015finapatideva and took part in most of his battles. Among such \u0131re vassals of Rudram\u00e6devi S\u00e7\u00e5r\u00e6nap\u00e6nideva, the son of king Singha\u0161a of Devagiri was the most important. Another chief of \u0131re descent was R\u00e4naka Gopadevare\u015fi mentioned in the Gundalap\u00e6du inscription of Palnad taluk in Guntur district, dated \u00e7aka 1195 (1273). He held the post of commander in the royal army. T\u00f6ta Pi\u0161\u00e7ama, the progenitor of the later \u0131revi\u015fu chiefs of the Vijayanagar period, was in all probability a dependent of Kum\u00e6ra Rudradeva. According to the Bidar inscription, a subordinate king named Bhairava, son of Maila of Sinda lineage, is said to have assisted the queen by securing victories in all her military enterprises over Ve\u0161g\u011fi, Dr\u00e4v\u0161la and the country of the S\u00e7u\u0161a kings.

The Vinyala chief, Sura, known from the Ko\u0161gini plates76 and the chiefs of the Ceraku family having fiefs in the northern and southern parts of the K\u00e6katiya territory respectively, continued to be hereditary loyal s\u00e4mantas and rendered valuable service by holding the posts of commander (sen\u00eaddhipatis) of the queen's armies. Several mah\u00e6pradh\u00e6nas (ministers) of Rudram\u00e6devi and Kum\u00e6ra Rudradeva make their appearance in the records of her reign. Mah\u00e6pradh\u00e6na Indul\u0161iri Annyadeva, son of Gannaya, deserves special mention for being related to the royal family.76 Next in importance was Mah\u00e6pradh\u00e6na P\u00e4nka\u015fi Mallaya Preggada, the b\u00e4hattara-niy\u015fin\u00eaddhipati of the queen.77 It may be noted that he was the first minister to hold this office after the death of Ga\u015finapen\u0161\u015fi Ga\u015fnaya-s\u00e4h\u0161i in 1258-59.

Rudram\u00e6devi's Family

As stated above, Rudram\u00e6devi married the Eastern C\u0161\u00f6kukya prince Virabhada of Nidadav\u0161\u0161u. She had no male issue but had two daughters named Mummadamma and Ruyy\u0161mb\u0161. The former, according to the Prat\u0161parudra-Ya\u015fnobhi\u0161\u015fi of Vidy\u0161n\u0161tha, was married to Mah\u00e6deva probably of K\u00e6katiya lineage. To them was born a son called V\u00e4ra Rudra or Prat\u0161parudra, whom Rudram\u00e6devi by the command of her father Ganapatideva, adopted as her son and heir to the throne. Ruyyama, the second daughter of Rudram\u00e6devi, was given in marriage to Annyaya, son of Ga\u015finaya-mantri of the Indul\u0161iru family.78 He was a m\u00e4hapradh\u00e6na and
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senādhipati in the service of the queen and rendered her invaluable service in the administration of the kingdom. According to the Ālapādu grant of Yellana deva of the Sēuna lineage,79 another daughter of Rudramādevī, said to be the second in order, is known to have married to that chief who was holding a fief near Guntur.

PRATAPARUDRA (1295-1323)

Rudramādevī was succeeded by her grandson (her daughter Mummadambā’s son) Pratāparudra in 1295. As he was already associated with his grandmother in her military undertakings and the government, the enemies and the nobles of the kingdom did not dare to lift their heads against the young monarch after his accession. His first military enterprise as crown prince was against the kāyastha chief Ambadeva, who suffered a defeat at his hands and was compelled to retire from the Tripurāntakam region. However, even after the death of Ambadeva, his son and successor Tripurārī Il seems to have exercised independent authority over Mulikinādu, as can be seen from the absence of Kākatiya inscriptions in this region and from the omission of the name of the Kākatiya overlord in his own epigraphs. To suppress the kāyaasthanas completely, Pratāparudra despatched an army in 1309 under the generals Mahārāya Paṭṭaśāhinī Somaya Nāyaka and Indulūri Annaya. This time the kāyaasthanas were thoroughly defeated, their kingdom was annexed and the administration of the region entrusted to Somayanāyaka.

Before Pratāparudra could consolidate his possessions in the south, he had to face a Turkish invasion from Delhi. Garshāsp Malik, the son-in-law of Jalāl-ud-din Khalji, the sultan of Delhi, attacked the Sēuna capital Devagiri in 1295 and seized it. Though he went back to Delhi after exacting heavy sums of money and jewels from king Rāmadeva by way of tribute, he was expected to come to the south to attack and plunder other kingdoms in the region. Pratāparudra, expecting danger from the Turks, reorganized the defences of his kingdom, toned up the nāyārkara system and mustered up an army of 9,00,000 archers, 20,000 horses and 100 elephants. This preparedness enabled Pratāparudra to meet the northern invaders no less than seven times on the battlefield, though he had to make treaties of peace on more than one occasion, paying enormous tributes in the form of jewels, money, horses and elephants.

The earliest of the Turkish invasions over Telingana was that of Ala-ud-din in 1303, under the leadership of Malik Fakhr-ud-din Juna and Jhaju of Kara. The object of the invasion was plunder and territorial expansion. The expedition reached Telingana by way of Bengal. Their advance was checked by the Kākatiya armies at Upparapalli. The Veḷaḷa chief Venna, son of Recerla Prasāditya and Potugānti Maili, the two commanders of the Kākatiya
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armies according to the Velugotvāri Vamsāvalli,\textsuperscript{80} destroyed the pride of the Turiṣkās. To avenge this disaster suffered by his army, Ala-ud-din despatched a large army in 1309 with Malik Naib Kāfūr and Khwāja Hāji as its commanders to conquer Telingana. Pratāparudra made all possible arrangements to defend the fort. According to the Pratāpācaritra, the outer fort was protected by seventy bastions, each of which was left in the protection of a näyaka.

The siege began on 19 January 1310 and continued for a period of twenty-five days. The defence of the inner fort became difficult and Pratāparudra had to sue for peace at enormous cost, with a further promise of sending a tribute of gold, elephants and horses annually to the Delhi sultan. Pratāparudra fulfilled his promise faithfully and friendly relations between him and the sultan were maintained for a long time. This preoccupation of the king was taken advantage of by vassals in the outlying provinces and they created trouble by asserting independence.

After the second Turkish invasion, Pratāparudra had to engage himself in the suppression of revolts in the southern part of his kingdom. The Telugu Cōla ruler of Nellore, named Raṅganātha, asserted his independence, while in Ghanḍikōṭa in Muliki-nāḍu the Vaiḍumbā chief Malladeva flouted the authority of the Kākatiya emperor, probably with the support of the Kāyastha chief. Pratāparudra sent an army under Juttaya Lemka Goṅkaya Reddi against Mallideva and these armies defeated Mallideva and captured Ghanḍikōṭa. Prataparudra appointed Goṅkaya Reddi as the governor of Ghanḍikōṭaśīma and the adjoining territories.

In the meantime Ala-ud-din Khalji solicited the assistance of Pratāparudra during his invasion against the Pāṇḍyas in 1311. Pratāparudra took advantage of this opportunity, marched with his armies towards Kāṇcī and suppressed the rebellion of Raṅganātha on the way. At this time, conditions in the Tamil country were far from satisfactory. The death of Mārvarma Kulaśēkhara in 1310 and the outbreak of a civil war between his two sons Vīra Pāṇḍya and Sundara Pāṇḍya and the consequent confusion created in the Pāṇḍyan dominions was aggravated by the invasion of the Hoyśāla king Baḷḷāla III who made an attempt to regain the lost possessions of his family in the Tamil country. The attempt of the Hoyśāla king was checked for some years by the sultan’s armies led by Malik Naib in the Deccan. After the death of the sultan and the withdrawal of the Turkish forces from the south, Baḷḷāla III made a successful attack on Kāṇcī. This victory was only short lived. He could, however, not keep Kāṇcī for long.

According to an inscription at Drākṣārāmam preserved in the Mackenzie Manuscripts\textsuperscript{81} Pedda Rudra, the commander of the Kākatiya armies, defeated
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Ballāla III and his allies Sāmbuvarāya of Paḍavīḍu and the Yādavarāya of Candragiri and occupied Kāñcī. These victories of the Kākatiya forces and their march further terrified the Pāṇḍyas. They mustered their forces, gave a stiff fight to the Kākatiya forces and attempted to expel them from Kāñcī. Pratāparudra himself took the lead in the battle assisted by the Telugu infantry of the Veḷama chiefs, Recerla Erṛa Dāca and Deveri Nāyaka. Deviri Nāyaka, at his master's command, proceeded further and inflicted a defeat on Vīra Pāṇḍya and his ally Malayāla Tiruvāḍi Ravivarman Kulaśekhara and re-established Sundara Pāṇḍya on his throne at Viradavala.

On the death of sultan Ala-ud-din Khalji, Malik Naib Kāfūr placed the young prince Shihab-ud-din on the throne and began to rule the country as regent on his behalf. Kāfūr was, however, soon murdered and Qutb-ud-din Mubarak Shah, another son of Ala-ud-din, set aside Shihab-ud-din and seized the throne. Soon after consolidating his position, sultan Mubarak Shah set out on an expedition to the Deccan in 1318 to suppress the rebellion of Harapāladeva in Maharashtra. On reaching Devagiri, he captured the fort from Harapaladeva and put him to death. The sultan despatched his faithful slave Khusrau Khan to Warangal at the head of an army to demand tribute from Pratāparudra, who had neglected to send it to Delhi as usual. Pratāparudra, without offering any resistance, sued for peace and paid the annual tribute of 100 elephants and 12,000 horses besides gold and precious stones and also agreed to cede five districts of his kingdom to the sultan.

Pratāparudra's relations with Kampili, a neighbouring state in the south-west on the banks of the Tungabhadra, had been strained due to the invasion by Ballāla III against that small principality. According to the Kannada book Kumāra-Rāmana-Sāngatya, Kumāra Rāma, the son of Kampiliyāya, solicited the help of Pratāparudra against Ballāla. But, as Pratāparudra declined to join him against the Hoysāla king, Kumāra Rāma turned against Pratāparudra and provoked him by assuming some of the Kākatiya titles. Pratāparudra, therefore, sent his armies to the frontiers of the kingdom of Kampili. According to a verse in Śrīnātha's Bhīmesvara Purāṇamu, a Telugu literary work, Prolaya Anṇaya, one of Pratāparudra's commanders, destroyed Kummaṭa, the capital of Kampiliyāya. Similarly Koṭiṇaṭi Rāghava, one of the sons of Āravīḍu chief, Tāta Pinnama, probably a Kākatiya feudatory, is said to have defeated Kampiliyāya and deprived him of his royal insignia. Thus, though Pratāparudra won some victories over Kampiliyāya, he does not seem to have gained any material benefit therefrom.

Sultan Qutb-ud-din had to send Khusrau Khan to the south for a second time to suppress a revolt in Maharashtra by Malik-ek-Lakhī, his governor. The commander proceeded with a large army to put down the rebel and restore the royal authority in Maharashtra, which he accomplished successfully. From there he proceeded against the Pāṇḍyan monarch at Pattan in Ma’bar. Though he captured the city, he was arrested by his fellow commanders in the army, who suspected his disloyalty to his sovereign and carried him
back to Delhi as a prisoner. The sultan, however, set him at liberty and punished the commanders for their misconduct. Khusrau, however, showed no gratitude to his master, but treacherously assassinated him and usurped his throne. The Turkish nobles who resented his usurpation conspired against him and put him to death.

Ghiyas-ud-din Tughluq, the leader of these rebels, ascended the throne and proclaimed himself sultan. Having consolidated his authority in the kingdom in the first three years of his reign, he turned his attention to the south. An expedition against Telingana was sent in 1323 under his son Ulugh Khan (latter Mohammad bin Tughluq) as its leader with instructions to conquer and annex that kingdom. The circumstances which led the new sultan to send his forces against Telingana are not clearly known but Ferishta, writing in the early years of the seventeenth century, states that Rudradeva, the raja of Warangal, during the late disturbances had refused to send his tributes and Ulugh Khan was, therefore, sent against him.  

This is not improbable for Prataparudra had, on a former occasion, withheld the payment of the annual tribute to the sultan under similar circumstances. Prataparudra, according to Ferishta, opposed the advance of the Turkish army with spirit, but was obliged in the end to retreat to his capital, which was immediately invested by Ulugh Khan.

The siege was indeed both protracted and fierce. The fighting was not confined exclusively to Warangal and its neighbourhood. A part of the Delhi army under Majir Abu-Riza was engaged in besieging Koṭagiri at the time when Ulugh Khan was vainly attempting to capture Warangal. It is not at all unlikely that other places of importance in the country were also attacked by various detachments. Nevertheless, Ulugh Khan failed to achieve his object and had to beat a hasty retreat from Telingana, hotly pursued by the Kākāṭiya army.

The failure of Ulugh Khan is attributed by Muslim historians to the machinations of the poet Ubaid, a treacherous companion and friend of the prince. According to Barani, Ulugh Khan had closely invested Warangal, and had reduced the defenders to extremities. Of the two forts that surrounded the city, the outer or the mud fort was about to fall when Prataparudra sued for peace and offered to submit to the authority of the sultan and pay the tribute demanded. But Ulugh Khan who was determined to capture Prataparudra and his capital rejected the offer. In the meanwhile, a change came over the spirit of the Turkish army. Since the communication system had broken down, no recent news had reached the camp from the capital, and at this juncture the poet Ubaid and Shaikh Zāda-i-Dimashqī, who were intimate friends of Ulugh Khan, spread in the army the false rumour that the sultan was dead in Delhi, that a usurper had seized the throne, and that the Khan was about to arrest some of the important chiefs
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of the army, their loyalty being suspect in his eyes on account of their Khalji sympathies.

This information, coming as it did from the intimate companions of the Khan, created panic in their minds and they fled from the camp with their followers. The Turkish army was thrown into confusion as a consequence of their fright, and the Kākātiyas, taking advantage of the sudden misfortune that had overtaken their enemies, stormed Ulugh Khan’s camp and plundered it. Unable to withstand their attack, he rallied his troops and retreated in haste towards Devagiri.  

Ibn Battuta, who came to India some ten years after the conquest of Telingana, attributes the disaster to the miscarriage of the ambitious designs of Ulugh Khan himself, and represents Ubaid as an unfortunate victim of his treachery. Ulugh Khan who, according to Battuta, was planning to stir up a rebellion against his father, instigated Ubaid to spread in the army the false rumour of the sultan’s death, expecting that the leaders of the army would swear allegiance to him as their sovereign.

But his plan misfired. The amirs rose against him and would have killed him but Malik Timur, one of the principal amirs in the army, offered him protection and helped him flee to Delhi. Though the sultan was aware of the treacherous designs of his son, he accepted the false accusations which the latter levelled against the amirs, and not only punished them severely but also sent him back with men and money to Telingana to retrieve the disaster.

Though Ibn Battuta visited India within a decade after the fall of Warangal, he actually wrote his Risāla from memory in the last quarter of the fourteenth century, after his return to his native place Morocco. The correctness of this account is doubted by scholars as it not only contradicts the evidence of the contemporary Indian Muslim historians but also runs counter to the character of the sultan. Ghiyas-ud-din Tughluq Shah was a just and upright ruler. It is not likely that he would have condoned Ulugh Khan’s treachery and sent him back to Telingana with men and money if the latter had really acted in the manner described by Battuta.

The most satisfactory account of the events mentioned above comes from the pen of Isāmī, the first to write on the subject and who finished his history in 1349. According to him, Ulugh Khan plundered the country until he reached Warangal. He then besieged the fort for six months but could not reduce it. The sultan at Delhi became impatient and wrote letters to him charging him with indifference in the execution of his commands. Ulugh Khan, in his eagerness to bring the siege to a successful end, consulted Ubaid, the astrologer, to find out the day on which the fort was destined to fall into his hands. The astrologer made his calculations, fixed the day of the fall, and declared that if the fort still remained unconquered
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on that day he would forfeit his life on the gibbet in its vicinity.

The day fixed by Ubaid approached but the defenders of the fort showed no signs of submission. Ubaid was greatly alarmed. If his prediction should fail, as it appeared certain to do, Ulugh Khan would certainly demand his head. To escape the evil consequences of the failure of his prediction, he devised a plan, and spreading in the army the false news of the sultan’s death, of a revolution in the capital and of Ulugh Khan’s secret resolve to kill the principal amirs in the camp for their alleged Alāyī sympathies, he created panic which led to the conclusion of peace by them with Pratāparudra and their subsequent flight from Warangal followed by that of Ulugh Khan himself. What presumably happened at Warangal may now be stated briefly, though it is not possible owing to the conflicting character of the available evidence to present an indisputably accurate picture of the events. Ulugh Khan marched to Warangal with his army and besieged the city for six months but failed to capture it. A rebellion broke out in his camp owing to the machinations of Ubaid who is variously spoken of as a poet and an astrologer, and Ulugh Khan was obliged as a consequence to raise the siege and retreat homewards, hotly pursued by the Kākatīyas, who attacked him frequently, plundered his baggage, and followed him until he reached Kotagiri, where Majir Abu Riza, who was engaged in besieging the fort, came to his help and saved his army from destruction.

Ghiyas-ud-din Tughluq was a man of strong will and firm determination. Defeat did not discourage him, but rather urged him on to make a fresh effort to achieve his purpose. He severely punished the rebel amirs, and sent reinforcement to Devagiri, where Ulugh Khan had taken refuge, with instructions to his son to march again into Telingana and subjugate the country.

As soon as the reinforcement arrived in Devagiri, Ulugh Khan started for Telingana. By rapid marches he reached Badrikot (Bidar?), which he seized along with several others along his route and posted strong garrisons in them under trustworthy officers with instructions to hold them to the last. Finally, he came to Bodhan which was a ten day journey from Warangal. After a siege of three or four days the fort capitulated, and the governor and his followers saved themselves by embracing Islam.

Ulugh Khan next proceeded to Warangal and laid siege to the city. Not much information is available about the second siege of Warangal. It is disposed of briefly by Barani and the later writers who follow his account. It is stated that Ulugh Khan first laid siege to the mud fort and seized it, and that the inner citadel next fell into his hands. The fort was captured and Pratāparudra was taken prisoner and sent to the court of the sultan at Delhi. The capture of Warangal was not so easily effected as these historians would have us believe. But for the amazing lack of foresight of Pratāparudra, it is doubtful whether Ulugh Khan would have effected its
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capture as quickly as he did. The siege, as a matter of fact, lasted for five months.

Isāmī describes this siege and the circumstances in which the fort was captured. It appears that after the retreat of Ulugh Khan from Warangal at the end of his first expedition, Pratāparudra held a feast to celebrate his victory over the Muslims. Believing that they would not invade his kingdom again in the near future, he opened the granaries within the fort and sold all the grain stored there. He also commanded his subjects to abandon their military activities and busy themselves with their cattle and crops. Within four months of his retreat Ulugh Khan returned with a fresh army and appeared before the walls of Warangal. The fort did not have a proper garrison to maintain its defence and lacked even adequate stores and provisions to feed the garrison during the siege. Though taken by surprise, Pratāparudra put up a courageous fight. However, the scanty stock of provisions which he hastily gathered together soon ran out, and the troops inside the fort began to suffer severely from hunger. Pratāparudra was obliged to surrender. He threw open the gates of the fort and along with the other members of his family surrendered to Ulugh Khan. Ulugh’s forces then entered the fort, plundered the houses and demolished the public buildings.

Since Pratāparudra’s presence might have led to popular revolts and other political complications, Ulugh Khan sent him immediately to Delhi with all the members of his family, escorted by a contingent of his army under Qadir Khan and Khwaja Haji, the two officers in whom he had great confidence. They were not, however, destined to bring the fallen monarch to the metropolis for, before they could reach Delhi, he died. Schms-i-Siraj Affīf, who despatches him to hell with a single sentence, does not disclose the circumstances in which he died.87

More information is furnished by the inscriptions. In the Vilasa grant of Musunūri Prolaya Nāyaka (c. 1330), it is stated that Pratāparudra, while being carried away as a captive to Delhi, died on the banks of the river Somodbhavā, i.e., the Narmada.88 His death does not seem to have been the result of natural causes for, according to the Kaluvaceru grant of the Reddi queen Aṃtālī dated 1423, he departed to the world of gods by his own desire.89 This seems to suggest that he either committed suicide or was slain by one of his followers at his own instance. Pratāparudra was a proud monarch, and it would seem that he could not reconcile himself to the changed conditions of his life in captivity. Preferring death to dishonour, he seems to have voluntarily embraced it. With the defeat and death of Pratāparudra ended the rule of the Kākatiya line of kings and the country passed into Turkish hands.
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The Pratāpapacaritra, a late legendary account of the Kākatiya kings, refers twice to Pratāparudra's chief queen Viṣālākṣī. Another queen named Lakṣmīdevi is mentioned in an inscription discovered in the village Yelgūḍu in Karimnagar district. Although various names such as Juttaya Lemkā Goṅka Reddi90 and Krishna Nāyaka91 are referred to as his sons in the inscriptions these names were those of the king's intimate and beloved subordinates only. Similarly, the account given in the Pratāpapacaritra that Pratāparudra's son Virabhadrā was crowned king by the deceased king's brother Anṇamadeva, is also absolutely baseless as no authentic evidence to this effect has been recorded till now. True Anṇamadeva, the progenitor of the later rulers of Bastar in Madhya Pradesh is mentioned in the Danteśvara inscription of Dikpāladeva92 as king's brother but this is not confirmed by any other evidence.

The Telugu Cōla kings—Oplī Siddhi of Kotaydana, Manuna Ganda Gopāla of Nellore and Teluṅgu Bijjana—were prominent among the vassals of Pratāparudra. Teluṅgu Bijjana is said to have visited the court of the Delhi sultan and fought an exhibition duel with Potuṅganti Maili, another noble of Pratāparudra's court, in the presence of Ala-ud-din and Malik Nāib. Bijjana was vanquished in this contest. This is stated in the prāśasti of the Veḷama chief Potuṅganti Maili in the family account Velugotivārī Vamsāvalī. The duel was probably arranged to satisfy the curiosity of the sultan and his court who desired to witness a display of the swordsmanship for which the Deccanis had always been famous.93 The Gheraku family was one of the hereditary subordinates who served the Kākatiyas with the utmost devotion and faith since the time of Rudra. According to the unpublished Jamulūru epigraph preserved in the Khanana Building Museum, Golconda, the ancestors of these chiefs were the first the subordinates of Bhīma, a Telugu Cōla king of Eruva from whom they obtained the fief consisting of twelve villages with Ceraku as its capital and hence they were known as the Ceraku chiefs. They assisted Kākatiya Rudra in defeating the Cōla king named Coḍodaya and his general Arasālu. Since then, they were serving the Kākatiyas as mahāsāmantas, possessing the areas comprising the forest tracts on either side of the river Krishna near Śrīśeṣālam as evidenced by their records found in the Nandikotkur taluk of Kurnool district and in the Amarabad sub-taluk of Mahbubnagar district. Keta, Māra and Erṛa were the early members of the family who rendered help to Rudra in defeating the Cōla chiefs, whereas Bollaya, Viśvānātha, Bollaya II, Gaṇapaya and Anṇaya belonged to the later period of Ganapatideva, Rudramā and Pratāparudra. The Veḷamas or Padmanāyakas of the Recerla family played an important role in the late Kākatiya period. The services rendered by several members of this family in the wars of Pratāparudra
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are, however, detailed in their family chronicle, the Beḷugoṭīvāri Varṇśāvalī. Veṇṇama, the son of Dāma, led his troops in a defeat of the Turks very probably during Ala-ud-din Khilji’s first invasion of Telingana in 1303. This success against the Turkish arms took place in the battle of Upparapaḷi, where Pottuṅṭi Maili is said to have put the enemies to flight. Erā Dāca and Nalla Dāca, sons of Veṇṇama and his brother Sabbi, distinguished themselves in the Paṇḍya invasion in 1316. Siṅgama I, another member of the family, played a prominent part in the defence of the kingdom at the time of the Tughluq invasions in 1323.

Among the ministers of Pratāparudra, the mahāpradhānis Vepetī Kommayyaṅgāru, Gaṅgideva and Indulūri Gaṅṇaya appear to have been members of the king’s council of ministers who probably guided the policy of the state. Mahāpradhānas such as Muṣpiddi Nāyaka and Juttaya Lemkā Goṅka Reddi, were in charge of the government of the provinces. The former is spoken of as the kāryakartā (agent) and pratiniṇdi (representative) of the king and ruled over the Nellore-rāya which extended from Aḍḍaṅkī in Guntur district to Kāṅcipurā in the south. The latter is said to have been anointed by the king himself as governor of several districts, including Muliki-nādu Sākiḷi, Pottapiṇḍuṇaḍu and Gaṅḍikota. Kollāṇi Rudradeva was in charge of the Veṅgi country, with his headquarters at Kokunu, modern Elore in West Godavari district. We know from the Sivayogasāram that he is the son of Indulūri Somaya, one of the mahāpradhānas and commanders of Gaṅapatideva who appoin’ted him the governor of Kollāṇu after its conquest. His son Rudradeva succeeded him and continued in the office till Pratāparudra’s end.

The military officers of Pratāparucira fall into two classes, the sāhinīs and senādhipatis. The former were the officers employed for training the horses and elephants for the purpose of war, known as asva-sāhinīs or gajasāhinīs respectively, whereas the senādhipatis were the commanders of the armies. Benḍapuḍu Anṇaya, who is said to have been the chief of the elephant force of the Kākatiya king Mahārāya-gaja-sāhinī also held other posts like commander and nāyaka. He is described in the records as “moon to the ocean of the kingdom of the lord of nine lakh archers”, the fire of destruction to the Yavana armies and the destroyer of the pleasure gardens of the city of Kummata. Among the senādhipatis and sakala senādhipatis, Somayājula Rudradeva and Recerla Mummadi nāyaka are two distinguished generals.
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GENEALOGY OF THE KĀKATĪYAS

I. Early Subordinate Chiefs

- Durjaya
- Vanna
- Gunda I
- Gunda II
- Gunda III
- Eriya
  (Beta)
- Gunda IV (c. 950-90)
- Beta I (c. 1000-55)
- Prola I (c. 1055-75)
- Beta II (c. 1078-96)

  Durgarāja (1098-1116)      Prola II (1117-56)

II. Independent Rulers

1. Rudra (1156-95)
2. Mahādeva (1195-98)

3. Ganapatideva (1199-1262)
   - Maliambā (daughter)
     (m) Rudra of Natavādi family
   - Kundambā (daughter)
     (m) Rudra of Natavādi family

4. Rudramādevi (1262-95) (daughter)
   (m) Cāljukya Virabhadra
   - Ganapāmbā (daughter)
     (m) Ketarāja II of Koṭa family

5. Pratāparudra (1295-1323)
Chapter VII

THE LATER PĀṇḍyAS (c. 985-1200)

For most of the period covered by this volume, the Pāṇḍyan kingdom was a subordinate province of the Cōla empire. Its ancient line of kings never reconciled themselves to their feudatory position and forever sought for opportunities to regain their independence. The rulers of Travancore and Sri Lanka who shared their subjection to the Cōla power were their natural allies, and their diplomatic intrigues and political opposition to the suzerain power sometimes led to fierce reprisals. In the second half of the twelfth century, a protracted succession dispute among the rival Pāṇḍyan princes brought about the intercession of the Sri Lankans and Cōlas, and for some years the whole country was ravaged by war. But, in the end, neither of the intervening powers gained their objective of making the Pāṇḍyan kingdom an appendage of their dominions. At the close of the civil war, the Pāṇḍyan line produced a succession of very able monarchs who, taking advantage of the weakening of the Cōla power, overthrew it, and in the face of Hoyśāla opposition, succeeded in establishing an empire which embraced practically the whole of the Tamil country. They extended their empire up to Nellore on the east coast until another succession dispute and the advent of the Turkish army in south India in the fourteenth century brought about a change. Inscriptions, including those of the Cōlas and their viceroys in the Pāṇḍya country, are our main source. The Cōḷavamśa or the continuation of the Mahāvamśa of Sri Lanka is another important source.

The Pāṇḍyan kingdom was first conquered by Cōla Parāntaka I in the early years of his reign (c. 910-20) but later, when he had to face the disasters consequent on the invasion of his empire from the north by the Rāstrakūta ruler Kṛṣṇa III (c. 950), the Pāṇḍyas reasserted their independence under a certain Vīra Pāṇḍya whose relation to the last Pāṇḍya ruler of the first empire, Rājasimha II, cannot be ascertained. Vīra Pāṇḍya's inscriptions run up to his twentieth year and he bears the title Śōlan-taiji koṇḍa, who "took the head of the Cōla". The period of his rule may be fixed approximately as 946-66. His title is best explained as due to his success in foiling an attempt on the part of Gaṇḍarāditya, the son and successor

* See also chapter I. Some recent writings on the Pāṇḍyas include K. V. Raman, Some Aspects of Pandyam History in the Light of Recent Discoveries and N. Sethuraman, The Imperial Pāṇḍyas.