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SECTION I.
INTRODUCTORY.

No authentic work of a definite historical character has ever been written by the Hindus of Western India. But, in the inscriptions on copper-plates and stone-tablets, on monumental stones, the pedestals of idols, the walls and pillars of temples, and rocks, there have come down to us, particularly in the Kanarese country, a large number of original historical records of the most important kind. In these records, if they could be exhaustively examined, there exist abundant materials for compiling a detailed and connected history of the Kanarese districts of the Bombay Presidency, and of the neighbouring territories of Madras, Mysore, and Haidarabad, from about the middle of the fifth to the end of the sixteenth century A.D., and, at the same time, for illustrating the development of the modern forms of the alphabet and of the vernacular language, the decay of old and the growth of new forms of religion, the origin of many of the different land-tenures and territorial divisions that now exist, and many other subjects of historical and antiquarian interest and importance.

The first systematic collection of these inscriptions was made by Sir Walter Elliot, K.C.I., who, when in the Madras Civil Service, was employed for a long time in this part of the country. Besides a large number of facsimile impressions of copper-plate grants, of which only a few have as yet been published, he compiled manuscript copies of no less than five hundred and ninety-five stone-tablet inscriptions from the Kanarese country alone and in the Sanskrit and Old-Kanarese languages, in addition to a large number of others from the Telugu country and in the Telugu language. The results of his labours were published in his paper on Hindu Inscriptions, which appeared first in the Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, Old Series, Vol. IV., pp. 1 &c., and was afterwards reprinted, with corrections and additions, in the Madras Journal of Literature and Science, Vol. VII., pp. 193 &c. And one copy of his collection of inscriptions from the Kanarese country, in two volumes entitled Carsadhabades Inscriptions and belonging to the Library of the Edinburgh University, is at present in my hands. The voluminous contents of these two books have as yet only very partially been made public.

1 The present paper is written upon much the same lines. No better method than for Walter Elliot's of dealing with the subject could well be devised.
2 These volumes will be quoted in this paper as the Elliot MS. Collection, Vol. I. and Vol. II. Three other copies of his collection appear to have been made; one of them is in the Library of the Royal Asiatic Society; but what became of the other two, I do not know. Many of the original copper-plate grants are now in his possession, and have been examined and transcribed for future publication by himself.
In 1865 the Mysore Government published a photographic collection of one hundred and fifty inscriptions on stone-tablets and copperplates at Chitaldurg, Balagánse, Harīhar, and other places in Mysore, from negatives taken by Major Dixon, H. M.'s 23rd Regiment, M. N. I. And in 1866, the Honourable Mr. Hope, Bo.C.S., edited, for, and at the cost of, the Committee of Architectural Antiquities of Western India, under the title of Inscriptions in Dharwar and Mysore, a series of sixty-four photographic copies of inscriptions in the Belgaum, Dharwar, Kalādgi, and North Kanara Districts of the Bombay Presidency, and in the adjoining parts of the Madras Presidency and Mysore, from negatives taken by Dr. Pigon, Bo.M.S., and Col. Biggs, R.A., and a few other inscriptions, from negatives taken by the same gentlemen, were inserted by him in another work, entitled Architecture in Dharwar and Mysore, edited by him at the same time. These two collections being out of print and difficult to obtain, and the negatives being available at the India Office, the contents of them were re-arranged by myself and compiled, with additions, into one volume, which was published by the India Office in 1878, under the title of Pūli, Sanskrit, and Old-Canarese Inscriptions, from the Bombay Presidency and parts of the Madras Presidency and Mysore.2

Meanwhile a few detached inscriptions had been published by Sir Walter Elliot, in the Madras Journal of Literature and Science,—by Mr. Watthen and Professor Dowson, in the early volumes of the Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society,—by Bal Gangadhar Sastri and General Sir George LeGrand Jacob, in the early volumes of the Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society;—and by Dr. Taylor, in the Transactions of the Literary Society of Bombay.3

These publications, however, were desultory and few and far between; and it was not till the Indian Antiquary was started by Dr. Burgess, in 1872, that any real impetus was given to the study of the Epigraphy of Western India. Since then, in that Journal and in Dr. Burgess's Archæological Reports, as well as in the later volumes of the Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society, a large number of most valuable inscriptions have been published, with texts and translations and in many instances with lithographic facsimiles, by Dr. Bühlcr, Professor Enggeling, the Revd. Mr. Kitto, the Revd. Mr. Rice, the Revd. Mr. Foulkes, Prof. R. G. Bhandarkar, Pandit Bhagāvānila Indrajit, and Messrs. S. P. Pandit and K. T. Telang, and, the large majority, by myself. And, in 1879, Mr. Rice published, under the title of Mysore Inscriptions, translations of all

---

1 Only ten copies of this work were published. Of these ten copies, one was presented to each of the following: the Royal Asiatic Society ; the Société Asiatique at Paris ; the German Oriental Society, Leipzig; the India Office Library; and Mr. Thomas, F.R.S., and the remaining five were sent to Bombay for distribution.

2 The funds available, however, permitted of the publication of only nine copies of this work. They were distributed to the India Office, the British Museum, the Royal Asiatic Society, the Bombay Secretariat, the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society, the Honourable Mr. Gibbs, C.S.I., Dr. Burgess, myself, and J. Bich, the Bodleian Library.

3 I am speaking, of course, only of such publications as bear on the history of that part of the country which is the subject of the present paper. Many other inscriptions were published by other scholars in the same Journal, and in the Asiatic Researches and the Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal.
the inscriptions included in Major Dixon's collection, and of some others collected by himself.

It is from the sources indicated above, and from such other unpublished inscriptions as I myself have collected and have in hand for publication, that the materials for the present paper have been drawn.

To a certain extent the ancient history of the country can be at present treated only as the history of the dynasties that successively ruled over it. The subordinate governments, the different territorial divisions and the changes that they underwent, the decay of the Buddhist and Jain religions, the spread of the Saiva faith, especially in its form of Lingayatism, and similar topics, still remain to be worked out in detail. The dominions of the dynasties treated of in this paper extended sometimes to the north as far as the Vindhyas and the Narmada river, sometimes to the east as far as the shores of the sea of Bengal, and usually to the south for a considerable distance into Mysur. They, therefore, were not always confined to the Kannaars districts of the Bombay Presidency. But they did always include those districts; and the chief seats of government were always within, or close to the borders of, them. The history of the dynasties, therefore, with notices of the localities in which their inscriptions are found and over which accordingly their sway extended, and with such other details as have as yet been worked out, gives, as far as we can as yet decipher it, the history of the districts.

In official language, three out of the four Kannaars districts of this Presidency, viz. the Belgaum, Kalâgari, and Dhurward Collectories, are, together with the Kolhapur, Miraj, and other Native States, always called the 'Southern Marathâ Country.' A more complete misnomer, however it originated, could not well have been devised. It is true that, in one of the earliest inscriptions, of Pulikesi II, this part of the country is included in what was known then, and even many centuries before his time, as Mâhârâshtra, or 'the great country.' But the word had originally, and in his time, a signification very different from the special meaning which its corruption, 'Marathâ,' carries now, and denoted simply the great and comparatively unknown region lying to the south of the early Aryan settlements in Hindustân. In the whole area of the country treated of in this paper, not a single Marathi inscription has been discovered of a greater age than two or three centuries. With the exception that a few Prâkrit words occur here and there, the inscriptions are all either in pure Sanskrit or pure Kannaars, or in the two languages combined. This fact speaks of itself as to what was the vernacular of the country in early times. In the present day, the people and the language of the British districts are Kannaars; and the Kannaars people and language have been displaced, to a certain

---

* It is mentioned, as 'Mahârâshtra,' twice in the Mahârâshtra, Chap. XII, pp 71 and 74; I owe this reference to the kindness of Professor Weber. The expression refers to the deputation of the Buddhist Thero Maha-Dharmarajika to Maharâshtra, in the third century B.C. At the same time, the Thero Rakkhita was deputed to Wainwad or Banavasi in North Kanara, and the Thero Maharâsa to Mahâthithamandala or Mâysur. See Ind. Ant., Vol. III., p. 372.
extent, by the Marāthi people and language in the Native States, only because these States were established by the aggressions of Marāthas from the north, whose local influence proved to be greater than that of the native rulers whom they dispossessed. Even in those Native States, and in Marāthi official correspondence, the Political Agent at Kolhāpur is to the present day always addressed as the Political Agent, not of the 'Dakshina-Mahārāṣṭra,' or 'Southern Marāthā Country,' but of the 'Karuviru Ilakhā and the Karnāṭaka Prānt'.
SECTION II.
THE EARLY DYNASTIES.

The earliest inscription that has as yet been found is one in the Pali language, engraved on the two edges of a large slate slab, on which was carved a five-hooded cobra, in the court of the great temple at Banawasi in North Kanara. 1 It is not dated in the Saka or any other definite era; but it is undoubtedly very early, and is allotted by Pandit Bhagwanlill Indrajii to the second century a.d. It is of the time of a king named Haritiputra-Satakarni of the Vindhukadadutu family or, perhaps, of the Dutu family of the place called Vindhakula or Vishnukuta. Who this Hariti putra was, has not yet been determined. 2 His title of Satakarni, being associated with the Andhrabhritiya dynasty, suggests that in very early times the country round Banawasi may have belonged to the Andhrabhritiya Kings; but it has not been shown that the title did not belong to other dynasties also. To whatever dynasty, however, this king may have belonged, it seems not improbable that he is the Satakarni, lord of Dakahinapatha or 3 the region of the south, 4 whom the Mahakshatra-Rudradama, the son of Chashtana, of the Saha dynasty, "without treachery twice completely conquered, but, on account of their near connection, did not completely destroy, and thus obtained glory." 5

The first inscription, however, that gives us any extensive insight into the early history of these parts is a stone-tablet at the Mogul temple at Aihole, 6 the ancient Ayyavole or A'ryapura, in the

---

1. No. 16, p. 168, of the separate pamphlets of the Archaeological Survey of Western India.
2. The Kadambas also, and the Early, Western, and Eastern Chalukyas, were Hariti putras, or "of the sons of Hariti. The name is not explained by the myth given in the later Western Chalukya inscriptions,—if only for the reason that Hariti is here the name of a man; whereas in the Hariti putra of the early inscriptions the vowel of the last syllable is long, i.e. Hariti is the name of a woman, not of a man. The name Hariti putra is, in fact, exactly analogous to the Gantampatras, Vanamahiti putras, and Madhaviputras, which were names of respectively two of the Satakarnas, of Patnamay, and of Purushadhita, of the Andhrabhritiya dynasty. And it is curious that we find Hariti putra occurring in the above inscription as the name of a king who may himself have belonged to the Andhrabhritiya dynasty, and who was ruling over that part of the country in which the Kadambas subsequently appeared, and in which they were succeeded by the Chalukyas. The Chalukya, however, had this name of Hariti putra, even when they were in the north, as is shown by the Kora grant of Vijayanaka or Vijayvarman, the earliest of their inscriptions as yet discovered. And that the same name,—though whether as belonging to a king, or in a private person, is not certain,—was known elsewhere in the north in early times, is shown by an inscription at Riwā in the Allahabad neighborhood; it records the construction of a cave by Hariti putra-Saranaka, and is evidently of very early date, being referred by Dr. Hoenle to about a.c. 350, though Dr. Burgess considers that it is of somewhat later date. (Ind. Ant., Vol. iv., p. 431.)
4. The "Vellum" of the map, Lat. 16° 1' S., Long. 78° 37' E., is in the Hungarian Taluiki.

Kalâgdi District. It is of the time of the Western Chalukyas king Pulikesi II., and is dated Sa.ka 535 (A.D. 634-5). From it we learn that, at the time of the advent of the Chalukyas, the dominant families in this part of the country, whom one by one the Chalukyas subjugated and dispossessed, were the Nala, the Mauryas, the Kadamras, the Matangas, and the Katachekarias; and that they came more or less in hostile contact at the same time with the Gangas, the Alupas, and the Pallavas of Konâchi or Conjeveram. Other opponents of the Chalukyas are mentioned in the same inscription,—A'ppâyêkGovinda, who was probably of the Bàâhitrakuta family, the Lâtes, the Mâlva, the Goriyâ, Harsha or Harshavardhana of Kanyâkutbâ, the Kesalas, the Kalingas, the Cholas, the Kuralas, and the Pandyas; but they are mentioned in connection with the more extended conquests of Pulikesi II. to the north, the east, and the south, after the consolidation of the Western Chalukya power at Vatsâpi or Râddâmi, and consequently no further account of them is called for in the present paper.

The Nala and the Mauryas are mentioned in connection with Kârttirvara I., who was the father of Pulikesi II., and whose reign terminated in Sa.ka 489 (A.D. 567-8). Of the Nala nothing more is yet known, as they are only spoken of in this inscription and in the Miraj grant of Jayasimha III.² And of the Mauryas, all the information that we have, furnished in the same inscriptions, is that they were a reigning family in the Konâka. As has been suggested to me by Mr. Ratiran Durgâram, B.A., it is not at all improbable that their capital was the Puri, or the city, the goddess of the fortunes of the western ocean, which is mentioned in the verse immediately following that in which the subjugation is recorded, and that this is the same town as the Puri which, in the eleventh century A.D., was the capital of the Silahâras of the Konâka. These Mauryas were perhaps descendants of the Maurya dynasty of Pataliputra, which was founded by Chandragupta, the Sandrocottus of the Greeks, in the fourth century B.C., and of descendants of which we seem to have some still more recent traces in Western India, in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries A.D., in the Mâhâmandaivalvâras or great feudatory nobles of the Guta family, or the lineage of Chandragupta, whose inscriptions are found at and in the neighbourhood of Chandulâmpur in

---

² For this identification, see the papers referred to in note 1 above. Bhatkñ is the chief town of the Tailata of the same name in the Kalâgdi District, and is in Lat. 15° 36' N., and Long. 75° 45' E.
⁴ The inscriptions at present available do not afford materials sufficient for a separate chapter on the Guta Mahamandarivara. It will, therefore, be useful to collate here whatever is known about them. The family is called sometimes the Guttakula, and sometimes the Chandrâgupavarna, Chandrâgupavâya, or Chandragnâhanârâjâdhipati. It is described from, or through, the great Vikramâditya, king of Ujjayini in Mâlava, where many of the inscriptions (Pali, Sanskrit, and Old-Central Indian Inscriptions, No. 100) appear to represent a descendant of Chandragupta. The family is also attributed to the Samvatsara, or lineage of the moon. The members of it all had the family-title of Ujjasvini-puranâ-dhârâ, or Ujjasvini-puranâ-dhârâ, 'supreme lord of Ujjayini, the best of cities', and in one instance (P. S. and D.-C. Inscriptions, No. 103) also of Patali-puranâ-dhârâ, or 'supreme lord of Patali, the best of cities', which was the city of Chandragupta. They also had the title of Puskârâ-gana, or 'the punisher of the Twelve', but the meaning of
the Drāvīḍ District and at Halebid in Mānará, and also were feudatories of the Western Chālukya kings and their successors.

The Kadambas are first mentioned in connection with the same monarch, Kṛttivarmā I. Two later families,—called, with a slight difference in the first syllable of the name, the Kadambas; and, though they pretend to great antiquity, probably not the direct descendants of the original Kadamba stock,—will be noticed further on, in Sections XI. and XII. But we are concerned here only with the early Kadambas of Pulāñika or Halsi, in the Bellgum District, and of Vijnāyantī or Bānāvāśī in North Kanara. They are known from

this is not quite clear, though it appears to refer to the conquest of twelve Mahāśīva or Mahāvīranās who attacked them. And they carried the banners of a sacred leaf-tree and of Goroda, and used the mark or signet of a deer. Their family-god was Siva, under the name of Mahakāle of Upjavīni. And we have the following specific names and dates:—1, Kīttrī Goroda, the Mahāprakina and Dānabagīna of the Western Chālukya king Viṣṇukīrata II., who had the government of the Kadamba Twelve-thousand-province, which was the Gutt family, or some member of that family, held under Goroda. But the photograph of this inscription being incomplete, this point cannot be present be cleared up (P. S. and O. C. Inscriptions, No. 108).—2. An inscription of the Kalashiri king Sunkara, dated Saka 1101 (a.d. 1179-80), the Vikrī inscriptions, mentions a Mahāmanasaśiva of the Gutt family, whose name seems to be Sambakura, but the photograph is rather indistinct (P. S. and O. C. Inscriptions, No. 123);—3. In Saka 1103 (a.d. 1181-2), the Flavanga suktam of the Kadamba inscriptions, names a Mahāmanasaśiva of the Gutt family, who was governing at the city of Guttmavāl; this place may be either the modern Gutta, near Chausadganer, in the Karagi Taluka of the Dīhrūr District, or the modern Holal, in the Ballāli District, about twenty miles to the east of Gutta, and on the opposite bank of the Tungabhadra river (P. S. and O. C. Inscriptions, No. 239).—4. In Saka 1109 (a.d. 1187-8), the Flavanga suktam, in Saka 1113 (a.d. 1191-22), the Viraśikharā suktam, and in Saka 1135 (a.d. 1213-14), the Uśasika suktam, the same Mahāmanasaśiva Vikramaditya II. was governing the Varnavas, Twelve-thousand province at his capital of Guttmavāl; and, as these three inscriptions mention the name of no paramount sovereign, he seems to have been then independent (P. S. and O. C. Inscriptions, No. 231, 106, and 234).—5. An inscription of the Devagiri-Yadava king Sāgasīma II., of Saka 1109 (a.d. 1187-8), the Hemadhrīsya suktam, mentions the Mahāmanasaśiva Dāsikāya of the Gutta family, with whose permission a grant was made, in the neighbourhood of Gutta, by one Kīttrī Mahakāle, an officer of his. In Saka 1134 (a.d. 1212-13), the Bahvesthī inscriptions, in the Kadamba inscriptions, the Kadambas, the Mahāmanasaśiva Gutta of the Gutta family, who was governing at his capital of Guttmavāl (P. S. and O. C. Inscriptions, No. 110 and 111).
ten copper-plate grants, of which seven were found at Halla, \(^1\) and
three at Devagiri \(^2\) in the Dharswad District. Their principal capital
was Pulikulla; but Vajjayanti \(^3\) also was one of the seats of their

---

\(^1\) "Ind. Ant.," Vol. XI, p. 232, l. 30-31, that being the number of villages of which the province consisted; the only exceptions are, on the one hand, the Vamsatapura of P. S. and O.-C. Inscriptions, No. 178, I. 33, where the use of the form Vamasthra is required by the metre, and, on the other hand, the Vanamasthresha and the Vanamasthreshcha of the Brahtrakutas inscriptions in the Hangu Tanka and at P. S. and O.-C. Inscriptions, No. 120, I. 31 and 34, and the Vamasthreshcha of the Harsh grants of Vamasthriyikes. So, also, in the Visnusnamadacarika (Buhler’s edition, V., 23, and XIV., 4; see also Ind. Ant., Vol. V., pp. 320 and 321), the sandhala is called Vamasthra, the city itself does not seem to be mentioned in this poem. It is, perhaps, rather a hazardous conjecture to make; but it appears to me not at all improbable that it may be shown hereafter that the Vamasthra province is the part of the country in which the Pallavas spent the twelve years on their conquest to the forests, as related in the Vetus Poema or third book of the Madhavadasana. There are at least strong and ancient traditions in justification of such a conjecture. Thus, at Balagatna, eighteen miles to the north-east of the city, there is an inscription (P. S. and O.-C. Inscriptions, No. 163) which says that the king of the Rajogas, named Christianity and established these five castes. And the town of Hangu, sixteen miles to the north-east of Banavasi, is called in the inscriptions (P. S. and O.-C. Inscriptions, No. 123, II. 33 and 33, No. 174, I. 33, and other passages to be published hereafter) Vratasthana and Vratamangali, the fort or city of Virata, Virata being the name of the king at whose court the Pallavas spent the thirteenth year of their exile, and whose daughter Uptya was married to Aryama’s son Ahimbavanyu, as related in the Visnusnamadacarika. Dr. Walter Elliot has shown that the tradition, that Hangu is the place where the Pallavas resided during their exile, is even still current among the inhabitants (Ind. Ant., Vol. V., p. 179).


\(^3\) "Ind. Ant.," Vol. VII., p. 22, et.; and P. S. and O.-C. Inscriptions, Nos. 1, 3, and 4. This Devagiri is in Lat. 14°. 31’ N., and Long. 76°. 36’ E., in the Karnaj Taluka.
power, and Uchchasingri was another; and still another is mentioned, Tripuravata, which has not as yet been identified. The Halai grants give us the following names:

Kākusthavarmā.

Sāntivarmā. (Not named.)

Mrigesavarmā. (Not named.)


Harivarman.

And the Devagiri grants, in addition to mentioning Mrigesavarmā, give us the names of Krishnavarmā and his son Devavarmā, who may have been either anterior to Kākusthavarmā, or slightly subsequent to Harivarman, there being nothing in the inscriptions to decide the point either way. These Kadambaras were of the Jain religion, and belonged to the Mānava gotra and were ‘of the sons of Hariti.’ They seem to have established their power originally by deferring either the Ganga or the Pallava kings, or both combined. Subsequently, Mrigesavarmā again conquered both of them. And Ravivarman established himself, and re-established his family, at Palasika, by overthrowing Chandradanda, the lord of Kānchi, who was undoubtedly of the Pallava dynasty. The precise date of the Kadambaras is not known; for, with one exception, their grants are dated, when at all, only in the years of their reigns. The sole exception is the grant of Kākusthavarmā, which is dated in the eightieth year of victory; and here, unfortunately, we have no information as to the victory from Yelawatti, about six miles to the north of Hāngal.—Hāngal is sixty-four miles distant, to the north-east, from the coast; and the only place of ancient importance on the coast, in an approximate south-west direction from Hāngal, is Hinjawdi in North Kanara. Hinjawdi has always been identified with the Namas of the Periplus of the Erythraean Sea (Ind. Ant., Vol. VIII., p. 145). Even if it had not been thus disposed of, it does not lie within the limits of the Vastavā province, which did not extend below the Western Ghats. And, even if it had lain within the limits of that province, it would hardly, with sixty-four miles of country, including the Ghats, intervening, have been selected to give the direction of a small inland district which, being close to, and on the further side of, the capital of the province of which it formed a part, would naturally have its position defined with reference to that capital. And, finally, if, so I expect, the real reading of the Sanskrit plates is substantiated, the proximity of,—‘(I have made several attempts to get the original plate from personal, but without success, —this expression entirely excludes the possibility of there being a reference to any place so far away as the coast. ’Banavasi is only sixteen miles from Hāngal, and approximately in the south-west. And it is the only large town in the Vastavā province which could suitably be selected for laying down the bearing of the Eldridge district, in the way in which it is laid down in the Sanskrit inscriptions. I think, therefore, that, on all the facts combined, it must be taken as clearly established that Vaijayantika, as well as Jayantikara, was a nāga of Banavasi. —The nāga nāga, which the Greeks was called Bovastik, is usually identified with Vijayapura in the Ratnagiri District, about one hundred and seventy miles to the north-west from Hāngal.

1 Yelawatttiga near Harinar. Lat. 14° 14' N., Long. 76° 7' E.; Mr. Elce, Mysore Journals, p. 323.

2 Harivarman; see p. 3, note 2.
DYNASTIES OF THE KANARESE DISTRICTS.

The date of which the computation is made, is the application of the term 'Pavaha year' to the third year of Mrigosavarmá's reign, and of the term 'Vaisakha year' to the eighth year of his reign, and the mention of the eighth fortnight of the rainy season in one of his grants, and of the sixth fortnight of the winter season in Bhánuvarmá's grant, indicating that, at the time of these grants, the primitive division of the year into three seasons only, not into six as now, was still followed, as it was followed in the Násk Cave inscriptions,—probably contain the clue which will enable us hereafter to determine the date of these kings with accuracy. Meanwhile I would place the culmination of the power of the Kadambas, and the date of the above-mentioned kings, about the close of the fifth century A.D., a little anterior to the subjugation of the Kadambas by Kiritivarmá I. Mr. Rice has allotted the specific dates of A.D. 438 to Krishnavarmá, A.D. 538 to Kákusthavarmá, A.D. 570 to Mrigosavarmá, and A.D. 600 to Bhánuvarmá. The bases for the last three dates are not given by him. The date of A.D. 438 for Krishnavarmá is based on the statement, in the Ganga grants, that the sister of a Kadamba king named Krishnavarmá was given in marriage to the Ganga king Mādhava II., whose reign is accepted by Mr. Rice as having ended in A.D. 425. But, as I cannot agree with Mr. Rice in his opinion of the authenticity of these Ganga grants, therefore I cannot concur with him in thus arriving at a specific date for Krishnavarmá. One of the Kadamba inscriptions mentions incidentally another early dynasty, that of the Sendrakas, the representative of which, in the time of the Kadamba king Harivarman, was Bhámasakti. But all else that we at present know for certain about this dynasty is that, in the time of the Western Chalukya king Vikramaditya I., the representative of it was Devasakti who seems to have been a feudatory of the Chalukya monarch, and that, in the time of Vīmanaditya, the son of Vikramaditya I., the representative of it was Pogri, who, again, appears to have been a feudatory of the Chalukyas.

The Mātangas and the Katashchurias are mentioned in connection with Mangalasa, who was the younger brother and successor of Kiritivarmá I., and whose reign commenced in Saka 489 (A.D. 567-8) and terminated in the early part of Saka 533 (A.D. 610-1). Of the Mātangas, nothing is known, except this mention of them. But mātanga means 'a Chāndāla, a man of the lowest caste and untouchable, a Kirata mountaineer, a barbarian;' and the Mādrī, i.e., the Mahārajas of this part of the country, usually call themselves Mātangi-mādhokan, i.e., 'the children of Mātangi or Purgā,' who is their goddess. It is probable, therefore, that the Mātangas of this inscription were some aboriginal family of but little real power, and not of sufficient importance to have left any records of themselves. As regards the Katashchurias of this inscription,—whether this form of the name is due only to a mistake of the engraver, or whether it is a genuine and authentic variety,—those who are really meant are

---

1. Mārāca Inscriptions, p. xxxvii.
4. A form of Katashchuri is the cvalata 1, usually expressed by a dot under it; and the 'of Katashchuri' is the second form of it, usually transliterated by a dot under.
undoubtedly the predecessors of the Kalachuris of later times; and
in the description of Mangalas in the Miraj grant, the word used
is Kalachchuri (by a metrical license for Kalachuri), and not
Kalachuri. The later Kalachuris will be noticed further on in this
paper; but nothing more is known at present in respect of their an-
ccestors of the time of Mangalas, except that the Buddharka, son
of Samkaragama, whom he is said in two of his inscriptions to have
conquered, very probably was, as General Cunningham has suggest-
ed, an early king of this dynasty. This, in fact, seems to be
rendered almost certain by the Mahakuta column inscription of
Mangalas, which, after mentioning the conquest of King Buddha
and the seizure of his riches, records that the wealth of the
Kalatans (evidently a Sanskritized form of Kalachuri) was given
to the temple of Makutavara.

The Gangas are mentioned in connection with Pulikest II, who
succeeded to the throne in Saka 532 (A.D. 619-8) and continued to
reign up to at least Saka 550. Any detailed notice of them is not
called for in this paper, as their dominions lay in what is now the
territory of Malabar, and it was only in the extreme south and south-
east parts of what is now the Bombay Presidency that the Chalukyas
came in contact with them. Previous to that they had been conquered
by Mrigesa, of the Kadamba dynasty of Palasak. Seven Gangas
copper-plated grants have been published by Mr. Rice, and one by
myself, and three stone-tablet inscriptions by Mr. Kittel, and such
information concerning this dynasty as is derivable from them and
from an old Tamil chronicle called the Kangudevariyakal has been
already compiled and published by Mr. Rice, and the result is a
tolerably lengthy account and list of kings, such as it is. There was
undoubtedly an early important dynasty of Ganga kings; for,
in addition to the present inscription, it is mentioned, as has been
indicated, also in one of the Kadamba grants of Mrigesavaram.
But, while of necessity I admit this much, I cannot go further than
this; and, especially I cannot say with Mr. Rice that "the true
history of this important line of kings may be said to have been
entirely brought to light and authenticated by the inscriptions"
mentioned above. If these inscriptions could be accepted as
genuine, they would certainly establish Mr. Rice's point. But,
whereas the grant published by myself, belonging to the third
generation inclusive of the founder of the dynasty, purports to be
dated in Saka 169 (A.D. 247-8), and therefore to be the oldest
known record of the kind, of fixed date, in Western India,—there
are incontrovertible grounds for stamping this grant at once as
spurious. For, not only do the characters in which it is engraved
show most conclusively that it is a forgery of not earlier than the
tenth century A.D., but also the date established by it cannot
possibly be made to fit in with the dates established by the other grants for subsequent generations of the same dynasty.\footnote{1} An further still, this grant of Saka 169, and the Merkara grant of the year 388, and the Negaranagala grant of Saka 698, were all engraved on their own showing, by one and the same man, Visvakarmacharya. The other grants may all be criticised in the same way, palaeographically, and on other grounds. But we have also extraneous corroborative evidence of the most important kind. These grants all agree in respect of the first three generations of the dynasty—viz. Konganivarman (or Madhava I.), the founder of the dynasty; Madhava II., the son and successor of Konganivarman; and Harivarman, the son and successor of Madhava II.—and the grant published by myself gives Saka 169 as the date of Harivarman. Now amongst the numerous stone-tablets extant at Lakshmeswar within the limits of the Dhawad District, there is one of the Ganga dynasty\footnote{2}, which gives exactly the same account of these three generations,—adding also Madhava I. as the proper name of Konganivarman, the latter being really only a family-title,—and records a grant by Marambha, the younger brother of Harivarman, in Saka 890 (A.D. 982-9). If the Lakshmeswar inscription were a forgery, the forger of it certainly would have given it a much earlier date than Saka 890, and would probably have endeavoured to imitate the more ancient characters, instead of engraving it in genuine characters of the tenth century A.D. Taking all things into consideration,—the palaeographical and other objections to, and the internal inconsistencies in, the copper-plate grants; the existence of this stone-tablet at Lakshmeswar; and, Marambha having also had the title of Satyavakya, the probability that Mr. Kittel's K GANGA-nâd stone-tablet inscription\footnote{3} of Satyavakya-Konganivarman, dated Saka 900 (A.D. 978-9), is another inscriptions of Marambha,\footnote{4} there can be no doubt whatever that the dates of the copper-plate grants are spurious, and that the date of the Lakshmeswar stone-tablet inscription is the true one for the third generation from the founder of the dynasty. And, finally, if any further argument is required, there is one more point which is of the most conclusive kind. I have just seen the advanced proofs of a paper by Mr. Rice on the Râshtrakuta kings, in which he draws attention to the fact, which I had overlooked, that the Merkara plates mention a king named Akalâvarna,—undoubtedly a Râshtrakuta, as Mr. Rice urges,—the grant, in fact, purporting to be made by a minister of this Akalâvarna with the sanction of the Ganga king.\footnote{5} As will be seen further on, the tradition of the Mirañj plates of the eleventh century A.D. mentions

---

\footnote{1}{The Merkara plates purport to record a grant in the year 388, which can be only Saka 388, by the great grandson of the Harivarman of the grant of Saka 169. And the Negaranagala plates purport to record a grant in Saka 698 by the eleventh or twelfth in succession to Harivarman.}

\footnote{2}{Ind. Ant., Vol. VII., p. 101; also see p. 112.}

\footnote{3}{Id., Vol. VI., p. 102.}

\footnote{4}{See Id., Vol. VII., p. 102.}

\footnote{5}{Mr. Rice considers that he was the called minister of Akalâvarna. I should prefer the equally justifiable hypothesis that he had been the minister of Akalâvarna, and that, either on the death of that king—by voluntary or compulsorily—you the Râshtrakutas and took service under the other dynasty, or, on the subversion of the power of the Râshtrakutas by the Western Chalukyas, part of their dominions, of which this minister was still in charge, fell into the possession of the Ganga.}
a Rāshtrakuta king named Krishna, whose son Indra was conquered by the Early Chalukya king Jayasimha I. about the beginning of the fifth century a.d. And confirmatory evidence,—at any rate of the existence of an early king named Krishna, who would be slightly anterior in date to Jayasimha I., and who very possibly did belong to the Rāshtrakuta dynasty,—is afforded by some silver coins, found at Devalāna in the Nāsik District, which have the name of Krishnaraṇa on them, and which, on palaeographical grounds, are to be referred, as was done by Dr. Bhuṣaṇ Deōji, to the end of the fourth century a.d. The date of Jayasimha I. was, as has been said, about the commencement of the fifth century a.d.; and accordingly General Cunningham has referred these coins specifically to the king Krishna, said to belong to the Rāshtrakuta dynasty, whose son was vanquished by Jayasimha I. Now, Krishna II., of the Rāshtrakuta dynasty, for whom we have the dates of Saka 797 (a.d. 875-6) and 883 (a.d. 911-2), and also Krishna IV., of the same dynasty, for whom we have the dates of Saka 887 (a.d. 945-6) and 878 (a.d. 966-7), both had the title of Akāḷavarsa. And Mr. Rice, starting with the suggestion that the fact, that nearly all the Govindas, and only the Govindas, among the Rāshtrakutas had the title of Prabhūtavarsa, leads to the inference that the relations between the peculiar titles and certain names of the kings of that line were constant,—proceeds to point out that, on this analogy, Akāḷavarsa would indicate a king Krishna, and finally intimates that the Akāḷavarsa of the Merkara grant is to be identified with the king Krishna whose son was conquered by Jayasimha I. This identification, if it could be accepted, would of course be a strong argument in favour of the genuine antiquity of the Merkara plates. The full facts, however, really tend very emphatically in quite the opposite direction. Even if any such constant relation between the names and titles of the Rāshtrakuta kings, as Mr. Rice has suggested, could be established, it would still be unsafe to be positive in allotting the title of Akāḷavarsa to this early king Krishna, about whom we are yet know so little. But no such constant relation can be established. To take first the case of the Govindas, relied upon as the basis of his argument by Mr. Rice,—the inscriptions have given no secondary titles of Govinda I., and have given only that of Vallaḥa II. for Govinda II.; and, though Govinda III. and Govinda IV. certainly both had the title of Prabhūtavarsa,—the former of them having also three other hereditary titles,—yet Govinda V. had not that title, but was called Suvarnavarsa II. and Vallaḥaṇandaṇa II. Again, Suvarnavarsa I., was the title of Karka or Kakka II.; while Karka or Kakka III. had not that title, but had the titles of Amoghaṇavarsa III. and Vallaḥaṇandaṇa III. And finally,—to come to the Krishnas,—the only titles recorded of Krishna I. and Krishna II. are respectively Vallaḥa I. and Akāḷavarsa I.; the inscriptions mention no other names of Krishna. III.; and, though Krishna IV. again had the title of Akāḷavarsa II., yet he had also that of Nirupama II., which had belonged in the first instance to Durvya. These facts are quite enough to show that there was no constant relation between the names and the titles of the Rāshtrakuta kings. And, turning to another dynasty, that of the Western Chalukyas, there, also, we find that there was anything but a constant relation between the names of the kings and their titles;—the
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The Alupas.

title of A’hamavalla belonged to Taila II. and Somesvara I.; the title of Tribhuvanavalla belonged to Vikramaditya V. and Vikramaditya VI., but also to Somesvara IV.; and the title of Trailokyaavalla belonged to Somesvara V., Jyayyamika IV., and Taila III. This part of the argument, therefore, falls entirely to the ground. And, since the alphabet of the Merkara plates is, in spite of certain attempts to reproduce the more ancient forms, certainly not earlier than the end of the ninth century A.D.; and since, other circumstances also fitting in, we have an Akalavara of the Rashtrakuta dynasty whose reign lay about the middle of the tenth century A.D., and whose dominions extended at any rate to the confines of Mysore—the obvious and the only tenable identification is that the Akalavara of the Merkara plates is not the early king Krishna of the end of the fourth century A.D., but this same Akalavara II. or Krishna IV. of Saka 867 (A.D. 945-6) and 878 (A.D. 956-7). This disposes finally of the pretensions to antiquity of the Merkara plates. It follows, therefore, that Mr. Rice’s Ganga kings are not the ones with whom the Kaulamitas and Pallakesi II. came in contact, and we have still to discover who the latter were, and to ascertain the authentic early history of the Ganga dynasty.

The Alupas are mentioned only in the present inscription, apparently under the name of A’lava, in a grant of Vinayaditya dated Saka 616, and under the name of Alupas again, as the foes of the Western Chalukyas in later times, in a Kaulamita inscription dated Kalyyana 4270 (A.D. 1109-70), and in the Vrikshamalam, devarshita of Bilhana. Who they were, and where their dominions lay, has still to be ascertained; but their kingdom must have been somewhere to the south or south-west and beyond the limits of the present Bombay Presidency.

The Pallavas appear to have surpassed even the Kaulamitas in power and importance, and to have been certainly the most hostile and aggressive family that the Chalukyas encountered in their conquest of the Dekkan. And there plainly is something still to be explained to account for their deadly antagonism to the Chalukyas, which was of so inveterate and peculiar a character that they are called in one inscription their natural enemies.

The explanation may perhaps be found in the fact, of which General Pearse assures us, that the Pallava cosa always bear the device of a bull, intended doubtless for Nandi, as the representative of Siva. This would lead to the inference that the family-god of the Pallavas was Siva. The family-god of the Chalukyas, on the other hand, was Vishnu, and their coins and the seals of their grants always bear a device of a boar. It is possible, therefore, that the natural enmity of the Chalukyas and the Pallavas had its origin in their belonging, at least by tradition, if not by actual practice, to the two great rival forms of the Hindu religion. As Mr. Rice says, the origin of the Pallavas is as yet uncertain. But there can be but little doubt, if any, that they are the Pallavas or Pahlavas, who, as he also points out, are mentioned in the Puranas, along with the Haidayas, Sakas, Yavanas, &c., and

this would imply a Persian origin. And, as regards the word ‘Pahlav,’—which at the period of the inscriptions would naturally be represented by ‘Pallava,’—Prof. Weber considers that it “lawsame early foreign to the Persians, learned reminiscences excepted; in the Pahlavi texts themselves, for instance, it does not occur. The period when it passed over to the Indians, therefore, would have to be fixed for about the second to the fourth century A.D.; and we should have to understand by it, not directly the Persians, who are called Pārāsikas rather, but specially the Aryanian Parthians.” In their inscriptions, however, the Pallavas claim to belong to the Bhārsadvāja getra, and therefore to be of Hindu origin. In the time of Pulikesi II., Kānchi, or Conjuveram, was the central seat of their dominions. Prior to that, they had held the country of Vengi, on the eastern coast, between the rivers Krishna and Godāvari, from which they were ejected by the Eastern Chalukyas at some time during the seventh century. And either their kingdom extended at the same time across India to the Western Ghauts, or, prior to their settling down in the Vengi country, their capital was Vatāpi or Badāmi, as is proved by a fragmentary and ancient inscription, discovered by me not long ago at Badāmi itself. Therefore, though the inscriptions as yet known do not expressly state the fact, the Chalukyas had come in contact with the Pallavas before the time of Pulikesi II., and it was from the Pallavas that they acquired Vatāpi, probably in the time of Pulikesi I. The Kadamba inscriptions, also, give clear evidence of the existence of the power of the Pallavas in Western India in early times, Mrigesavarnā conquered them. And Raviyavāma established himself, and re-established his family, at Pālāsikā, by overthrowing Chandadanda, the lord of Kānchi, and the Vīshnuravāma, who was slain by him, probably belonging to the same family. Also the Sendapu Simha, of the Bhārsadvāja getra, by whose son Mrigessa a Jain temple was built at Pālāsikā, was very possibly a member of the same family. And it seems likely that the Chandadandas, with the help of whom Pulikesi II. ejected the Manravas from the Konkana, was a descendant of the Chandadandas who was overthrown by Raviyavāma. Five early Pallava copper-plate grants have been published,—one by Mr. Foulkes, and four by myself. One of them is in the Prakrit language, and is probably the earliest Pallava grant that has as yet come to light; it gives the names of two kings,—Vijayavakandavāma, and his son Vijayabuddhavāma. Another of them mentions only one king, Attiravāma, with nothing to indicate his date or his place in the dynasty. The others establish the following short genealogy:—

1 Mynove Inscriptions, p. ii.—They are mentioned in the Fāhien-Puítara, Wilson’s translation, Half’s edition, Vol. II., p. 158, 159; and Vol. III., pp. 291, 292. And Maha (Chap. Xv., vv. 43, 44) says that they were a degenerate division of the Kastriyas caste.
2 History of Indian Literature, p. 157, note 291a.
3 1 14° 36’ N., Long. 70° 45’ E.
4 Ind. Ant., Vol. IX., p. 29.
5 Id., Vol. VI., p. 23.
6 Id., Vol. VI., p. 31.
7 Id., Vol. VIII., p. 167. This one, however, is of somewhat doubtful authenticity.
8 Id., Vol. V., pp. 59 and 104; and Vol. IX., pp. 199 and 192.
Unfortunately none of these grants are dated in any era except that of the reigning king. Therefore,—though Skandavarman I, and his successors may be safely attributed, as was done by Dr. Burnell, to the fifth and sixth centuries A.D., and Vijayakundavarman and his son probably to a somewhat earlier time,—we are left unable to say definitely that it was any one of these kings that held Vatapi and was ejected from it by the Chalukyas. The Badami fragment, however, has in it the name of either Vishnu, Simhavishnu, or Narasimhavishnu; and we have a Simhavishnu and Narasimhavarmá mentioned as belonging respectively to the first and third generation of the dynasty, so far as the genealogy is given and may be relied on, in a later Pallava inscription published by Mr. Foulkes.1

 SECTION III.

THE EARLY CHALUKYAS.

The records that have survived of this important and powerful dynasty are so numerous, and so carefully dated in almost every instance in the well-known Saka era, that we enter now upon a far more definite chapter in the history of Western India. To a certain extent our knowledge of it is in outline only, simply because there has been as yet no opportunity of examining more than a very small portion of the materials already collected, and much less of investigating the other remains that exist so abundantly all over the Kanarese country, but are from year to year being wantonly destroyed or allowed through negligence to disappear. Still, such knowledge as we do possess is by no means scanty.

The accompanying table gives a complete genealogy of all the generations of this dynasty, as far as they are now known, from its first appearance in historical times down to its final extinction. The mythical account of the origin of the name Chalkya, Chalikya, and Chalukya, the etymology of which has not yet been satisfactorily explained, is that the founder of the race sprang from the spray of a water-pot (chalta, chabika, chafika), when Harita, who wore five tufts of hair on his head, was pouring out a libation to the gods. The probability is that the oldest and original form was Chalkya, and that the other forms were created by the use of

1 The initial date of the Saka era was the 14th March, a.d. 78; Ind. Ant., Vol. VII, p. 151.
2 Hancarke inscription; Elliot, M.B. Collection, Vol. I. p. 645. - The inscription, which was of the time of Vikramaditya VI., states the genealogy from Vishnu, through Brahma, who was born in the water-lily that grew out of Vishnu's head, through Manthya, and Harita, to Hariti-Panchamitha, from whose water-pot the Chalukyas sprang as stated above. - Elliot, the Vahipati, or Chief Pandit of Vikramaditya VI., gives a somewhat different account, and says (Vikranadityadeva-charita, 1, 21-28) that, when Brahman was engaged in the morning ceremonies on the bank of the river of the gods, Indra came and represented to him that the inhabitants of the earth were becoming so indifferent about religion that it seemed as if all sacrifices to the gods would soon cease, and asked him to create a bar to destroy the enemies of religion. Brahman turned his eyes, full of meditation, upon his water-pot, from which there then sprang forth a warrior, clothed in golden armour, proof against all weapons, who was dedicated by Brahman to the destruction of the enemies of the gods. He attained pre-eminence over all the kings of the earth; and by him there was founded a family, of which Harita came to be considered the chief, or 'first progenitor,' and in which Manthya was born, who humbled the pride of his enemies. - It may be noted that the myth cannot be of very ancient invention; as, though this derivation will suit the name of Chalkya, which only came into use on the restoration of the dynasty under Tula II., and also the name of Chalukya, belonging only to the Anhiliwala dynasty, the members of which called themselves both Chalkyays and Chalukikas, and the earliest date for which is the middle of the tenth century a.d., yet it does not suit the original name of Chalkya, Chalikya, and Chalukya.
pronunciative vowels. The Chalukyas belong originally to the Scnavaunas, or lunar race; and, like the early Kadambas, they claim to belong to the Mahavya gotra and to be "of the sons of Hariti". It is suggested by Mr. Rice, that they borrowed these details of descent from the Kadambas, as being the most powerful and important family supplanted by them in Western India. But this can hardly be the case; for, these same details are given in the earliest known Chalukya inscription, the Kheda or Kaira grant of Vijayaraja, dated Saka 304 (A.D. 472-3), which was engraved before the Chalukyas left the northern part of this Presidency and, travelling southwards, came in contact with the Kadambas. The kuladevata, or family-god, of the Chalukyas was Vishnu; and the principal emblem that the seals of their grants and their coins always bear is a bear, derived from one of the incarnations of Vishnu. But, in spite of this fact, in early times they displayed a considerable amount of tolerance in matters of religion, and patronised the Jain and Saiva, equally with the Vaishnava, faiths. And in the later generations they devoted themselves almost entirely to the Saiva religion, particularly in the linga form of worship.

The early tradition of the family is that fifty-nine kings of this dynasty reigned at Ayodhya, and after them sixteen more over the region of the south, by which must be meant the northern part of the Deccan immediately to the south of Ayodhya. There was then a temporary obscuration of their power, which was restored in the person of Jayasimha I.

No inscriptions of the time of Jayasimhadeva and Jayasimhavallabha, are as yet known to exist. Should any be hereafter discovered, they will probably carry back the genealogy to still earlier times; for the directions of the Sanskrit lawyers, followed in nearly all these records, are, that the genealogical portion of the grant must give the name of at least three generations. At present the name of Jayasimha I. is the earliest historical name in this dynasty that we possess. It is given as the name of the founder of the dynasty, both in the earliest known Chalukya grant from the north, the Kheda or Kaira grant of Vijayaraja mentioned above, and in the only two authentic southern inscriptions which go back to the commencement of the genealogy,—the Aihole stone-tablet of Pulakesi II., and the Miraj grant of Jayasimha III., also mentioned above. And, though I cannot speak with absolute conviction at present, I am so strongly inclined to accept the two Jayasimhas as one and the same person, that I have treated them as such in the genealogical table published herewith. None of the southern inscriptions speak of any of the royal families of the south as having been conquered by Jayasimha I., or by his son Ramagati. And,—though a grant, of the eleventh century A.D., of one of the Chola successors of the Eastern Chalukya kings, professes to tell us that, after fifty-nine emperors, commencing with Udayas, had

1 *Hariharpur,* see p. 2, note 2.
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reigned in unbroken lineal succession at the city of Ayodhā, one of its descendants, named Vijayanātha, journeyed to the south from a desire of conquest; and that, though this Vijayanātha was defeated and slain by a Pālava king named Trilochana, his son, Vishnuvardhana, married into the Pālava family; and that Vishnuvardhana’s grandson Polekasivabhūha, the Pulkēśa II. of many tables, established the Chalukya empire in the south,—still this is a mere jāraja of vague tradition and Purāṇa mythology, of no authority, based on the undisputed facts that the Chalukyas did come originally from the north and did find the Pālavas in possession of some of the territories afterwards acquired by themselves, and on a tradition of the later Kālambhas that the founder of their family was named Trilochana or Trinātra. If the tradition of the Miraj plate is to be accepted, it was by defeating an early Rāṣṭrakuta king named Indra, the son of Krishna, that Jayasimha re-established the Chalukya power after its temporary obscurity; and at that time certainly the kingdom of the Rāṣṭrakutas did not extend below the northern parts of the Dekkan. It may be taken as absolutely certain that Jayasimha I. had no dominion south of the Tapi or Tapti river, and perhaps not south even of the Narmada.

Of Buddhavarman and Ranarāga, the two sons of Jayasimha I., we have no historical information; beyond the mere mention of their names. But here, again, the absence of any mention of the southern dynasties in connection with them indicates plainly that they did nothing to advance the Chalukya kingdom in that direction.

Of Vijayanātha or Vijayarāja, the son of Buddhavarman, the only record that we have is the Kairā grant of Saka 394 (A.D. 473-3). It confers the village of Parīyaya upon the priests and religious students of Jambusara, the modern Jambueser between Kairā and Brouch, and is issued from the victorious camp at the city of Vijayarāma. This city still remains to be identified, and has to be looked for somewhere in Gujarat. At the backs of these plates there is a cancelled grant, issued at the same time and by the same king, but apparently from some other place, the name of which is only partially legible, but which may be Nandipuri, identified by Dr. Bühler with a fort of the same name just outside the Jindeswar gate of the city of Brouch.

We have no record of any descendants of Vijayarāja. The next name is that of his cousin Polekas or Pulikesi I., also called Ranavikrama or ‘he who is valorous in war,’ the son of Ranarāga. His wife was Durlabhādevi, of the Bappura family. It was in his time that the Chalukyas left the north and invaded the south. The circumstances under which they did so are not yet clear. But the probability is that, at the death of Vijayarāja, or possibly by an invasion of his kingdom which resulted in his defeat and death in battle, the power of the Chalukyas in the north was subverted, and the family expelled, by the Gurjaras kings, or by the kings of Valabhi, the other most powerful rulers of these parts; and that, in his flight, directing his course to the south in the hope

of finding new and unoccupied dominions there, Pulikesi I. was attended by a band of adherents sufficiently numerous and strong to enable him to eventually invade, and conquer a part of, the dominions of the Pallava king, and, by wresting the city of Vaidropi from him, to establish for himself a new seat of government there. Or it is even possible that the Chalukyas were originally feudatories of the Gourjara kings, but, in the person of Pulikesi I., threw that yoke, and, emigrating to the south, established an independent sovereignty of their own. There is no genuine inscription of the time of Pulikesi I. There is a spurious grant, now in the British Museum, which purports to be of his time and to be dated Saka 411 (A.D. 480-90), and to record the building of a Jain temple and the allotment of certain grants to it at the city of Alakatakanga in the Kubandi district, which was governed by one of his factories. Saka 411 may, or may not, be within the limits of the reign of Pulikesi I.; but this grant, for the reasons which I have set forth in my notice of it, is a forgery of not earlier than the tenth century A.D. His capital appears to have been originally Indukula, a city which has not yet been identified, but which must be looked for somewhere in the north and possibly in the neighbourhood of Ajanta, if, indeed, it does not turn out to be that place itself. It was he who first made Vidapura the capital of the Chalukyas in Western India, wresting it from the Pallavas who then held it, and established the dynasty permanently in those parts; and it is probably owing to this fact that, in the majority of the Early and Western Chalukya grants, the genealogy commences with his name. An inscription of Vikramaditya VI. at Bhurangi in Musur, dated Saka 1039 (A.D. 1117-8), seems to compare a conquest of the Chola king, who had burned Kalyan in 858 A.D., with the Western Chalukya capital, by Somasvara I., to a conquest of the Pallava king, and a burning of Kanche, by Pulikesi I. This tradition, however, must be accepted with some caution, as we have no further evidence that Pulikesi I. penetrated so far into the Pallava dominions.

Pulikesi I. was succeeded by his eldest son, Kirttvarama I., who extended the Chalukya kingdom farther to the south and west by defeating and subjugating the Nalas, the Mavaras, and the Kadambas. The date of his accession is not known; but his reign terminated in Saka 489 (A.D. 567-78). We have as yet only one inscription of his time, and that found quite recently. It is an undated Old-Kanarese inscription at A'lur, the ancient Pundipura, eight miles to the east of Hangle in the Dharmat District; and it records that, while Kirttvarama was reigning as supreme sovereign, and while a certain king Sindra was governing at Pundipura, endowments were made to...
a Jain temple at that town. The existence of this inscription in the heart of the Kadamby territory furnishes an interesting corroboration of the statement of the Aihoje Meguti inscription, that Kritivarmā I conquered the Kalamis. It was by Kritivarmā I that the construction of the Vaishnava Cave, No. III., at Badami was originated, and probably in his reign that it was commenced.

He was succeeded by his younger brother Mangalisa, also called Mangalaraja and Mangalivasara, in Saka 489. Of this king we have five inscriptions,—an undated copper-plate grant from Nnerur in the Sāwantwadi State; an inscription, dated in the fifth year of his reign, on a large fallen column at Mahakuta near Badami, where there is the temple of the god Mahākutesvara, or, as the name is written in this inscription, Mahakutesvara; an inscription on a pillar in the verandah of the Vaishnava cave, No. III., at Badami, dated Saka 500 (A.D. 678-9) in the twelfth year of his reign, and recording the completion of the cave; an undated inscription on the rock just outside the same cave; and a copper-plate grant from the Gaṅna territory dated Saka 532 (A.D. 710-1), in the twentieth year, not of his reign, but of his conquest of Revatidvīp, which is spoken of both in the Aihoje Meguti inscription and in the Miraj plates. According to the Miraj plates, he succeeded as regent during the minority of his nephew, Pulikesi II., the eldest son of Kritivarmā I, and peaceably resigned the throne when Pulikesi II. attained maturity. But, whatever may be the circumstances under which he obtained the sceptre, the Aihoje inscription speaks of a desire on the part of Mangalisa to secure the succession for his own son, and of discord and civil war between him and Pulikesi II., in the course of which he lost his life. This last occurrence must have been in the early part of Saka 532. In addition to his conquest of Revatidvīp, Mangalisa subjugated the Mattanga and the Katakchurias or Kalaśurias. He seems to have acquired his kingdom in the Konkanas from a branch of the Chalukyas, otherwise unknown, settled there, the chief of whom, Srāmikāra, he slew. And he conquered and dispossessed another king, named Buddhā, the son of Sankusgama, who very probably was, as suggested by General Cunningham, of the Kalaśuria dynasty. The Mahakuta column inscription, in fact, seems to render this almost certain, as, after mentioning the conquest,
of king Buddha and the seizure of his riches, it records that the wealth of the Kulatuaris (evidently a Sanskritised form of Kalschuri) was given to the temple of Makutesvara.

It is recorded in the Ahole inscription that Mangalisa had a son, for whom he was desirous to secure the succession after his own death. This son's name is not given there, nor is any mention made of him in the Mirañj plates. But it is just possible that he is the Yaçavaja Satyäaraya-Indravarman or the Satyäaraya-Dhruvaraja-Indravarman, the governor of Ruvatidivpu, by whom the grant recorded in the plates of Saka 533 from the Portuguese territory was made. That this person was at any rate in some way or other a connection of Mangalisa, is shown by his being called 'the ornament of the Adinahabappuravamsa,'—the Bappura family being the one to which Darlabhadovi, the wife of Pulikesi I., belonged.¹ The expression applied to Satyäaraya-Indravarman may mean that his father was of the Bappura family, in which case he himself was only a connection by marriage of Mangalisa; or, as in the case of some of the titles of the later Western Chalukyas, derived from intermarriages with the Pallavas and Ganges, it may be a family-title of the Chalukyas derived from the intermarriage of Pulikesi I. with the Bappuras, or from a similar intermarriage by Mangalisa himself. However this may be, it does not appear that Mangalisa's son ever actually ascended the Chalukya throne.

¹ It is not yet clear, however, whether she was the mother of Mangalisa. In his inscription in which she is mentioned, he calls her, not his 'mother,' but sus-pura-añkā, 'the wife of his own father,' which reads somewhat as if Kiritivarman I. and Mangalisa were the sons of Pulikesi I. by different wives.
SECTION IV.

THE WESTERN CHALUKYAS.

Kritivarman I. left three sons,—Pulikesi II., also called Satyasaraya, or 'the asylum of truth,' because he adhered to his promises even though they were not enforced by precept; Vishnuvardhana I., who, being also called Kubja-Vishnuvardhana, seems to have been hump-backed; and Jayasimhavarman or Jayasimha II., also called Jayasraya 'the asylum of victory,' and Dharasraya 'the asylum of the earth.' There was a formal division of the kingdom between the two elder brothers,—Pulikesi II. taking the western dominions, and establishing himself at Vatapi as the capital; and Vishnuvardhana I. taking the eastern dominions, and establishing himself in the Vengi country. This division must have taken place in, or very shortly after, Saka 532 (a.d. 610-1), when Mangalan died and Pulikesi II. succeeded to the throne; and from that time forth the Western and the Eastern Branches of the Chalukya family remained separate and distinct. At the same time, Jayasimha II. appears to have received his share of the kingdom, more to the north. We are not further concerned with him; and he is known only from the undated Nirpan grant, from the Nasiik District, of his son Nagavardhana, also called Tribhuvanasastraya, or 'the asylum of the three worlds.' It is just possible that he was the progenitor of the Chalukyas of Auhillwe, who appear historically in the tenth century a.d. Nor are we any further concerned in this paper with Vishnuvardhana I. and his descendants of the Eastern Branch.

Pulikesi or Pulikesi II., who succeeded to the throne early in Saka 532 (a.d. 610-1), was the most powerful and illustrious of the early kings of his dynasty. We have three inscriptions of his time,—a grant from Haidarabad in the Dekkan, dated Saka 534 (a.d. 612-3), the third year of his reign; an undated grant from Narur in the Sawaiwadi State; and the Aihula Meguri inscription, dated Saka 556 (a.d. 634-5) and Kaliyuga 375. There is also a stone-tablet inscription at Amrakavi in the Darwad District, which falsely attributes to him the date of Saka 485 (a.d. 564-5); but his real date is so well known, that it is unnecessary to give any 

---

1 Jad. Ant. Vol. IX., p. 125.  2 Jad. Vol. VI., p. 126.  3 Jad. Vol. VI., p. 72.  4 Jad. Vol. VIII., p. 43.  5 Kirli MS. Collection, Vol. I., p. 672.  6 I have quite recently had inquiries made about the original stone, with the object of obtaining an impression of it; but, like many of the inscriptions that were in existence in Sir Walter Elliot's time, it is not now forthcoming.
reasons here for rejecting the date of this inscription. His conquests were numerous and widely spread, and included the Rashtrakutas, who invaded him under Appayaka-Govinda, the Kadambas of Vanavasi, the Gangas, the Alupas, the Mauryas of the Konkan, the Latas, the Malavas, the Gurjara, the three countries known by the name of Maharshta and including, it is said, ninety-nine thousand villages, the Kosalas, the Kalingas, the Pallavas of Kanchi, the Cholas, the Keralas, and the Pandyas. The greatest of these was his conquest of Harsha or Harshavarman, also called Siladitya, of Kanyakubja or Kanjor, who is called, in the inscriptions, the warlike lord of all the region of the north. It was by this victory that Pulikesi II. acquired the title of Paramesvar, or supreme lord, and this, with his other name of Satyakrsya, under which alone he is usually spoken of in all the later Western Chalukya inscriptions, became one of the hereditary titles of his descendants. The Chinese pilgrim Hiuen Thang, who sojourned in India from A.D. 629 to 644, or Saka 531 to 547, visited the court of Ho-li-sha-ju-an-na or Harshavarman, otherwise called Shi-lo-o'-tsu-lo or Siladitya, and describes, and apparently visited a capital of the kingdom of Ho-ko-la-ch'or Maharshta, the king of which was named Pu-lo-ki-sho or Pulikesi II. His account of this kingdom is as follows:—"The kingdom of Ho-ko-la-ch'or is nearly six thousand li (twelve hundred miles) in circuit. The capital, towards the west, is near a large river; its circumference is thirty li. The soil is rich and fertile, and produces abundance of grain. The climate is warm; the manners are simple and honest. The natives are tall, and haughty and supercilious in character. Whoever does them a service may count on their gratitude; but he that offends them will not escape their revenge. If any one insult them, they will risk their lives to wipe out that affront. If one apply to them in difficulty, they will forget to care for themselves in order to flee to his assistance. When they have an injury to avenge, they never fail to give warning to their enemy; after which each puts on his cuirass and grasps his spear in his hand. In battle they pursue the fugitives, but do not slay those who give themselves up. When a general has lost a battle, instead of punishing him corporally, they make him wear women's clothes, and by that force him to sacrifice his own life. The state maintains a body of damasked champions, to the number of several hundreds. Each time they prepare for combat, they drink wine to intoxicate them; and then one of those men, spear in hand, will defy ten thousand enemies. If they kill a man met upon the road, the law does not punish them. Whenever the army commences a campaign, these brave march in the van to the sound

2 This number may appear rather large. But the Gangavati district, in Malabar, in the tenth and eleventh centuries A.D. included ninety-six thousand villages. Ind. Ant., Vol. IV., p. 203; and Mysore Incriptions, p. 209.
3 Dr. Burgess: Ind. Ant., Vol. VII., p. 209.
4 Dr. Burgess has suggested that this may be Badami.—There is a river near Badami, the Malaprabha; and about three miles to the southeast of Badami there is the temple of Ramamukt, which may be the ancient seat in which there was a stone statue of Avalokitesvara-Bodhisattva. But no traces have been found as yet of the hundred convents of Hiuen Thang's account, or of the five temples built by Asoka.
of the drum. Besides, they intoxicate many hundreds of naturally fierce elephants. At the time of their coming to blows, they drink also strong liquor. They run in a body, trampling everything under their feet. No enemy can stand before them. The king, proud of possessing these men and elephants, despises and slight the neighbouring kingdoms. He is of the race of the Ta'ia-ti-Ni (Kahateis); his name is Pa-lo-ti-she (Pulikesi). His ideas are large and profound, and he extends widely his sympathy and benefactions. His subjects serve him with perfect self-devotion. At present the great king Siladitya carries his victorious arms from the east to the west; he subdues distant people and makes the neighbouring nations fear him; but the people of this kingdom alone have not submitted. Although he be often at the head of all the troops of the five Indies, though he has summoned the bravest generals of all the kingdoms, and though he has marched himself to punish them, he has not yet been able to vanquish their opposition. From this we may judge of their warlike habits and manners. The men love study, and follow at the same time the teachings of heresy and of truth. There are a hundred convents, which contain nearly five thousand devotees, and where they study alike the greater and lesser vehicles. They reckon a hundred temples of the gods; the heretics of various sects are exceedingly numerous. Within and outside the capital, are raised five stupas. In all these places the four past Buddhas have sat, and, in performing their exercises, have left the marks of their feet. These monuments were constructed by king Wu-yen (Asoka). There are other stupas in stone and brick, but they are so numerous that it would be difficult to mention all. A short distance to the south of the town, there is an ancient convent, in the middle of which is seen a stone statue of Kwoon-tou-saot-p’u-ka (Avalokitesvara-Bodhisattva). The effects of his divine power are manifested in secret: those who apply to him, obtain for the most part the objects of their vows. On the eastern frontiers of the kingdom, there is a great mountain, which shows summits heaped one upon another, chains of rocks, peaks in double rank, and scoured crests. Of old there was a convent there, which had been formed in a gloomy valley. Its lofty walls and deep halls occupied large openings in the rocks and rested against the peaks; its pavilions and its two-storied towers were backed by the caverns and looked into the valley. The reputation and influence of Pulikesi II. were by no means confined to India. For, as Mr. Ferguson has shown in a paper recently read by him before the Royal Asiatic Society, there is an Arabic chronicle, which records the fact that, in the thirty-sixth year of the reign of Khoera II. of Persia, presents and letters were interchanged between him and Pulikesi II. Khoera was dethroned on the 25th February A.D. 628, in the thirty-eighth year of his reign. This makes Saka 547 (A.D. 625-6), when Pulikesi II. had been about sixteen years on the throne, the date of the communication between him and the king of Persia. And in the same paper,—in fact, as the chief

1 The Malayum and the Hinayana.
2 Mr. Ferguson identifies this place with Ajanta.
subject of it,—Mr. Fergusson has drawn attention to a painting in one of the Ajantá caves, which depicts the presentation of a letter from a Persian king to an Indian king, who is supposed to be Pulikesi II. himself. The exact date of the termination of the reign of Pulikesi II. is not known, as none of the inscriptions of his sons, which have as yet been discovered, are dated in the Saka era, or with such details that they can be referred to the Saka era. But, as he must have been at least three years old in Saka 489, when his father, Kritivarmá I., died, it is not likely that he continued to reign much longer after Saka 556, the date of the Aihole Meguti inscription.

After the death of Pulikesi II., the kingdom of the Western Chalukyás appears to have been invaded by the Pallavás, who succeeded in driving them for a time, on the west, back to and below the Western Ghauts, and on the south, to the Karnul District. In this the Pallavás appear to have been aided by a confederacy of the Chola and Pándya and Keralá kings. And we have, perhaps, an allusion to these events in a Pallava grant of later times, published by Mr. Poukés, which compares Narasimhavarman, one of the early Pallavás, with the saint Agastya, the destroyer of the demon Vátopi. In this comparison, it is almost impossible to avoid seizing an allusion to some early conquest of the city of Vátopi by the Pallavás.

Aúityavarmá.

Pulikesi II. had three sons, Aúityavarmá, Chandráditya, and Vikramadityá I., and a daughter, Ambérá. Aúityavarmá is known from a copper-plate grant, which has only recently come to notice, from the Karnul district. It is dated only in the first year of his reign, and without any reference to the Saka era. It gives no historical information, and does not expressly state that Aúityavarmá was the eldest of the sons of Pulikesi II. I consider this, however, to be the probability, on palaeographical grounds.

Chandráditya is known only from the undated Nerur and Koeluru grants of his wife, Vijayamahádevi or Vijayabhuttárkalá, from the Konkan. They do not mention Aúityavarmá; but they expressly state that Chandráditya was the elder brother of Vikramadityá I. Whether Chandráditya himself actually reigned, is not clear. But Vijayamahádevi reigned after his death,—probably as regent, during the childhood of a son, whose subsequent death lead to the accession of Vikramadityá I.

Ambérá.

Of Ambérá, we know nothing, except from the copper-plate grant from Hosur in Maisur, published by Mr. Rice, which may, or may not, be genuine.

Vikramadityá I.

Of Vikramadityá I., also called Vikramadityá-Satyásraya, we have three genuine grants;—two are from the Karnul District, and are

---

1. *Ind. Ant.*, Vol. VI., p. 82; and Vol. X., p. 132.
3. The Miraś plates, and some subsequent inscriptions based on them, introduce two more generations into the genealogy, and make a certain Nálaśmiari the son of Pulikesi II.—Aúityavarmá the son of Nálaśmiari,—and Vikramadityá I. the son of Aúityavarmá, and therefore the great-grandson, instead of the son, of Pulikesi II. But this is a mere mistake, based on imperfect tradition. *Ind. Ant.*, Vol. VI., p. 70, and Vol. X., p. 133.
dated in the third and tenth years of his reign, but without any reference to the Saka era; the third is from Haidarabad in the Dekkan, and is not dated at all. The exact commencement of his reign is, therefore, not known; but, as it terminated in Saka 602 (A.D. 680-1) or 603, and as he reigned for at least ten years, it cannot have been later than Saka 592 or 593. There is another grant from the Karnal District, which professes to be of the reign of Vikramaditya I; but it is undated and very corrupt. There is also another copper-plate grant, from Kurukotii in the Dhaurad District, which professes to be dated in Saka 582 (A.D. 610-11), in the sixteenth year of his reign; but, for the reasons set forth in full in my notice of it, it is a forgery of the ninth or tenth century A.D. The Karnal and Haidarabad grants, and the inscriptions of his successors, speak of Vikramaditya I as riding forth to battle on his horse of the breed called Chitrakatna, seizing the city of Kanchi; after defeating the leader of the Pallavas who had been the cause of the humiliation and temporary destruction of his family; defeating the kings of Chola and Pandya and Keral; and the Kalabhras, acquiring for himself the regal splendour of his father, which had been obscured by a confederacy of three kings, and effecting the subordination of the whole kingdom to one sovereign in his own person. The second of his inscriptions mentions, apparently as his vassal, Devasaakriti, the king of the Sendrakas.

Vikramaditya I was succeeded, in Saka 602 (A.D. 680-1) or Saka 603, by his son Vinayaditya, also called Vinayaditya-Satyasraya, Rajasraya or 'the asylum of kings', and, if the Miraj plates may be trusted on this point, Yuddhamalla, or 'the wrestler or champion in war', who continued to reign up to about the middle of Saka 618 (A.D. 697-8). We have six inscriptions of his time—a stone-tablet at Lakshmeswar within the limits of the Dhaurad District, dated Saka 608 (A.D. 686-7), the seventh year of his reign, while his victorious camp was at the city of Baktpura; a copper-plate grant from Togurahode, dated Saka 611 (A.D. 689-90), the tenth year of his reign, while his victorious camp was on the bank of the river Pampa, or the Tungabhadra; a copper-plate grant from some unspecified place in the Karnal District or in Maipur, dated Saka 613 (A.D. 691-2), the eleventh year of his reign, while his victorious camp was at the city of Ellumpundalo; a copper-plate grant from Sorah in Maipur, dated Saka 614 (A.D. 692-3), the thirteenth year of his reign, while his victorious camp was at the village of Chitrasedu in the Toravara or

---

2. *Id.,* Vol. VI., p. 244.
5. Baktpura would seem to have been a second ancient name of Pullagur, Paharangara, Pragare, or Lakshmeswar;—Lat. 15° 8' N., Long. 78° 22' E.
6. *Ind. Ant.,* Vol. VI., p. 85; *P. S. and O.C. Inscriptions, No. 14.* I at first thought that this place was the 'Togurahode' of the maps, in the Shikarpur Taluka in Maipur. But I have since found a village, the name of which is given as 'Togurahode' in the map, and which is probably the place where this grant was really found. In the Karnal District—Lat. 15° 28' N., Long. 78° 20' E.
7. *Id.,* Vol. VI., p. 35; *P. S. and O.C. Inscriptions, No. 15.*

---

*This grant is further dated on Saturday, at the time of the sun's commencing his progress to the north, under the constellation Rohini. This is the earliest instance yet known of the day of the week being mentioned in an inscription.*
Torana country; a copper-plate grant from Harihar in Mysur, dated Saka 616 (A.D. 694-5), the fourteenth year of his reign, while his victorious camp was at the village of Karunjapatragrama in the neighbourhood of Harishpura, which may perhaps be Harihar itself, and an undated stone-tablet at Balagamve in Mysur. His warlike expeditions appear from the inscriptions to have been very numerous and extensive. He is described as arresting the extremely exalted power of the Pallava, the lord of Kanchi, whose kingdom consisted of three component dominions,—as causing the rulers of Kaveri and Pampa and Simhala, or Ceylon, and other islands, to pay tribute to him,—as bringing the Pallavas, the Kalabhras, the Haihayas, the Vitas, the Malavas, the Cholas, and the Pandyas, into a similar state of servitude with the Aluvan and the Gangas, who were hereditarily subject to him,—and as acquiring the pallekanceja and other regal insignia, by crushing the lord of all the region of the north. A comparison of the fourth and fifth of his inscriptions noted above shows that his campaign against the Pallavas, the Kalabhras, &c., took place in Saka 615-6. The Balagamve tablet mentions, apparently as his vassal, Pogilii, the king of the Sendrakas. Vinyadityya seems to have fully restored the pristine power of his dynasty; and probably he made Vatapi again the capital.

Vinyadityya was succeeded, in the month of Ashadh of or Srawana of Saka 618 (A.D. 696-7), by his son Vijayadityya, also called Vinyadityya-Satyasraya, who continued to reign up to Saka 655 (A.D. 733-4). Of his time we have seven inscriptions,—one on a pillar in a temple called the Kalanamtha at Badami, dated Saka 621 (A.D. 699-700), the third year of his reign, while he was reigning at the capital of Vatapi; a copper-plate grant from Nerur in the Sawaiantwadi State, dated Saka 622 (A.D. 700-1), the fourth year of his reign, while his victorious camp was at the city of Rasamanaraga, which may perhaps be Rasin in the Ahmadnagar District; another copper-plate grant from Nerur, dated Saka 627 (A.D. 705-6), the tenth year of his reign; an inscription on the wall of the Huchchunalligudi temple at Aihole, dated in the thirteenth year and the third month of his reign, and consequently in Saka 630 (A.D. 708-9); a stone-tablet at Lakhnateswar, dated Saka 651 (A.D. 729-30), the thirty-fourth year of his reign, while his victorious camp was at the city of Raknapura; an undated inscription on a pillar in the porch of the temple of Mahakutesvara near Badami.

1 Ind. Ant., Vol. VII., p. 300.
2 Lat. 14° 31' N., Long. 77° 52' E.
3 P. & C., Inscriptions, No. 122; and see Ind. Ant., Vol. VI., p. 94.
4 This is the earliest known stone-tablet that has any emblem; beyond a floral device, at the top of it; the emblem here is an elephant, standing, and is probably the emblem of the Sundrakula family.
5 Lat. 14° 24' N., Long. 77° 18' E.
7 Id., Vol. VIII., p. 54. 8 Id., Vol. X., p. 60. 9 Id., Vol. IX., p. 125.
10 Lat. 15° 27' N., Long. 47° 53' E. It seems to be the Rasayana which is mentioned in the Rashtrakuta grant of the Rashtrakuta king Gorinda III. (Ind. Ant., Vol. VI., p. 69.)
and a stone-tablet at Pattadakal, the ancient Kesuvalal and Pattada-Kesuvalal, in the Kaladgi District. He is spoken of in the inscriptions as a king who maintained the supremacy acquired by his father in the north and by his grandfather in the south; but, no campaigns undertaken by himself being mentioned, his reign seems to have been a peaceful one. It was in his time that the temple of the god Vijayesvara, now called the temple of Samganesvara, at Pattadakal, was built.

Vijayāditya was succeeded, in Saka 655 (A.D. 733-4), by his eldest son Vikramāditya II., also called Vikramāditya-Satyārāya, who continued to reign up to Saka 669 (A.D. 747-8). Of his time we have one dated inscription,—a stone-tablet at Lakshmeshwar, dated Saka 656 (A.D. 734-5), the second year of his reign, while his victorious camp was at the city of Raktapura; and seven undated inscriptions,—a copper-plate grant from Nerur, an inscription on the gateway of the Durga temple at Aihole, two inscriptions on two pillars in the eastern gateway of the temple of the god Virupākṣa, formerly Lokesvara, at Pattadakal; two inscriptions on two pillars in the east porch of the same temple; and an inscription on a pillar in the house of Parappa Pujari, close to the same temple. The Pattadakal inscriptions tell us that his wife was Lak namahdevi, of the Hathayn family, and that the temple of Lokesvara was built for her, in commemoration of her husband having three times conquered the Pallavas of Kānchi. With this exception, his own inscriptions give no historical details. But the inscription of his son, Kirttivarman II., to be noticed below, tells us that, determined to uproot the Pallavas, who had obscured the splendour of former kings of his lineage and who were the natural enemies of the Chalukyas, he made a sudden and expeditious incursion into the district of Tadaka, slew the Pallava king named Nandipotāvārman, who came to oppose him, and entered Kānchi, which, however, he refrained from destroying; also that he grievously distressed the Pāṇḍya, Chola, Kerala, Kālabhra, and other kings, and that he set up his pillar of victory on the shores of the southern ocean.

Vikramāditya II. was succeeded, in Saka 669 (A.D. 747-8), by his son Kirttivarman II., also called Kirttivarman-Satyārāya. The only inscription of his time that we have is the Wokkaleri grant, published by Mr. Rice, dated Saka 679 (A.D. 757-8), the eleventh year of his reign, while his victorious camp was at the village of Bhandāragavattle, or perhaps Bhantāragavattle, on the northern bank of the river Bhimāraṇthi. This fact, that his only known inscription comes from Māsur, the grant recorded in it being made at a village lying in the vicinity of Banavasi and Hāṅgal,—coupled with the statement of the Mīrāj plates that "through him the regal fortunes of the Chalukyas became impeded on the earth," and with what I shall have to say below regarding the

---

2. *Id.,* Vol. VII., p. 110.
5. *Id.,* Vol. VIII., p. 33.
6. *Lat. 15° 57' N., Long. 78° 22' E.
7. *Id.,* Vol. IX., p. 102.
8. *Id.,* Vol. X., pp. 162 to 165.
Rāstrakūta kings,—shows that, in the time of Kṛttivināraṇa II., about the early part or the middle of the eighth century A.D., the Chālukyas were expelled from the Kanarese districts of the Bombay Presidency, which then came under the sway of the Rāstrakūtas.

The termination of the reign of Kṛttivināraṇa II. has not yet been fixed. So far as our information goes, he left no offspring, and the succession went back to his uncle, Bhīma II., the younger son of Vījayāditya, or to his descendants. But we have no further authentic records belonging to the dynasty itself, till we come to the time of Taila II. We are dependent for the intermediate names entirely upon the Miraṇa plates, and the interval,—from Saka 679 (A.D. 757-8), the last recorded date for Kṛttivināraṇa II., to Saka 935 (A.D. 973-4), the commencement of the reign of Taila II., being occupied only by seven generations, of which only five are subsequent in degree to Kṛttivināraṇa II., it is pretty clear that the genealogy is not altogether reliable here, and that some steps must be wanting. About this I shall have more to say when I come to treat of the Western Chālukyas, as restored under Taila II. So far as the Miraṇa plates go, we have no record of Bhīma I., Kṛttivināraṇa III., Taila I., Vīkramāditya III., and Bhīma II., beyond the mere mention of their names; and of Ayyana I., all that we are told is that he repaired the fortunes of his race by marrying a daughter of Krishna, who was probably the Rāstrakūta king Krishna II., or Akālāvaraha I., and of Vīkramāditya IV., that he married Bonthādēvi or Vonthādēvi, the daughter of Lakshumana, of the family of the kings of Chedi. The Rāstrakūta inscriptions, however, show that the power of the Chālukyas, though broken, was not annihilated, and that they made several, though unsuccessful, attempts to assert themselves. And it is probable that Taila I. and Ayyana I. are the Tailas and Ayyanas of the Begur inscription, which records that Ayyapa was killed in battle against a certain Viramahendravarman who was perhaps, as Mr. Rice suggests, a Pallava king. But, with these exceptions, we practically lose sight of the Western Chālukyas, and have as yet no clue as to what became of them, from the time of Kṛttivināraṇa II. to the restoration of the dynasty by Taila III., about two centuries later.

1 i.e. of the Kalachuri dynasty of Tripura or Tuar.—General Cunningham, *Archaeological Reports*, Vol. IX., p. 85.
3 *Rājārata Inscriptions*, p. 1xiii.
SECTION V.

THE RĀŚHTRAṜUKĀṬAS.

So far we find that, from the first appearance of the Chalukyas in this part of the country, in the fifth century a.d., the Kanara districts of the Bombay Presidency were held by them, with short periods of interruption of their power caused by the invasions of the Pallavas and other kings, down to about the early part or the middle of the eighth century a.d. Their sway over this part of the country then ceased entirely for a time. This was due to an invasion by the Rāśhtrakūṭa kings, who, like their predecessors, came from the north. The chief exponent of the records of this dynasty has been Dr. Bühler.1 The inscriptions of this dynasty edited by Bāl Gangādhara Sāstri, Mr. Wathen, Mr. Prinsep, and General Sir George Lebland Jacob, require to be revised from the original plates and prepared for critical republication, and are being now so treated by myself; and I have also a few more inscriptions which have not yet been published at all. But, as I have not many materials additional to those accessible to Dr. Bühler, I can do little more than follow in his track,—at any rate as far as the time of Amoghavasana I.

It is difficult to say when there was first a Rāśhtrakūṭa kingdom. The earliest notices that we have of the family are contained in the Western Chalukya inscriptions. Thus, the Miraj plates tell us that Jayasimha I. restored the fortunes of the Chalukya dynasty by defeating, amongst others, one Indra of the Rāśhtrakūṭa family, who was the son of Krishna;2 and who possessed an army of eight hundred elephants; and there is little doubt that Appayika-Govinda, who, as we are told in the Aihole Meguti inscription, came from the north and invaded the Chalukya kingdom with his troops of elephants and was repulsed by Pulikesi II., also belonged to this same dynasty. It is plain, therefore, that in the fifth and sixth centuries a.d. the Rāśhtrakūṭa dynasty was one of considerable importance in central or in northern India. The later inscriptions state that the Rāśhtrakūṭas were of the Somavamsa or lunar race, and were descendants of Yadu. Dr. Burnell seems inclined to look upon the family as of Dravidian origin, as he gives 'Rāṣhtra' as

---

1 His chief paper on the dynasty is in the Ind. Ant., Vol. VI., pp. 59 &c.
2 Some silver coins, found at Devakāna in the Bāṇḍān Talukā of the Nāgar district, and on palaeographical grounds attributed by Dr. Rām Dāji to the end of the fourth century a.d. (Jour. Bu. Br. R. As. Soc., Vol. XII., p. 213), clearly have on them the name of Krishna as is shown by General Cunningham, who attributes them to this early Rāśhtrakūṭa king Krishna, who was the father of the Indra defeated by Jayasimha I. and whose date accordingly must be about a.d. 275 to 400 (Archaeological Reports, Vol. IX., p. 29).
an instance of the Sanskritising of Dravidian names, and considers it to be a mythological perversion for 'Ratta,' which is the same as the Kannarese and Telugu 'Reddi.'\(^1\) Dr. Bühler is unable to record any opinion, as to whether the Rādhakutas were an Aryan Kshatriya, i.e. Rajput, race, which migrated into the Dekkan from the north, like the Chalukyas, or a Dravidian family which was received into the Aryan community after the conquest of the Dekkan.\(^2\) The earliest inscriptions, at any rate, show them as coming from the north. And, whatever may be their origin, as the word rādhaṅkuta is used in many inscriptions of other dynasties as the equivalent of rādhaṅpati, i.e. as an official word meaning 'the head-man or governor of a country or district,' it appears to me that the selection of it as a dynastic name implies that, prior to attaining independent sovereignty, the Rādhaṅkutas were feudal chiefs under some previous dynasty of which they have not preserved any record.

The accompanying table gives the genealogy of the dynasty, as far as it is known at present. In the last three generations it does not altogether agree with the genealogy given in the Kharepātan plates.\(^3\) But these plates contain a grant, dated Saka 990 (A.D. 1008-9), the Kīkaka savarata, of Bāhurāja, belonging to a branch of the Sūrabhā family in the Koukan, a feudatory of the Western Chalukya king Sātyavaraya II.; and the Rādhaṅkuta genealogy, as given in that inscription, is not of necessity to be accepted as correct in all its details.

The first two names are taken from an inscription of Dantidurga or Dantivarman II. in the Elura caves.\(^4\) But it furnishes no historical information in respect of them; and none of the other inscriptions carry the genealogy back beyond Govinda I.

Regarding these two, again, we have no information beyond the mention of their names. No historical facts are recorded in respect of them.

In connection with Indra II., all that we are told is that his wife, whose name is not given, was the daughter of a Chalukya father and a Somavarnam mother. It is a justifiable inference from this fact, that the Rādhaṅkutas had not yet come into any hostile contact with the Western Chalukyas, or made any attempt to dispossess them.

Dantidurga, or Dantivarman II., also called Khadgāvaloka, is the first of whom we have any historical details. We have two inscriptions of his time,—the inscription in the Elura caves, of which I have spoken above, and the plates from Sāmanagad in the Kolhāpor territory, dated Saka 675 (A.D. 753-4).\(^5\) In the latter we are told that his victorious elephants ploughed up the banks of the river Revā, or the Narmoda,—that he acquired supreme dominion by conquering Vallabhā,—and that he easily defeated the army of

---

1. *South-Indian Numismatics*, p. X.  
3. No. 10, p. 92, of the separate pamphlets of the Archaeological Survey of Western India.  
4. Lit. 16° 11' N., Long. 74° 29' E.  
5. *Jour. Ant.,* Vol. XI., p. 106.—This is the earliest known inscription in which the date is expressed by figures arranged according to the decimal system of notation.
the Karnātaka, which was expert in dispersing the kings of Kānchi and Kōra, the Chola, the Pandyas, Sri-Harsha, and Vajrata. Taking these statements, and comparing the date of Dantidurga with the date of the Western Chalukya king Kirttivarman II., the only ruler of the Karnātaka with whom he can have come in contact; and bearing in mind that the only known grant of Kirttivarman II. comes from Māsur,—we have it clearly established that it was Dantidurga who dispossessed the Western Chalukya of their kingdom in the Kanaraese districts of the Bombay Presidency, and established the Rashtrakutas in their place. It must have been by his victory over the Western Chalukyas that he acquired the title of Prithviravallaḥa, or 'favourite of the world,' which had always been borne by the kings of that dynasty. And 'Vallabha', too, was, in more instances than one a Chalukya name or title.

Dantidurga was succeeded by his uncle Krishna I., also called Vallabha II. There are two explanations given of this. The Kardā plates state that Dantidurga died childless. While the Baroda plates state that Dantidurga fell into evil ways, and that consequently Krishna I. ousted him and appropriated the sovereignty for the good of his race. He continued the conquests of Dantidurga, and is described as dispersing the darkness which was the race of the Chalukyas, and as depriving them of the goddess of sovereignty. An allusion to the same fact is also made in the statement that he changed into a deer, i.e. that he put to flight, the Mahadevā, or 'the great bear,'—the family-emblem of the Chalukyas. It is also said that he established himself at the hill, or hill-fort, of Elāpura, where there was a famous temple of the god Svanambha-Siva. This place has not been identified, I believe; but it seems to me not unlikely that it is Yellāpur in North Kanara, in the Western Ghats.

Krishna I. left two sons. Of the elder, Govinda II., also called Vallabha II., we have no historical details, except that he was dethroned by his younger brother.

The younger son then succeeded.—Dhruva, or Nirupama I., also called Dhora, Iddhatejas, Dhāravarsa, and Kālivallabha. Of these, the name Dhora is simply the Prakrit correlative of the Sanskrit form Dhruva. We have an undated Old-Kanara inscription of this king, on a pillar in the north porch of the temple of the god Lokeswara or Viṣṇukahsa at Pattadakal in the Kalāgī District, in which he is called Dhāravarsha-Kaivalabha.—Kaliballaka being the Prakrit correlative of the Sanskrit form Kaivalabha. Among the exploits of Dhruva, it is recorded that he conquered and imprisoned the Ganga king, and that he humbled the pride of the Pallavas.

Dhruva was succeeded by his eldest son Govinda III. or Prabhutavaraha I., also called Jagatitnga I., Jagadraksha I., Vallabhanarendra I., Srīvallabha, and Prithviravallaḥa. Of his time there are four inscriptions,—a copper-plate grant in Sir Walter Elliot's possession, dated Saka 720 for 725 (A.D. 803-4), the Subhāna or Svanabhāna num-

1 Iat. 44° 59' N., Longitude 74° 47' E.; the chief town of the Taluka of the same name.
Dynasties of the Kanarese Districts.

The Wani-Dindori plates from the Nasik District, dated Saka 730 for 728 (A.D. 806-7), the Vṛsha: samasthāna; the Rudhanpur plates from Gujarāt, dated Saka 750 for 729 (A.D. 807-8), the Sarvajit samasthāna; and an undated fragment at Lakshmieswar in the Dhārward District, in which he is called Śrīballa, are Śrīballa. The early part of his reign was occupied with wars and victories in Gujarāt and Central India, with which we are not concerned in this paper. The first of the grants that I have mentioned above gives us Gāmundabbe as the name of his queen, and records a grant that was made by him when, having conquered Dantiga, the ruler of Kumbhi, he came to the banks of the Tungabhadra on his way to demand tribute, and there had some sport with wild boars at a sacred place called Rāmesvarā, and was consequently pleased with the place. This expedition to the Tungabhadra, and this conquest of the Pallavas, are mentioned in his other inscriptions, which tell us also that the rāja of Vengi, i.e. his contemporary of the Eastern Chalukya family, was one of his vassals, and was employed to build for him the high walls of a town or fortress. His dominions, therefore, extended from the western to the eastern coast, and from the Vindhya mountains and Mārvād in the north to at least the Tungabhadra in the south. His second and third grants were issued from Mayurakhandi or Mayurakhindi, where Dr. Bühler has identified with Morkhanda, a hill-fort north of Wani in the Nasik District.

In the time of Goyinda III. there seems to have been a partial division of the Rashtrakuta kingdom; and his younger brother, Indra III., received from him the newly conquered province of Lāta, or central and southern Gujarāt. This established the separate Rashtrakuta kingdom of Gujarāt. Indra III. was succeeded in this kingdom, first by his eldest son Karaka II., also called Suvarkavastra 1 and Lātesvarā, of whose time we have the Baroda plates, dated Saka 734 (A.D. 812-3), and issued from Siddhāsasvatī; and then by his second son, also called Prabhu-

---

1 I have no precise information as to where these plates were found, but it was somewhere in the Kannara country, and the inscription is in the Old-Kannara language. This is the earliest known instance of the use in inscriptions of the cycle of sixty samasthānas. We find it, therefore, first introduced into the Kannara country by the Rashtrakutas. But, as it is not used in the subsequent grants of Karaka II. and Goyinda IV., who constitute what Dr. Bühler has named the Gujarāt branch of the family, whereas it is used in all the subsequent southern grants of the family, it is plain that the Rashtrakutas did not import the cycle from the north, but found it already in use in the south, though not among the Chalukyas. The Saka year and the samasthānas, as recorded in these inscriptions, do not always agree correctly. In the present instance, by the Table in Brown's Singhalese Chronicle, the Sāvatana samasthāna was Saka 728, and Saka 729 was the Tārana samasthāna. The error is, I believe, always in the Saka date, and not in the name of the samasthāna.

4 An island a few miles north of the junction of the Tunga and the Godavari. It is said that the Tunga, and the Godavari, and the island, were all named after the great goddess Iscaphusa, p. 343. Mr. Rice places it, in his map of ancient Malwa, in the position occupied in modern maps by 'Anavara.' "Lat. 14° 42' N., Long. 75° 49' E.
5 Apparently Vijnāpinī, also called Naradravirgarāja, who reigned from about Saka 710 to about Saka 730.
6 Jour. R. As. Soc., Vol. V., p. 64.
7 Lat. 20° 24' N., Long. 75° E.
8 Jour. R. As. Soc., Vol. VIII., p. 293.
9 The genealogies given by Dr. Bühler in Jour. R. As. Soc., Vol. V., p. 448, and Jour. R. As. Soc., Vol. VII., p. 75, make Goyinda IV. the son, and not the younger brother, of Karaka II., and consequently the grandson, and not the son, of Indra III. This must be only a clerical error, or a printer's mistake.
varsha II., of whose time we have the Kāvi plates, dated Saka 749 (A.D. 827-8), and issued from Bharukachchha or Broach. We are not concerned any further in this paper with the history of these three kings, whose line, indeed, seems to have died out with Govinda IV. Dr. Bühler considers that they were only vassals of their relatives of the main line.

In the main line, Govinda III. was succeeded by his son, Amogha-varsha I. This is only a title; his real name is unknown. The only historical facts recorded of him are that he defeated the Chalukyaas, and was pacified by them at a place named Vingavali, which is evidently a Kannara name, but which I cannot identify,—and that he either founded, or located himself at, the city of Mānyakheta, which became the capital of his descendants. This city has been satisfactorily identified by Dr. Bühler with Malkhed in the Nisām’s Dominions, about ninety miles in a south-easterly direction from Sholapur. We have six inscriptions of his time,—two in the Kanheri caves, which are dated Saka 775 for 773 (A.D. 851-2), the Pranjapati samvatsara, and Saka 799 (A.D. 877-8), and record that, during the reign of Kapardi II. of the Konkana branch of the Silahara family, the whole of the Konkana was presented by Amogha-varsha I., apparently to Kapardi II.; one at Mantrawalī, near Bankāpur in the Dharawād District, dated Saka 787 (A.D. 885-6), the Pāṭhiya samvatsara; one, undated, at Nidagundi in the same neighbourhood, which records that his feudatory, Bankāyamasa, of the Chellakotana family, had the government of the Banavasi Twelve-thousand, the Belgali Three-hundred, the Kundarage Seventy, the Kundur Five-hundred, and the Purigore, i.e. the Puligere or Lakhameswar, Three-hundred; one, undated, at Kyāsamlī near Hāngal, which records that his feudatory, Samkara-granda, of the same family, had the government of the Banavasi province; and one at Sorāt, near Gadag in the Dharawād District, dated in the Virodhi samvatsara, i.e. Saka 791 (A.D. 869-70), which records that his feudatory Aṭhāvādiya, belonging to a family which apparently was called the Aḍavavamsa, was then governing the Kappeya-Purigore province.

He was succeeded by his son, Krishna II., or Akālavarsha I., of whose time we have six inscriptions,—one, undated, at Kyāsamlī, in which he is called Kandaravelabha, and which records that his feudatory, the Mahāvīramaṇḍhari Samkara-granda, who must be the Samkara-granda of the Chellakotana family mentioned above as the feudatory of his father Amogha-varsha I., was governing the Banavasi province; one, the date of which is unfortunately quite illegible in the photograph, at Tālgund in Māisur, in which he is called Khandaravelabha, and which mentions again the same Samkara-granda as his feudatory in charge of the Banavasi province; one at Namwādige in the Kalādgi District, dated Saka 822 for 824

---

2 The ‘Malkhad’ of the maps; Lat. 17° 12’ N., Long. 77° 14’ E.
4 P. S. and O. G. Inscriptions, No. 213.
5 The ‘Tamilgaruda’ of the maps; Lat. 16° 23’ N., Long. 75° 19’ E.
6 The ‘Namwādige’ of the maps, fourteen miles to the east from Tālgund.
(A.D. 902-3), the Dundubhi samanta, in which he is called Akalavarna; one at Mulguni in the Dharwad District, dated Saka 824, the Dundubhi samanta, in which he is called Krishnavañabhā; one at Emur near Hāngali, dated Saka 836 (A.D. 904-5), the Raktakshya samanta, in which he is called Akalavarna, and which mentions some other Mahāśāmantaka of the Chaluketa family, whose name is very doubtful, as having been the government of the Kanavatī Twelve-thousand; and one at Aibole in the Kalāḍgi District, dated Saka 831 for 833 (A.D. 911-2), the Prajāpati samanta, in which he is called Kannara. In two of the later inscriptions of the Rattas of Saundatti and Belgaum, he is called Krishna-Kandhara and Krishn-Kandhara. And in one of these two passages he has the title of Kaṇḍhara-puravav-adhiśevara, or supreme lord of Kaṇḍhara-pura, the best of cities? there may have been an original city of the Bāshtrakutās, named Kaṇḍhara-pura; but the present mention of it is as yet an isolated one. He is also mentioned in the earliest of the Ratta inscriptions, as reigning in Saka 797 (A.D. 875-6), the Manmatha samanta, but he must at that time have been only the Yuvaraja, or heir-apparent and viceroy, for the southern part of his father's dominions. It is plain, therefore, that at the end of the ninth century A.D. he had all the Kanarēse districts of this Presidency above the Ghanta. The two later Ratta inscriptions mentioned above also assert that he was the progenitor of their family. But this can hardly be the case; though it was he who first made them, in the person of Pṛthvirāma, to the rank and authority of Mahāśāmantaka or Mahāśāmanvelavāra. Nothing more is known of him, except that his wife was the younger sister of Sankuka, and the daughter of Kokkala or Kokkala, king of Chedi, who is said in the Kardā plates to be of the Haihaya family, and in the Sāngli plates to be of the lineage of Sahasarājuna, i.e. Kūṭāvīrya, or Sahasrābhu-Arjuna, prince of the Haihayas. This Kokkala or Kokkala, king of Chedi, was, therefore, the first of that name in General Cunningham's genealogy of the Kalachuri kings of Tripura or Tewar.

Krishna II. was succeeded by his son, Jagattunga II., or Jagadudrava II. He had two wives. The Sāngli plates tell us that he married Lakshmi, the daughter of Ranavirgha, who was the son of Kokkala, and had by her Indra IV., his immediate successor. The Kardā plates give the same name, Lakshmi, but state that she was the daughter of Sankumugam, lord of Chedi, and give also the same name, Indra, as that of his eldest son. But they also add that he set out on an expedition with the object of

---

1 P. S. and O.C. Inscriptions, No. 85.—Through some mistake, which I do not now understand, I have spoken of it there and also in the Ind. Ant., Vol. VII., p. 210, as being dated Saka 722, or of the time of Dharura re of Govinda III.
2 Twelve miles to the south-west from Gadag.
4 P. S. and O.C. Inscriptions, No. 79.
5 Kannara, Kanhara, Kandhara, Kanakara, and Kandhara, all occur as the name of kings whose name in its Sanskrit form is Krishna. In the first and second of his inscriptions, Kannara and Kanhara must be intended for Kandhara.
7 Archaeological Reports, Vol. IX., p. 93. Sankuka, however, is not mentioned in that genealogy.
making the whole world subordinate to one sovereign in himself, and then, in Chedi, married Govindâmbâ, the daughter of his maternal uncle Sankarangana, and had by her two other sons, Krishna III. and Amoghavarsha II. These accounts as to the pedigrees of his wives can be properly reconciled only by taking Sankarangana and Runavigraha to be one and the same person, and to be a brother of the daughter of Kokkalla whom Krishna II. married; in this way Sankarangana would be the maternal uncle, as well as the father-in-law, of Jagattunga II. However this may be, this explicit statement of the double marriage of Jagattunga II. entirely removes some doubts that have been entertained as to the line of the succession, and the correctness of the genealogy, after him.

Jagattunga II. was succeeded immediately by his eldest son, Indra IV. or Nityavarsha. Of him all that we are told is that he married Dvijambâ, the daughter of Ammao, the son of Arjuna, who was the son of Kokkalla of the Hâhaya family, i.e. Kokkalla I. of the Kalachuri dynasty, whom we have already mentioned.

Indra IV. appears to have left two sons, the elder of whom, not named in the inscription, was quietly set aside by the younger, Govinda V., also called Suvarnavarsha II. and Vullabhanarendra II. We have one inscription of his time, the Sângli plates, dated Saka 855 (A.D. 933-4), the Vijaya samratasa. His capital was Mârukheta; but we have no further details regarding him.

The succession then went to the second family of Jagattunga II. by his second wife Govindâmbâ, probably through Govinda V., dying without issue. There is at any rate nothing in the inscriptions to indicate that any act of forcible usurpation took place. It is not probable that Krishna III. and Amoghavarsha II., whose wife was Kundakadevi, and Khottiga, actually reigned. The shortness of the interval between the date of the grant of Govinda V., and the date of the grant of Krishna IV., is against any such supposition.

Of Krishna IV., or Kannara, also called Nirupama II. and Akâlavara II., we have five inscriptions,—two at Kyaunur in the Dhârawad District, dated Saka 868 for 867 (A.D. 945-6), the Visava samaratasa, in which he is called Kannara, and which record that his feudatory, the Mahâmâlakta Vâli-Vitta, of the Chellakatan family, had the government of the Banavasi province; one at Sâlotri in the Kalâdri District, dated Saka 867 for 866 (A.D. 947-8), the Pravaniga samaratasa; one at Soratur in the Dhârawad District, dated Saka 873 (A.D. 951-2), the Virodhikrit samaratasa; and one at A'llur, near Hângal, dated Saka 877 for 878 (A.D. 956-7), the Nala samaratasa, in which again he is

2 *Lat. 16° 52' N., Long. 74° 35' E.*
4 General Cunningham considers that she was the daughter of the Kalachuri king Yuvâraja I. (Arakan, Smyth, *Arch. B. E.,* Vol. IX., p. 104). In the same Report, p. 50, he makes her the daughter of Lakshmana, the son of Yuvâraja I.; but this must be an oversight. It is likely enough that she was of the Kalachuri family, and was the daughter of Yuvâraja I.; but the Râshtrakuta inscription which mentions her tells us nothing of her father except that his name was Yuvârâjadeva.
5 One of them is given in the Elliot *MS., Collection,* Vol. II., p. 672.
6 Six miles to the south-east from full. 7 *Ind. Ant., Vol. I.,* p. 205.
8 Twelve miles to the south from Godag. 9 *Elliot *MS., Collection,* Vol. II.,* p. 673.
called Kannara. The third of these records that Krishna IV was then reigning at Mānya-khetra. Mr. K. T. Telang, who published this inscription, translated the words pravardhānasā-prama-hal
gāna-nirayodhyama, in line 4, by "engaged in reducing the prosperous and great Kalyāna" (of the Western Chālukyas). This rendering, however, cannot be upheld; in the first place, if the city of Kalyāna had been intended, the word para would certainly have been used; and in the second place, it was not long, if at all, before Saka 975 (A.D. 1058-9), that Kalyāna became a capital of the Western Chālukyas, in the reign of Somesvara I. The words, as they stand, are simply an expression of the continually increasing prosperity and victorious enterprise of Krishna IV.

Kakka III.

He was succeeded by his son, Kakka III., or Karka III., —also called Kakkala, Karkara,1 Amoghavarsha III., and Vallabhamarendra III., —the last of the dynasty of whom we have any record. There is one inscription of his time, the Karda plates, dated Saka 894 (A.D. 972-3), the Anigrās samvatsara, while he was reigning at Mānya-
khetra.2 He is spoken of as conquering the Gurjara, the Huna, the Chola, and the Pāṇḍya kings; but no details are given. In Saka 895 (A.D. 973-4), the Srimukha samvatsara, he succumbed to, and probably was slain by, Taila II. of the Chālukya family; and the Rashtrakuta dynasty then ceased to exist. The only offspring of Kakka III. of whom we have any mention is his daughter, Jākabbi or Jākaladevi, who became the wife of Taila II.

---

1 Jat. Ant., Vol. VIII., p. 16. And the name is given probably in the same form, though the copy reads Kamlara, in an inscription at Māmugulli in the Kālādi District (Elliott MS. Collection, Vol. I., p. 746).
SECTION VI.

THE WESTERN CHALUKYAS.

Various allusions in the Rastrakuta inscriptions show that, all through the period of this obscurantism of their power, the Chalukyas had repeatedly made attempts to re-assert themselves, but without success. These allusions, however, have no individuality about them. And,—with the exception of the possible notice of Taila I. and Ayyana I. in the Beagur inscription,—practically we lose sight completely of the Chalukyas from the time of Kirtivarman II. until the restoration of the dynasty by Taila II.¹ Of this restoration,
there are many distinct records. The Khārupātan plates, for instance, after giving the Rāṣṭrakuta genealogy from Dantidurga down to Kakka III, or Kakkala as he is there called, state that he was defeated in war by the Chālukya king Tailapa. The Miraṇ plate, in the account of Taila II, tells us that by him “were easily cut asunder, in the field of battle, the two pillars of victory in war of Karkara, which belonged to the kingdom of the Rāṣṭrakuta family,” and that by him “were lifted up the royal fortunes of this kingly favourites of the Chālukya family, which had been made to sink down by the deceitful practices of the Rāṣṭrakutas.” A somewhat similar description is given in an inscription at Mannugulli in the Kalāḍgi District, in which the name of the Rāṣṭrakuta king conquered by him is given as Kaukara in the copy, but is probably correctly given as Karkara in the original. And an inscription at Gadag in the Dhārward District, and another, based on the same model, at Kālige in the Nizām’s Dominions, tell us that Taila uprooted the Rattas, and slew Munja, and killed the leader of the Pāñchalas in war, and then reigned over the whole earth for twenty-

---

four years, beginning with the Srimukha samvatara. This fixes the restoration of the dynasty, and the commencement of his reign, in Saka 895 (A.D. 973-4), which was the Srimukha samvatara. These Rattas, uprooted by Tails, were the Rāshtrakutas of Mānyākuta,—not the Rattas of Saundatti and Belgaum, of whom an account will be given further on.

As I have intimated above, a comparison of the date of Saka 679 (A.D. 757-8) as the last recorded date of Kṛttivārman II., with that of Saka 395 (A.D. 973-4) as the commencement of the reign of Tails II., shows,—the interval of two hundred and sixteen years being occupied by only seven names, and practically by only five generations, as only five of those names are subsequent in degree to Kṛttivārman II.,—that the genealogy cannot be reliable here, and that some steps must be wanting in it. And,—whereas the Early and Western Chalukyas invariably call themselves Chalukyas, Chalikyas, or Chalukyas, (with the vowel of the first syllable short),—Tails II., and his descendants, except where the word occurs in verse and the metre necessitates the use of the older form Chalukya, always call themselves Chalukyas (with the vowel of the first syllable long), or 'descendants of a Chalukya.' These facts, taken together, suggest as an inevitable inference that Tails II. was not a direct linage descendant of the youngest son of Vijayaditya, but came from some side-branch of the Chalukya stock. Where the break in the genealogy is to be fixed is not quite certain. The Gadag, Kālīga, and Manunguli inscriptions agree with the Miraj plates in making Tails II. the son of Vikramaśīlā IV., and Bonthādevi; but none of the inscriptions, except the Miraj plates and the stone-tablets based on them, give the name of the grandfather of Tails II. We may probably, therefore, accept as correct the statement that his father was Vikramaśīlā IV., and place the break in the genealogy between Ayyana I. and Vikramaśīlā IV.

Tails II., then,—also called Tailapya, Nurmadi-Tails I., and A'vava-malla I.,—restored the Western Chalukya dynasty and ascended the throne in Saka 895 (A.D. 973-4), the Srimukha samvatara, and reigned for twenty-four years. His wife was Jákabib, or Jākala-devi, the daughter of Kakka III., the last of the Rāshtrakuta kings. We have only four inscriptions of his time,—one at Saundatti in the Belgaum District, dated Saka 902 (A.D. 980-1), the Vikrama samvatara, while his feudatory, the Mahāvāmana Sāntivarman, of the Ratta family, was governing at Sugandhavarti; another at Sogal, near Saundatti, of the same date, while his feudatory Kārtavirya I., of the same family, was governing the Kundi country; the first part of an inscription at Bhairunmatti in the Kalked District, dated Saka 911 for 912 (A.D. 990-1), the Vikriti samvatara; and an inscription at Tailgund in Maisur, dated Saka 919 (A.D. 997-8), the Hemalambī samvatara. Where his capital was, is not clear. But,—as the third of his inscriptions is in the Kalked District, and as the fourth is in Maisur and records that his feudatory, Bhiramasa, also called Tailapna-Ankakāra or 'the warrior or champion of Tailapsa,'
was the governor of the districts known as the Banavase Twelve-thousand and the Sântaliq Thousand in Mâisur, and also the Kisa-kâd Seventy or the country lying round Pattadakal in the Kâlädgi District,—it is plain that he had then fully re-established the Chalukya sway over at least all the territories that they had held in the Kanarese districts of this Presidency. In addition to subverting the power of the Râshtrakutas, he is said also to have overcome the king of Chedi, the Utkalas or people of Oria, and the kings of Chola and Nepâla, and to have subjugated the whole of the country of Kuntala. His alleged conquest of Nepâla must certainly be an invention of the poets. The other statements are perhaps true, but remain to be verified.

Taila II. was succeeded, in Saka 919 (A.D. 997-8), by the Hemalambhi samrâtara, by his eldest son Satyârâya II., also called Sattiga and Irivihinjarma. Of his time we have seven inscriptions,—one at Gadag in the Dharwad District, dated Saka 934 (A.D. 1002-3), the Subhakrî samrâtara, while his feudatory Subhanarâma or Sobhanarasa was governing the districts known as the Belvola Three-hundred, the Puliguru or Lakshmieswar Three-hundred, and some other smaller districts; one at Kukkurâr in the Nizam’s Dominions, the date of which is not certain, as only the figures 9 and 2 are shown by the copyist to be legible, and the name of the samrâtara is illegible; one at Tumbe in the Kâlädgi District, dated Saka 926 (A.D. 1004-5), the Krâddhi samrâtara; one at Yalawal in Mâisur, in the date of which, again, only the figures 9 and 2 are legible and the name of the samrâtara is illegible, while a feudatory of his was governing the Banavase Twelve-thousand; one at Kannessewar in the Dharwad District, dated Saka 927 (A.D. 1005-6), the Visvâvasya samrâtara, while his feudatory Bhimarâja, also called Tailipannas-
Ankakāra, was still governing the Khukād, Banavase, and Sāntaliga districts; the Khārepāta plates, dated Saka 930 (A.D. 1008-9), the Kālaka samvata, and containing a grant of his feudatory, Rāmurjita, of the southern branch of the Silahāra of the Kunakā, and an inscription at Muvawali near Bankāpur, dated somewhat later in the same year. The exact termination of his reign is not known; but we may adopt Sir Walter Elliot's opinion that it ended in about Saka 930 (A.D. 1008-9), the Kālaka samvata.

The next name in the list is that of Vāgarmanā, the younger brother of Satyārāya II. All that we know about him is that his wife was Bhāgyavati or Bhāgaladevi. As there are no inscriptions of his time, and as his name is omitted in some of the later inscriptions, it is probable that he did not actually reign.

The actual successor of Satyārāya II, in about Saka 930 (A.D. 1008-9), the Kālaka samvata, appears to have been Vikram or Vīkramaditya V, also called Tribhuvanamalla I, the eldest son of Vāgarmanā. Of his time we have three inscriptions— one at Sudi in the Dhāravāl District, dated Saka 932 (A.D. 1010-1), the Sādhamena samvata; one at A'ūr in the Gadag Tāλukā in the same District, and of the same year, while his feudatory, Irvā-Nolambālahirja, also called Ghadiva-Aukakāra or Gadiya-Akakāra, was governing the Nolambāvādī. Thirty-two thousand in Mazur, the Kengere Two-hundred, the Ballakurī Three-hundred, the Kukakur Thirty, and five towns in the Māsvādi country; and one at Galargath in the same District, dated Saka 933 (A.D. 1011-2), the Virodhukrit samvata. The termination of his reign is put by Sir Walter Elliot in about Saka 940 (A.D. 1018-9), the Kālayukti samvata.

The next name in the list is that of Ayyama II, the younger brother of Vīkramaditya V. We have, however, no records of him; and he does not appear to have really reigned.

The actual successor of Vīkramaditya V, in about Saka 940 (A.D. 1018-9), the Kālayukti samvata, was his youngest brother, Jayasimha III, who also bore the titles of Jagadikāmalla I, and Vallabhaṅgamālī. His wife was Suggaladevi. Of his time we have the Miraj copper-plate grant, and some twenty-four stone-tablets, ranging from Saka 940 (A.D. 1018-9) the Kālayukti samvata, to Saka 964 (A.D. 1042-3) the Chitrabhām samvata,—at Balagolwe and Talgund in Mazur; at Kalāyā, Hāvanige, Benkankond, and other places, in the Dhāravāl District; at Hul in the Belguum District; at Arasibid, Belur, Bhairamātā, and other places more to the north, in the Kahlādi District; and at Alavandhar in the Nāsām's Dominions. In several of them he is spoken of as 'defeating the Chola king.' But no details are given, except in the Miraj plates, which state that the grant recorded in

3 Elliot M.D. Collection, Vol. I., pp. 37 to 40.
5 Elliot M.D. Collection, Vol. I., pp. 44 to 74; P. S. and O.C. Inscriptions, Nos. 70, 86, 103, 114, 122, and 215; Jour. As., Vol. IV., p. 37; and Vol. V., p. 35; and inscriptions collected by myself, as yet unpublished. From this time the inscriptions become too numerous to give the details of all of them in this paper.
them was made by him in Saka 946 (A.D. 1024-5), the Rakahalka, an East India Company officer, at his victorious camp, which, after warring against the mighty Chola, the lord of the city of Chidambaram, and after seizing the possessions of the lords of the seven Konkamas, was located near the city of Kolhapur, the modern Kolhapur, for the purpose of conquering the northern country. His principal feudatories and officials were,—the Mahisamandaleshvara Kundamara, of the family of the Kadamba of Banavasi and Hangal, who in Saka 941 (A.D. 1019-20) was governing the Banavasi Twelve-thousand, the Santalinga Thousand, and the Hayre Five-hundred, up to the borders of the western ocean, at the capital of Balipura or Balagamvra; the Badanayaka Barmeveda, who in Saka 945 (A.D. 1024-5) was governing the Taddavadi Thousand, the Betusa Three-hundred, and the Puligere Three-hundred; the Mahisamandaleshvara Sevya and Nagaditya, of the Sinda family, who in Saka 955 (A.D. 1033-4) were governing the Bardagho country; the Mahisamandaleshvara Mayuravarma II., of the family of the Kadamba of Banavasi and Hangal, who in Saka 955 (A.D. 1033-4), and Saka 960, was governing the Pannagal or Hangal Five-hundred; and Nolamba-Pallava-Bommanna or Hemmanaya, who in Saka 962 (A.D. 1040-1) and Saka 964 was governing five towns in the Masavadi One-hundred and-forty. Also, the Belur inscription of Saka 944 (A.D. 1022-3) shows that his elder sister Akkadevi was entrusted with the government of the Kanakad Seventy. The Balagamvra inscriptions of Saka 941 (A.D. 1019-20) and Saka 957 give that place, under its ancient name of Balligove or Balipura, as his capital. Also, the Bhairamattis inscription of Saka 955 (A.D. 1033-4) gives as his capital Kollipaka, a place which I cannot as yet find in the maps; and the second Balagamvra inscription, and one at Alawandi of the same date, give as another capital, Pottalakuro, which also I cannot as yet find in the maps.

1 It should, however, be a very well known place, being the slightly differently spelled Kollipaka which is mentioned in the Rajastharastra, I, 53 to 56, as the birthplace of the Rakahalka, Ranadhesharya, or Revanapradipa. According to the poem, Ranadhesharya was born from the feet or linga at Kollipaka, into which he was absentiated again when he had begotten a son named Rudrumuniswara, and had instructed him and given him the office of guru. In his introduction to his edition of the Rajastharastra, Gangadhar Madhukarshwar Thurner states that Ranadhesharya was one of the Prachalika-pan or five protectors who established the Lingayat religion, and that he founded a matter or religious college at Kollipaka and gave the pujashibhuta or postulatio of it to his son Rudrumuniswara; that in Rudrumuniswara's image were seen Uddha-stakalisha-wara, Amruthanasa, Revanadvahika-wara, and Chikkavinnava, who established a matter at Damugur, south of Bengalur, and became the creator of poems if it; that in Chikkavinnava's image was born the poet Shalakshara, the author of the Shalaksharas, who became the postulatio of the Damugur matter, about A. D. 1031; that Shalakshara died at Yelmadaur, in Mysore, where the people set up in memory of him a linga which they worship to this day; and his descendants are still found at Kollipaka, Damugur, and Yelmadaur. But he does not give any information as to where Kollipaka is to be looked for.

2 Thus, again, should be a very well known place, being the slightly differently spelled Uttalakuru of the Banasa-Patna, chap. II., in which it is said that it contained seven hundred 'gurushala' or Jain temples and twenty thousand Jain saints, and the subject of which is how Devara-Bhimayya, the guru of Sugandihara, the wife of king Desieng, despised the Shvetas or Jains and induced Desieng to adopt the Saiva or Lingayat religion. The same story is epitomised in the Chandadasa-Prakasa, V. VII., 10, which says that Sugandhara the wife of the Jain King Desingh, publicly cast her guru Devara-Bhimayya into disgrace with the Jains, and then, transforming a serpent in a box into a linga made of the chandrakadde or moon-stone, the
Jayasimha III. was succeeded, in or about Saka 964 (A.D. 1042-3) the Chitrabhānu samvatsara, by his son Somesvara I, also called Trailokyahamalla I and Ahavamalla II. Of his time we have some forty inscriptions, ranging from Saka 965 (A.D. 1042-3), the Tārana samvatsara, to Saka 990 (A.D. 1068-9), the Kilaka samvatsara,—at Tāligund, Balagāmve, and Dāvānave, in Maṅisur; at Banavāsā in North Kanara; at Nīgund, Aḍūr, Ingaligundi, and other places, in the Drīvāvā District; at Saundatti in the Belgaum District; at Arāvali and Devur, in the Kalāḍagī District; and at Talakal, Kembhāvī, and other places in the Nāṁkal’s Dominions. His wives were Bālkahadevi, Chandalakabbe or Chandrikadevi, and Mailahadevi. His principal feudatories and officials were,—the Mahāmāndalesvara Mayūravarmā II., of the family of the Kāṇambas of Banavāsā and Hāṅgal, who in Saka 966 (A.D. 1044-5) was governing the Pāṇagul Five-hundred; the Mahāmāndalesvara Chāṇvānderayka, of the same family, who in Saka 967 (A.D. 1045-6) and Saka 984 (A.D. 1062-3) was governing the Banavase Twelve-thousand at his capital of Balligāve or Balagāmve; the Mahāpāṇḍaḷa Kārtavīrya I. and Anka, of the Rattu family, the latter of whom in Saka 971 (A.D. 1049-50), was governing at Sugandhamvari in the Kondi Three-thousand; and the Mahāmāndalesvara Kīrtivarma II., of the family of the Kāṇambas of Banavāsā and Hāṅgal, who in Saka 990 (A.D. 1068-9) was governing the Banavase Twelve-thousand. Also his aunt, Akkadevi, continued in authority during his reign; for, in one of the Arāvali inscriptions, of Saka 969 (A.D. 1047-8), we find her laying siege to the fort of Gokāga, which can only be Gokāga in the Belgaum District, probably to quell some local insurrection. Also we find that in Saka 975 (A.D. 1063-4) his wife Mailahadevi, who is called the pīraṇ-avāsi, or ‘chief queen’, was entrusted with the government of the Banavase Twelve-thousand; that in Saka 971 (A.D. 1049-50) and Saka 975 his eldest son Somesvara II., also called Gangapermanadhi—Bhūvānākavira, was governing the Belvāla Three-hundred and the Puligere Three-hundred; and that in Saka 977 (A.D. 1055-6) his second son Gangapermanadi-Vikrama, or Vikramaditya VI., was governing the Gangavadi Ninety-six-thousand in Maṅisur and the Banavase Twelve-thousand, with Harikēcari, of the family of the Kāṇambas of Banavāsā and Hāṅgal, as his subordinate in charge of the latter district.

As he had no son, he adopted his brother’s son as his successor, and named his adopted son Jayasimha IV., also called Somesvara II., as his successor. The adoption of a son of his brother as successor is an unusual custom, and it is to be noted that Jayasimha IV. was only a child at the time of his adoption. The history of this adoption is recorded in an inscription of Saka 999 (A.D. 1069), which is the last of the Somesvara inscriptions. The inscription is as follows:

Somesvara I.

Jayasimha III. was succeeded, in or about Saka 964 (A.D. 1042-3) the Chitrabhānusamvatsara, by his son Somesvara I, also called Trailokyahamalla I and Ahavamalla II. Of his time we have some forty inscriptions, ranging from Saka 965 (A.D. 1042-3), the Tārana samvatsara, to Saka 990 (A.D. 1068-9), the Kilaka samvatsara,—at Tāligund, Balagāmve, and Dāvānave, in Maṅisur; at Banavāsā in North Kanara; at Nīgund, Aḍūr, Ingaligundi, and other places, in the Drīvāvā District; at Saundatti in the Belgaum District; at Arāvali and Devur, in the Kalāḍagī District; and at Talakal, Kembhāvī, and other places in the Nāṁkal’s Dominions. His wives were Bālkahadevi, Chandalakabbe or Chandrikadevi, and Mailahadevi. His principal feudatories and officials were,—the Mahāmāndalesvara Mayūravarmā II., of the family of the Kāṇambas of Banavāsā and Hāṅgal, who in Saka 966 (A.D. 1044-5) was governing the Pāṇagul Five-hundred; the Mahāmāndalesvara Chāṇvānderayka, of the same family, who in Saka 967 (A.D. 1045-6) and Saka 984 (A.D. 1062-3) was governing the Banavase Twelve-thousand at his capital of Balligāve or Balagāmve; the Mahāpāṇḍaḷa Kārtavīrya I. and Anka, of the Rattu family, the latter of whom in Saka 971 (A.D. 1049-50), was governing at Sugandhamvari in the Kondi Three-thousand; and the Mahāmāndalesvara Kīrtivarma II., of the family of the Kāṇambas of Banavāsā and Hāṅgal, who in Saka 990 (A.D. 1068-9) was governing the Banavase Twelve-thousand. Also his aunt, Akkadevi, continued in authority during his reign; for, in one of the Arāvali inscriptions, of Saka 969 (A.D. 1047-8), we find her laying siege to the fort of Gokāga, which can only be Gokāga in the Belgaum District, probably to quell some local insurrection. Also we find that in Saka 975 (A.D. 1063-4) his wife Mailahadevi, who is called the pīraṇ-avāsi, or ‘chief queen’, was entrusted with the government of the Banavase Twelve-thousand; that in Saka 971 (A.D. 1049-50) and Saka 975 his eldest son Somesvara II., also called Gangapermanadhi—Bhūvānākavira, was governing the Belvāla Three-hundred and the Puligere Three-hundred; and that in Saka 977 (A.D. 1055-6) his second son Gangapermanadi-Vikrama, or Vikramaditya VI., was governing the Gangavadi Ninety-six-thousand in Maṅisur and the Banavase Twelve-thousand, with Harikēcari, of the family of the Kāṇambas of Banavāsā and Hāṅgal, as his subordinate in charge of the latter district.

This title, belonging to both Somesvara II. and Vikramaditya VI., indicates that his mother was of the Ganga family. The mother of Jayasimha IV., on the other hand, must have been a Pallava princess. In this inscription, in addition to being called Gangapermanadi, Vikramaditya VI. has the other Ganga titles of Sātyavāyaksa, Kāmnavaravasa, Bharmashankara-Durjaya, Kuvala-purvaravasa, Namabhī-śahua, Maṅgajjina-śahua, Padavati-labha-vacakasuda, Ganga-Kṣeravatiha, and Namiyā-ganga. His mother must have been very young, and the ages of the two persons in question probably was actually carried on by his mother in his name.
in the time of this king, and in Saka 975 (A.D. 1058-9), that we first find Kalyâna mentioned as a Western Chalukya capital. How the mistake arose, I do not know; but it is not an uncommon thing to find the Early and Western Chalukya called 'the Chalukya of Kalyânpura.' This is nothing but a complete error. Kalyâna is nowhere mentioned in the Early and Western Chalukya inscriptions; and, even if it existed as a city at that time, it certainly was not a Chalukya capital. The earliest mention of it is the one that I have just pointed out; and it was probably not long, if at all, before Saka 975 that it fell into the hands of the Western Chalukya, who were then in the course of reconquering the ancient dominions of their ancestors towards the north. We find, from an inscription of his eldest son and successor,^ that in the time of Somesvara I, the Chola king made an incursion into the Western Chalukya dominions. He invaded the Belavola Three-hundred and burnt many temples there, and then proceeded to Puligore, or Lakhoamswar, and destroyed the Jain temples which had been built by Pammâdiga. This incursion was probably by way of retaliation for the defeat which he himself had experienced at the hands of Jayasimha III. The success of the Cholas, however, did not last long. Somesvara I repulsed them, and drove them back southwards, and the leader of the Cholas lost his life in a battle which was fought apparently at the city of Kakaragond, on the bank of the Tungabhadra; Sir Walter Elliot identifies this place with Kakkatur, a small village on the south bank of the river, between Harivar and Dävagore. This victory over the Cholas is also referred to in one of the inscriptions of Somesvara I himself,^ which records that, having conquered the region of the south, and having defeated the Chola king,—on the occasion of an eclipse of the moon on Monday the day of the full-moon of the month Mahâ of Saka 981 (A.D. 1059-60), the Vikâra somesvara, while he was encamped at Puliypâna,^ in the Siddhavâdi country, he gave the village of Sivanur, in the Kusâkid Seventy, by a copper-plate grant, to Somesvarapandita, the priest of the god Nâgesvara of the shrine of the god Nagarovarsa at the capital of Sundi. This conquest of the Cholas is recorded also in the Vikramadityadachitra of Bilhana,^ which states that Somesvara I penetrated as far as Kânci itself, stormed it, and drove its ruler into the jungles. The same chronicle also states that he stormed Dhârâ, the capital

---

1 Ind. Ant., Vol. VIII., p. 105.
2 Elliot MS. Collection, Vol. I., p. 216.—The date of this inscription is Saka 993 (A.D. 1071-2), the VirodhiâlīH samastara, the date being expressed by the words pama or the 3 qualities, laksha or the 9 units, and raudra or the 9 names of the body,—the order of which is to be inverted in reading them off, according to the rule established therein. This is the earliest instance known to me of a date being expressed by numerical words.
3 Elliot MS. Collection, Vol. I., p. 144.
4 It is written as in the copy, but Mr. Rice (Mysore Inscriptions, p. 117) adopts the form of Puliypattana, and identifies it with the modern Huliyar in the Chitalaing District. He also, as well as Sir Walter Elliot, identifies Sivamur with the modern Sivanur, near Belavola in the Dharwad District. But Sivanur cannot be in that direction at all. It is, perhaps, the modern 'Sivapura' on the map, about three miles south of Belam; this, at any rate, is the neighbourhood in which it is to be looked for.
5 1, 114 to 117.
of the Pramāṇa in Mālava, from which king Bhoja had to flee; 1 that he utterly destroyed the power of Karnas, king of Dāhana, 2 i.e., Karnas, the son of Gaṅgaya, of the family of the Kalachuris of Tripura or Tewar, 3 and that he beautified Kashyapa so that it surpassed in splendour all the other cities of the earth. 4

In the genealogy at page 17 above, I have given the names of three sons of Somesvara I., viz., Somesvara II., Vikramaditya VI., and Jayaśimha IV. The Dāranga inscription of Saha 988 (A.D. 1066-7), the Prabhaṛava samvatāvara, 5 purports to give the name of a fourth son, the Mahārāja Vishnuvardhana-Vijayaśirā,—also called Alavannalimā-Aukakāra, and Sāhasamalla,—who was then governing the Nalambavādi Thirty-two-thousand in Māisur, and by whose Bundanāyaka and Mahāsaṃghaṇḍisvāra Dvaparyāya the grants recorded in the inscription were made. There is no reason for refusing to accept this inscription as genuine; and it certainly speaks of Vishnuvardhana-Vijayaśirā as the son 6 of Somesvara I. But he is mentioned in no other inscription as yet known. Now, the name of Vijayaśirā does occur once in this family, in the seventh century A.D., in the case of the son of Vinayāditya; but it is not repeated after that among the Western Chalukyas and Chalukyas, though, in later times, it was the name of several members of the Eastern Branch. Again, Vishnuvardhana was a frequent enough name among the Eastern Chalukyas, but does not occur once in the Western Branch, except in the case of Vishnuvardhana I., the younger brother of Pulikesi II., who separated from the Western Chalukyas and founded the Eastern Branch; and it is a name that would not be at all likely to be chosen for any member of the Western Chalukya dynasty, which made no particular profession of the worship of Vishnu. Finally, this Vishnuvardhana-Vijayaśirā had the title of Fagāmudālāsura, or 'lord of the province of Vengi,' which, as is well known, was the hereditary territory of the Eastern Chalukyas and their Chola successors. That Vishnuvardhana-Vijayaśirā was a person of considerable rank and position, is shown by his being called a Mahāraja,—by his having so high a minister as a Mahāsaṃghaṇḍiśāri,—and by his being in charge of so large a province as the Nalambavādi Thirty-two-thousand. And, that he was of Chalukya extraction, is shown by his also having in this inscription the title of Chālukya-sūra, or 'ruby of the Chālukyas.' But I am disposed to consider that he was not really the son of Somesvara I., but,—being a connection of his through the female line, in the next degree of descent after him, in the family of the Chola successors of the Eastern Chalukyas; and being raised by him to a position of great authority, in fact to that of vicerey of a large province,—he was simply called the son of Somesvara I. through

1. I, 91, 92. This is probably the Bhoja, who is referred to in also the time of Jayasimha III. (Ind. Ant., Vol. V., p. 177).
2. I, 102, 103.
4. Phāraṃbāḍaṇḍarākhyā; II., 1 to 23.
6. This is correct. 16-18. It may be noted, however, that the inscription does not make use of any such expression as śūtaṃ pālita; 'born to him.'
courtesy. I have, therefore, not given him a place in the Western Chalukya genealogy.

Somasvara II. was succeeded, in or about Saka 990 (A.D. 1068-9), the Klaka samvatara, by his eldest son, Somesvara II., also called Bhuvanaikamalla, who reigned up to Saka 997 (A.D. 1073-9), the Rākṣasa samvatara. Of his time we have some twenty inscriptions, ranging from Saka 991 (A.D. 1069-70), the Saumya samvatara, to Saka 997 (A.D. 1073-76), the Rākṣasa samvatara,—at Balagapura, Kuppatur, and Amavatti, in Māsur; at Sudi, Soratur, Gawarawād, Kalhukeri, and Gudngudi, in the Bhurāvā District; at Huli, Kādarwāli, and Saundatti, in the Belgaum District; at Anantnādi and Bijāpur in the Kālāgī District; and at Antarātāni in the Nīsam’s Dominions. His principal fundatories and officials were,—Lakshmanas, who in Saka 993 (A.D. 1071-72) was governing the Bolvāla Three-hundred and the Paligere Three-hundred, and who repaired the Jain temples which the Cholas had destroyed in the reign of Somesvara I.; Udayāditya, of the Ganga family, who in Saka 993 was governing at the city of Bankāpur, and in Saka 997 (A.D. 1073-76) was governing the Banavase Twelve-thousand, the Sāntalīga Thousand, the Mandali Thousand, and the Eighteen Agrahāraka; the Bandanāyaka Nākamayya, who in Saka 990 (A.D. 1071-75) was governing the Tadilvāli Thousand; and the Mahādēvāra Kārtavirya II., of the Ratta family, who was governing at Sugundhavarti. The principal capital of Somesvara II. seems to have been Kalyān. His reign was a short one and apparently of no importance, for his inscriptions contain no historical information, except that Udayāditya is said to have conquered for him the Chera, Chola, Pāndya, and Pallava kings, and others who dwelt on his frontiers, and to have levied tribute from them. In the end he appears to have alienated the affections of his subjects, by tyranny or by neglect, and thus to have led to his dethronement by his younger brother Vikramāditya VI., who "by the strength of his own arm seized upon the recent sovereignty of Bhuvanakamalla.’’

Vikramāditya VI.,—who was more commonly called Triḥṃuvama-malla II., and who also bore the names of Prasāda, Kālivikrama,

---

1 This is a very common custom in the Kanarese country. When a witness in Court speaks of such and such a son as being his son, or his brother, it is always necessary, if the point is at all relevant, to make him explain whether he means, in the first case, his own son, his brother’s son, or the son of a distant relative in the same degree of descent with himself; and, in the second case, his own father’s son, his uncle’s son, or the son of a distant relative in the same degree of descent with his father; and so with many other relationships also. In the inscriptions we have an instance of this in P. S. and O. O. Inscriptions, No. 190, where Jayakara II., of the Kālāmagas of Goa, is called the elder brother (sūndapratigya ) of Jagadlēva, and the Sānta kings of Patti-Poimbuchcham in Māsur; and Jagadlēva is called the younger brother (paragamya; i. 27) of Jayakara. A somewhat more correct expression is used in I. 18 of the inscription, viz. that Jayakara "was considered to be the younger brother" of Jagadlēva (ṣīkṣitaṃ ca maitrakaṃ), Jayakara II. and Jagadlēva were really maternal cousins, being the sons of two sisters, Chittalakṣi and Bījagahāri.


3 The Eighteen Agrahāraka appear to have been not a collection of eighteen contiguous townships, but eighteen towns of importance scattered over the eastern parts of the kingdom. Huli, in the Belgaum District, was one of them; and perhaps Dongar in the Bhurāvā District was another.

Vikramārka and Vikramānaka, ascended the throne on Monday the fifth day of the bright fortnight of the month Phālguna of Saka 997 (A.D. 1078-9), the Rākṣasam sammatsara, and reigned till Saka 1048 (A.D. 1129-7), the Purāṇhava smmatsara. One of the first acts of his reign was to abolish the use of the original Saka era, and to supersede it by a new era established in his own name. As the inscriptions say, "Having said, 'Why should the glory of the kings Vikramāditya and Nanda be a hindrance any longer?' he, with a loudly uttered command, abolished that (era) which has the name of Saka, and made that (era) which has the Chālukya figures," and again, "Having slain all the hostile kings, by his amplitude and alone, Tribhuvanamalla, the king Chālukya-Vikramāditya, became the favourite of the world. Having rubbed out the brilliant Sakavrsha, he, the impetuous one, the most liberal man in the world, who delighted in religion, published his name throughout the world under the form of the Vikramakhila."

I have not found any instance of this era having been adopted by the kings of other dynasties; but nearly all the inscriptions of his own time, and a few of his successors, are dated in the Chālukya-Vikramakala or Chālukya-Vikramavara era, thus established by him, which commenced from the date of his coronation as given above. And, in determining the chronological order of his inscriptions, it must be borne in mind that, as the result of the initial date of this era being so close to the initial date of the years of the Saka era, the samatsaras of the sixty-years cycle were made to commence and end with the years of his era, instead of with the years of the Saka era as had been the case up to then. Of his time there are already known to exist nearly two hundred inscriptions, containing an enormous amount of materials which still remain to be properly digested and arranged. And, being scattered over the northern parts of Māsur, the eastern parts of North Kanara, the whole of the Dhārwar, Belgaum, and Kālādgi Districts, and the western and north-western parts of the Nīkās's Dominions, they show very clearly the large and universal extent of his kingdom and sway in this part of the country. Also General Cunningham has found one of his inscriptions on an elaborately sculptured pillar at Sīthābad in the Central Provinces. It is dated Saka 1009 (A.D. 1087-8); and another of his inscriptions tells us that in Saka 1020 (A.D. 1098-99) he was still in the north and was then on the banks of the Narmada. One of the most interesting of his inscriptions is the Buddhist tablet at Dambal, which records grants made to a vihāra of Buddha and a vihāra of Ārya-Tārādevi at that town, in Saka 1017 (A.D. 1095-6), and which thus shows that the Buddhist religion still held a place in the Kanar country at least as late as the end of the eleventh century A.D. He indulged in a pretty considerable plurality of wives; I have found the names of the following seven mentioned,—Mālaladevi or Mālikārani, the daughter of the Sūnaabhoga or hereditary village-

---

5. *Ind. Ant.,* Vol. X., pp. 188 and 272.
accountant, Bāyāna, of Yelawatti; Sāvaladevi, the daughter of Jogamārāṇa or Jogamāraṇa and Tarādevī of the Suryavāmsa; Chandaladevi, the mother of Jayakarna; Jakkaladevi; Malloynaddevi or Malayamatidevi; Lakshmādevī, who in Saka 1017 (A.D. 1095-96), was governing at Dharmapura or Dharmavolai, the modern Dānīsil in the Dhāwad District; and Engaladevi. Of these, Chandaladevi, also called Chandralekha, was the daughter of one of the Siḥhān Mahāmāndaravas of Kollhāpur; and one of his wives was a daughter of the Chola king. The foundation of his power, and of his popularity with his subjects which led to his so easily usurping the sovereignty from his elder brother, appears to have been laid in the time of his father Somesvāra I, when he was invested with the authority of viceroy at Banawāsī, as we have already seen; and when he was also employed to command many successful expeditions, in which he is said to have repeatedly defeated the Chola, and plundered Kānchi,—to have lent his assistance to the king of Mālaya, who sought his aid to regain his kingdom, and to have carried his arms as far north as Gauḍa and Kāmaruṇa,—to have attacked the king of Simhala or Ceylon,—to have destroyed the sandalwood forests of the Mālaya hills,—to have slain the king of Kerāla,—and to have conquered the cities of Gāṅgakundu, Venni, and Chakrakota or Chakragottaya. His first idea seems to have been to leave his elder brother Somesvāra II, in possession of part of the kingdom at Kālyāna, and to have set up an independence of his own at Banawāsī; and it was probably with the object of strengthening his hands in that direction, that he gave his daughter Maḷaladevi in marriage to Jayakesi II, of the family of the Kādambas of Goa. Subsequent events, however, interfered with this plan. A rebellion occurred in the Chola dominions, in the course of which his brother-in-law was killed, and Rājīga, the king of Venni, took possession of Kānchi. Vikramāditya marched to the south to meet Rājīga, and Somesvāra II. followed with another army, promising outwardly to assist his brother, but intending secretly to play the traitor. A battle ensued, in which Rājīga fled and Somesvāra was taken prisoner, and Vikramāditya VI. then proclaimed himself monarch of all the Western Chālukya dominions. His long reign was a fairly peaceful one, except that his younger brother Jayasimha IV., whom he had made his viceroy at Banawāsī, created a rebellion, and, winning over many of the local chieftains, advanced as far as the river Kriśnā; but a battle was fought, in which Jayasimha was made captive, and the insurrection was easily crushed. The chief capital of Vikramāditya VI. was Kālyāna; but he had also a capital at Eṭagiri, the modern Yāṭagiri in the western part of the Nizām's Dominions; and he also either built or greatly enlarged Araibidi in the Kalāḍī District, and made it another of his capitals under the name of Vikramapura. The most important of his feudatories and officials were,—the Mahāmāndaravas.

---

2 Vikramakarshana, V. 76. 3 Id., Introd., p. 81.
5 Vikramakarshana, Introd., pp. 35 to 37. 6 Id., pp. 42, 43.
7 Ind. Ant. Vol. IX., p. 50; Lat. 16. 46 N., Long. 17 E.
Kirtivarman II, of the family of the Kādambas of Banawasī and Hāngal, who in Saka 998 (A.D. 1076-77) and Saka 999 was governing the Banavase Twelve-thousand; the Mahāpradhāna and Dandamayaka Barmadava, who in Saka 999 (A.D. 1077-78) was governing the Banavase Twelve-thousand and the Eighteen Agrahāvas; the Mahāmandalakara Sāntivarmā II, of the family of the Kādambas of Banavasī and Hāngal, who in Saka 1010 (A.D. 1088-89) was governing the Banavase Twelve-thousand and the Pāmungal Five-hundred; the Mahāmandalakara Tallapa II, of the same family, who in Saka 1021 (A.D. 1099-1100), Saka 1030, and Saka 1037, was governing the Banavase Twelve-thousand and the Pāmungal Five-hundred; the Mahāmandalakara Kanna II, Sena II, and Karītaviṅga II, of the Ratta family, who were governing at Sugandhavati; the Mahāpradhāna and Dandamayaka Anantasāla, who in Saka 1025 (A.D. 1103-4) was governing the Belvola Three-hundred, the Paligere Three-hundred, and the Banavase Twelve-thousand; the Mahāpradhāna, Dandamayaka, and Manasevadē or chamberlain, Govindara, who in Saka 1030 (A.D. 1114-15) was governing the Banavase Twelve-thousand and the Sāntalige Thousand; Tribhuvanamalla-Pāndya, who in Saka 1043 (A.D. 1121-12) was governing the Nanambādrī Thirty-two-thousand in Māsur; and the Mahāmandalakara A'chugī II, of the Sinda family of Erambarage, who in Saka 1044 (A.D. 1122-3) was governing the Kusukūd Seventy, the Kolavaḍi Three-hundred, the Bāradaḍi Seventy, and the Nareyangaḷ Twelve. In the time of A'chugī II, there was an invasion of the Western Chālukya kingdom by the Hoysalas, who were growing into power under Vishnuvardhana; but it was successfully resisted by A'chugī, who is said also to have fought with and put to flight the Pāṇḍyas, to have taken and burnt Gove or Goa, and to have seized upon the Konkan. The Silāhāras of Kollāpur, also, appear to have given some trouble about this time; as A'chugī II, is described as swallowing up and then vomiting forth a certain Bhoja who had invaded his country and who must be the first of that name in the Silāhāra family. Vikramāditya VI. ceased to reign, as I have said, in Saka 1048 (A.D. 1126-7), by which time he must have been of a good old age; but he does not seem to have died for some little while after that, as there is an inscription of Saka 1054 (A.D. 1132-3), the preamble of which speaks of him as if he was then still alive.1

Jayasimha IV. was, as we have seen, his elder brother's viceroy at Banawasī; but he does not seem to have survived Vikramāditya VI., and he certainly did not ascend the Western Chālukya throne. He is not often mentioned in the inscriptions. But one at Anantpur in Māsur records that in Saka 1001 (A.D. 1079-80), the Siddhārtha samwattar, he was governing the Banavase Twelve-thousand; and another at Lakshmesvar records that in Saka 1003 (A.D. 1081-2), the Durmati samwattar, he was governing the same province, and also the Sāntalige Thousand, the Kauder Thousand, the Paligere Three-hundred, and the Belvola Three-hundred. In these two inscriptions he is called the Yevarja, and has the titles of Annasa,

---

1 Ind. Ant., Vol. VIII., p. 192.
2 Mysore Inscriptions, p. 265.
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Ankakara, Trailokyanalla II., Virá-Nomalba, and Pallava-Permāṇadi. In both of them he is called Chālukya-chudāmani, or ‘the creative jewel of the Chālukyas’. But he is also said to be Pallavanāya, or ‘of Pallava descent’; and this, together with his titles of Virā-Nomalba and Pallava-Permāṇadi, shows that his mother was a Pallava princess, and that consequently he was only the half-brother of Somesvara II. and Vikramāditya VI.

Jayakarna.

So also Jayakarna, who appears to have been the senior son of Vikramāditya VI., in virtue of his mother’s rank as apsamukhi or ‘chief queen’, if not by actual priority of birth, seems, from the Ratta inscriptions and others, to have been entrusted with the authority of viseroy in the north-west parts of his father’s dominions; but there is no subsequent mention of him, and he must have died before his father.

Somesvara III.

The actual successor of Vikramāditya VI., therefore, was his second son, Somesvara III., also called Bhulokamalla and Sarvajna-chakravarti. He ascended the throne in Saka 1048 (a.d. 1126-7), the Prabhāvva samavatara, and reigned till Saka 1060 (a.d. 1138-9), the Kālayukti samavatara. Of his time we have about twenty inscriptions,—at Balagāmve and Dāvargere in Māsur; at Abbahur, Hīr-Kerur, Bankāpur, and other places in the Dharwar District; at Chiknāl in the Kālāḍi District; and at Gobbur, Hīr-Mūldanur, and Nīmarī in the Nizām’s Dominions. None of them record any campaigns made by him, and his reign seems in fact to have been a very tranquil one. His capital, throughout the whole of it, was Kālyāna. His principal feudatories and officials were,—the Māhāmāndalesāra Permaḍi, of the Kalachuri family, who in Saka 1050 (a.d. 1128-9) was governing the Tāddavād country; the Māhāmāndalesāra Jayakesi II., of the family of the Kādambas of Goa, who, about Saka 1050 (a.d. 1128-9), was governing the Konkana Nine-hundred, the Palasiga or Halsi Twelve-thousand, and the Venugrama or Belmont Seventy; the Māhāmāndalesāra May钒varma III., of the family of the Kādambas of Banawāsī and Hāngal, who in Saka 1053 (a.d. 1131-2) was governing the Banavase Twelve-thousand, the Santalige Thousand, and the Pānumgal Five-hundred; Tailapa II., of the same family, who in Saka 1057 (a.d. 1135-6) was governing the Banavase Twelve-thousand, the Pānumgal Five-hundred, and the Puligere Three-hundred; the Dundavaksa Māhādaiva, who in Saka 1060 (a.d. 1138-9) was governing at his capital of Puligere; and Viraṇḍyadeva, who about the same time was governing the Nensorvādī Thirty-two-thousand, from his residence at the hill-fort of Uchcharangidurga.

Jagadekamalla II.

Somesvara III. was succeeded, in Saka 1060 (a.d. 1138-9), the Kālayukti samavatara, by his eldest son, whose real name does not appear in any of the inscriptions, and who is known only by his title of Jagadekamalla II. We have some forty-five inscriptions of his time,—at Balagāmve, Harar, and other places in Māsur; at Hīr-Kerur, Balakallī, and other places in the Dharwar District;

1 Elliot, MS. Collections, Vol. I., pp. 672 to 777.; and F. S. and G.-C. Inscriptions, Nos. 139, 175, and 176.
at Bādāmi, Nālwaṭāvād, and other places in the Kālāḍgi District; at Bāyabāg in the Kolhāpur State; and at Kukkanur, Raichur, and other places in the Nīśām's Dominions. Kalyāna was his chief capital throughout his reign; but in Saka 1070 (a.d. 1148-9) he appears to have had also a minor capital at Kadalipura in the Kondarate Seventy, which district was on the Dharwād and North Kanara frontiers, near Hāṅgal. His principal fondatories and officials were,—the Dandānuyaka Bommanayya, who in Saka 1065 (a.d. 1143-4) was governing the Banavase Twelve-thousand; the Makhāmanaleśvara Kāṭavīrya III., of the Ratta family, who in the same year was governing the Kundi Three-thousand; the Makhāmanaleśvara Permāḍī I., also called Jagadekamalla-Permāḍī, of the Śinda family, who in Saka 1066 (a.d. 1144-5) was governing the Kistukād Seventy, the Bāgadage Seventy, the Kēlavādī Three-hundred, and the Narṣyāṅgal Twelve; the Dandānuyaka Kesirāja or Kēsimayya, who in Saka 1069 (a.d. 1147-8) was governing the Belvōla Three-hundred, the Palaśagō Twelve-thousand, and the Pāνungal Five-hundred; and Jagāḍalāra, of the family of the Sāntara kings of Pōmhuchapūra or the modern Hombuja or Hāmcha in the Nagar District in Māṁsr. It also appears that Bījana or Bījula, of the Kāluchuri family, in subordination to whom Vīṇayaḥpāṇa-deva was entrusted with the government of the Nōnumbāvādī Thirty-two-thousand, was a contemporary of his; but whether he was then an independent chieftain, or was a fondatory of Jagadekamalla, is not clear. He seems, therefore, to have pretty well held together the dominions that had come down to him. But, at the same time, not altogether without opposition. For the Śinda inscriptions show that in his reign there was another invasion from the south by the Hōysalas kings, under Bittiga or Vishnunavardha; they were, however, repulsed by Permāḍī I., who pursued Vishnunavardha to his capital of Dharmamudra and besieged him there, and also captured his city of Belāpura. Also the Kānambas of Goa gave some trouble; but they, again, were successfully met by Permāḍī I.

Jagadekamalla was succeeded, in Saka 1072 (a.d. 1150-1), the Pūvakoda saṃcetakeva, by his younger brother Tallā III., also called Nāḍhil-Tallā II., and Trālikyakamalla III. His inscriptions, of which we have only eleven, are to be found at Bālagāmve, Dārānag, and Harīhar in Māṁsr; at Pūra, Hamsahāvī, and Hāvīrī, in the Dharwād District; at Pattadakal in the Kālāḍgi District; and at

2. Kadalipura is mentioned in an inscription at Bālebhallī in the Hāṅgal Tāḷāka (Elliot MSS. Collection, Vol. I., p. 838), and must be Bālebhallī itself. Bālebhallī, 'the village of pālāmaśa,' would be rendered in Sanskrit by Kadalipura. And it is so rendered in the case of Kadalipura, near Hōmura in the Malelośa, or hill country, at which, Mr. Kitchin says (Nāgaurīvādī Camāva Prasāda, Introd., pp. xvi., livth., and xlv.), is the guru's throne of the present Hāvannāśadh, the disciple-donant of the Hāvannāśadh; or Rāmākṣitiya, mentioned at p. 44, note 1, above.
3. Jagāḍalāra's mother was Bījala-devi, whose sister, Chattāla-devi, was married to Vīra-kīrti I. of the family of the Kānambas of Goa. In his early years he seems to have been held in check by the Hōysalas kings Bāḷāḷa I. and Vishnunavardha. But we find him afterwards, in Saka 1071 (a.d. 1149-10), governing at Sētu, which Mr. Rice thinks was in Kanara (Nī∫ām's Inscriptions, p. lvii.), and coming to Bālagāmve and making a grant there (P. S. and O. C. Inscriptions, No. 180). And he also, apparently as the fondatory of Tallā III., laid siege to Anumakonda, in the time of Prīṣa, the father of Rundhāra (Introd., Vol. XI., p. 10).
Kukkanur, Kombhāvi, and Harasur, in the Nizām's Dominions. His capital, at any rate up to Saka 1079 (A.D. 1157-8), was Kalyāna. His inscriptions give very few historical details. They mention, as his principal feudatories and officials,—the Dandandayaka Mahādeva, who, in Saka 1074 (A.D. 1152-3), was governing the Puligere Three-hundred and the Banavase Twelve-thousand; and the Māhāmandalesvara Chāvunda II., of the Sinda family, who up to Saka 1085 (A.D. 1173-4) was governing the usual Sinda territories. They also mention, as his commander-in-chief, the Māhāmandalesvara Bijjala, of the Kalachuri family; and, as the Kalachuri inscriptions subsequently record that Bijjala destroyed all the Chālukya kings and acquired the whole of the Kuntala country, it is plain that he abused the trust reposed in him, and used his sovereign's own armies to deprive the latter of his kingdom. The date of this event is fixed,—as lying somewhere between the day of the new-moon of the month Pausha of Saka 1083 (A.D. 1161-2), the Vishnu sameasvara, and the same day in the following year, the Chitrabhadān sameasvara,—by two inscriptions at Balagamve, and at Anugeri. In the former of them, Bijjala still styles himself only a Māhāmandalesvara; while in the latter of them, he is invested with the usual regal titles of samantabhūmikarāgāya, prithivicchālakāha, mahāvijayākāra, and paramaśivāra, and Anugeri is called the rājadhāmipattana or 'royal capital.' But Taila's downfall was not accomplished solely by the Kalachuris, but was aided by an attack from another powerful king from the east. An inscription at Anamkond near Worangul in the Nizām's Dominions, of the Kākatya or Kākatiya king Rudradeva, tells us that Rudradeva's father, Pralāraja, "in an instant made captive in war the glorious Tailapadeva, the ornament of the Chālukyas, who was skilled in the practice of riding upon elephants,—whose inmost thoughts were ever intent upon war,—and who was mounted upon an elephant which was like a cloud (in size); and then at once he, who was renowned in the rite of severing the throats of his (captive) enemies, let him go, from goodwill produced by his devotion. The same inscription records that Taila III. subsequently died in the time of Rudradeva; and,—as it is dated on the thirteenth day of a bright fortnight of the month Māgha of Saka 1084 (A.D. 1162-3), the Chitrabhadān sameasvara, subsequently to the overthrow of a certain king Bhima, who, on Taila's death, ventured to assume the sovereignty over a part, evidently the more eastern and northern portions, of his dominions,—it is plain that the death of Taila III. must have occurred some months before that.

The Western Chālukya power, however, was not yet entirely destroyed. After the death of Taila III., a period of interruption of the power of the dynasty ensued. As recorded in one of the inscriptions of his son and successor, Somesvara IV., also called Soma, Vira-Somesvara, and Tribhuvanamalla III.,—the Chālukya dominions were meanwhile held by the Kalachuris. But in Saka

---

1 Elliot MS. Collection, Vol. II., pp. 1 to 20; and P. S. and O.-C. Inscriptions, Nos. 120 and 181.
2 Elliot MS. Collection, Vol. II., p. 67; and P. S. and O.-C. Inscriptions, No. 194.
3 Elliot MS. Collection, Vol. II., p. 72.
1104 (A.D. 1182-3), the Subhakrit samvatsara,—taking advantage of the fact that, owing to the religious dissensions between the Lingayats and the Jains at Kalyana, which they had made their capital, the power of the Kalachurus was rapidly waning, and in fact was already almost at an end,—he succeeded in re-establishing for a short time longer the semblance of a Chalukya sovereignty. He owed his power, such as it was, to the influence and energy of his Dandanayaka Barmarasa, who in one of his inscriptions is called Chalukya-raja-prativahapaka, or "the estabisher of the Chalukya sovereignty." This person is evidently the same Barmarasa who in Saka 1083 (A.D. 1161-2) was the Dandanayaka of Bijjala and had the government of the Banavasi province under him, while Bijjala was still, nominally, if not actually, only the commander-in-chief of Taila III.—and also the Brahma, i.e. Barma, the general in command of the Kalachuri army, by defeating whom the Hoyasalas, under Ballala II., first established their power north of the Tungabhadrā. This defeat destroyed the power of the Kalachuri. But the Hoyasalas found too much to occupy them in the eastern parts of the kingdom to admit of their making at once an attack in the direction of Banavasi, which was not permanently in their possession till Saka 1114 (A.D. 1192-3). And Barmarasa evidently took advantage of this to fall back on Banavasi, and there espouse the cause and fortunes of the son of his former sovereign Taila III. Someshvara IV. made Annigeri, 1 in the Dharmavira District, his capital. And, his inscriptions being found only at Annigeri, Dambal, Lakkundi, Hāngal, Kallukeri, Neregāl in the Hāngal Tālukā, and Ablur, in the Dharmavira District, 2 the limited extent of his rule is apparent. His inscriptions contain no historical details. His principal feudatories and officials were,—the Mahāpradhāna and Dandanayaka Tejimayya, who in Saka 1106 (A.D. 1184-5) was governing at Dharmāporā or Dambal in the Māsāvādi country; the Dandanayaka Barmarasa, who in the same year was governing at the capital of Annigeri; the Mahāpradhāna Kesavabhutta, who in Saka 1108 was governing the Belvola country; and the Mahā-pradhāna Kannada, of the family of the Kādatonins of Banavasi. Sangal, who in Saka 1111 was governing the Banavasi Twelvethousand, the Panugal Five-hundred, and the Puligere Three-hundred. The last of his inscriptions is dated Saka 1111 (A.D. 1189-90), the Samyakam samvatsara. What became of Someshvara IV. after that date, is not yet known; but the power of the Western Chalukyas, as a dynasty, may be considered to have been then finally extinguished.

There are a few later inscriptions,—such as a grant of Kānveśvarāya of Kalyana, dated Saka 1182 (A.D. 1260-1); 3 an undated grant of Vira-Satyasraya, the son of Govinda, also of Kalyana; 4 and a grant of Vira-Nonamba, also of Kalyana, which falsely assumes to be dated in Saka 366 (A.D. 444-5), 5—which

---

1 Lat. 14° 29' N., Long. 75° 39' E.
2 Ellis MS. Collection, Vol. II., pp. 27 to 40, and 196, 333, and 224.
4 British Museum: Plates; unpublished.
purport to be inscriptions of the descendants of the Western Chalukyas. But, shortly after the date of Saka 1111 mentioned above, the Western Chalukya sovereignty and dominions were apportioned for a time between the Hoysales of Dvarasamudra from the south and the Yadavas of Devagiri from the north, and were finally possessed in their entirety by the latter.
SECTION VII.

THE KALACHURIS OR KALACHURYAS.

As in the members of this family had the title of Kālanjara-parvavarta-dīkṣavarta, or 'supreme lord of Kālanjara, the host of cities,' it is plain that the original stock started from that city, which is now represented by the hill-fort of Kālanjara in Bandelkhand. And in the ninth, tenth, and eleventh centuries a.d., a powerful branch of the family was settled near there, and possessed the country of Ghōdi or Bandelkhand. An account of this branch has been published by General Cunningham.\(^1\) The first historical name is that of Kokkalla or Kokkalla I., who is attributed to the end of the ninth century a.d. But, as the inscriptions of this branch of the family are dated in an era, called both the Kalachuri-Samvat and the Chedi-Samvat, the initial date of which has been shown by General Cunningham to lie probably somewhere in a.d. 249,\(^2\) it would seem that the members of it had established their sovereignty long before the time for which we have as yet obtained historical records of their. They call themselves Halhayas, as well as Kalachurias, and claim descent from Yadu through Kārtavirya or Kālanjara-Arjuna. And their capital was Tripura, the modern Tawar, a small village about six miles to the west of Jalalpur. We have already noticed some of them in connection with intermarriages between their family and the Rāṣṭrakutas and Western Chāluṅgas. Thus,—of the Rāṣṭrakutas, Krishna II. married a daughter of Kokkalla I.; Jagattunga II. married Lakshmi and Govindāmbī, the daughters of Samkara-gana I. or Banavijaya, the son of Kokkalla I.; Indra IV. married Dväjāmbī, the great-granddaughter of Kokkalla I.; and Amogha-varaha II. married Kanka-kadevi, the daughter of Yuvāraja, who probably was Yuvāraja I. of the Kalachuri family;—and, of the Western Chāluṅgas, Vīramāditya IV. married Bouthādevi or Vouthādevi, the daughter of Takshma, the son of Yuvāraja I. Further than this, the Kalachuris of Tripura do not enter into the scope of the present paper.

We have also had indications of some of the Kalachuris having, in earlier times, established themselves more to the south, in the dominions afterwards acquired by the Chalukyas. Thus, in the sixth century a.d., Mangales is poetically described as "obtaining as his wife the lovely woman who was the goddess of the fortunes of the Kalachuris," and as "becoming the husband, by ravishment, of the queens of the Kalachuris." And the Buddhārjya, son of Samkara-gana, whom he drove out, apparently from the Koutrana, very probably was, as General Cunningham has suggested,\(^3\) an early king of the Kalachuri dynasty; this, in fact, seems to be rendered

---

\(^1\) Archaeological Reports, Vol. IX., pp. 54 &c.  
\(^2\) Id., p. III.  
\(^3\) Id., p. 37.
almost certain by the Mahākuta column inscription of Mangalisa, which, after mentioning the conquest of king Buddha and the seizure of his riches, records that the wealth of the Kalatsuris,—evidently a Sanskritized form of the name Kalachuri,—was given to the temple of Makutashvara. Also the Halaṇyas among Visunāditya subjugated, and a princess of whose family, Lokamahādevi, was married to his grandson Vikramaditya II., must have been of the same clan with the Kalachuris, even if they did not belong to their particular branch of it.

But we have no connected account of the Kalachuris of the south, until we come to the twelfth century A.D. We then meet with them first as Mahāmāṇḍalaśvaras, or great feudatory nobles, possessed of the title of supreme lord of Kālarjara, the best of cities, and entitled to carry the banner of a golden bull, and to have the musical instrument called domaruka played before them. Their inscriptions point distinctly to their belonging to the same original stock with the Kalachuris of Tripura; but they fail as yet to make it clear whether they were the lineal descendants of the last of the Kalachuris of Tripura, or whether they were descended from a branch of the family which had separated from the original stock and had established itself in the south before the northern Kalachuris established themselves at Tripura. The tradition that they do give as to the origin of the family is that the founder of it, Krishna by name, was the son of a Brahman girl by the god Siva. Passing himself off as a barber, he contrived to kill, at the city of Kālarjara, an evil-minded king who practised cannibalism. He thus acquired the province of Dāhala, i.e. Dāhala or Chedi, and established the Kalachuri family.

The accounts which are given of the descendants of Krishna differ. None of them agree till we come to the names of Jogama, the grandfather, and Perlādi, the father, of Bījala. Starting with Jogama, the genealogy stands as below:

\[
\begin{align*}
& \text{Jogama.} \\
& \text{Perlādi.} \\
& \text{Bījala.} \\
& \text{Siriyādevi.} \\
& \text{Someshvara.} \\
& \text{Sankama.} \\
& \text{A'hasramalla.} \\
& \text{Singhama.} \\
\end{align*}
\]

4. This looks somewhat like an invention to explain the name,—as we have in Kanarese claws and serp, as corruptions of the Sanskrit kharu, kharu, chardhah, 'a razor, a knife,' and a connection might easily be made between the first two syllables, khar, and the Kanarese khar, 'to kill.'
Of Jogama, we have no historical details. And of Bermadi, all that we know is that in Saka 1050 (A.D. 1128-9), the Kilaika samvatasara, he was governing the Taddwadi country, as the feudatory Mahämāndalesvara of the Western Chählukya king Somesvara III.1

The earliest mention that we have of Bijjala,—also called Bijja, Bijjama, Vijjala, Vijjama, Tribhuvanamalla, and Nissankamalla,—shows him to have been the contemporary and feudatory of the Western Chählukya king Jagadekamalla II, in whose time Vijayaśāṇyā, of the Pändya family, had the government of the Nanaṃbavādi Thirty-two-thousand, in subordination to Bijjala.2

We have already seen that Bijjala’s first step towards disposing of the Western Chählukyas of the sovereignty was his being employed as commander-in-chief under Taila III, in one of whose inscriptions, at Bijjāpur, dated Saka 1073 (A.D. 1151-2), Bijjala is specifically mentioned as the feudatory of Taila, with other officers under him in the government of the Taddwādi Thousand. His own inscriptions are dated as if his reign began in Saka 1078 (A.D. 1156-7), the Dhātu samvatasara; and probably he was virtually independent from about that date. But,—as it was not till Saka 1083 (A.D. 1161-2) or 1084, shortly before or shortly after the death of Taila III, that he ceased to call himself a Mahämāndalesvara, and assumed the regal titles,—he seems to have maintained for some little time longer a show of subordination to the Chählukya king. The exact date of the assumption of the sovereignty by Bijjala cannot yet be fixed. But it is determined, as lying somewhere between the day of the new-moon of the month Pauṣa of Saka 1083 (A.D. 1161-2), the Vīshu samvatasara, and the same day in the following year, the Chitrabrāhma samvatasara, by two inscriptions, of these dates respectively, at Balagāmve3 and Annigeri:4 in the former of them, Bijjala still styles himself only a Mahämāndalesvara; while, in the latter of them, he is invested with the usual regal titles of samatihubhuvanavaraya, prthivivallabha, mahārājunādhirāja and pāramesvara, and Annigeri is called the vajradhām-pattana, or, ‘royal capital.’ His inscriptions are found at Balagāmve, Tāigund, and Harihār, in Māsur; at Ablur, Rattelhalli, Annigeri, and other places, in the Dhawrād District; at Hult in the Belgaum District; at Yekkumbi near Tāsgaun; and at Mudgal and Chikkas-Muddanur, in the Nizām’s Dominions.5 They show, therefore, that he thoroughly established his power throughout the Chählukya dominions. His principal feudatories and officials were,—the Bandamāyaka Harmarasu, who in Saka 1083 (A.D. 1161-2) was governing the Banavase country; the Bandamāyaka Sridhara, who in the same year was governing at the capital of Annigeri; and Kāspayyanayaka, who in Saka 1085 (A.D. 1163-4) was governing the Banavase Thrissale-thousand and the Pāmungal Five-hundred. The exact year in which he established himself at Kalyāna is not apparent; but he did make that city his capital after Annigeri. The latest of his inscriptions is dated in Saka 1089 (A.D. 1167-88), the Sarvarjita samvatasara, in the

---

twelfth year of his reign. The Kalachuris were Jains. But Bijjala had always shown a considerable amount of favour and liberality to the Saivas; and his death was brought about by the growing power of that sect, or rather of a new division of it, the Lingayats, founded by the celebrated Basava. This led to a revolution which resulted in the assassination of Bijjala. I take the following account of this revolution, based on the Basava-Puranam, the text-book of the Lingayats, and the Bijjalahavaka-vyaya or Bijjalacharitra, the text-book of the Jains, almost verbatim from Sir Walter Elliot's paper:—

"Basava was born at Bagewadi, in the Bagewadi Taluk of the Kaladgi District, a few miles north of the Krishnâ, according to local tradition; though the Parsis ascribes that honour to the neighbouring village of Ingleswar. His father's name was Madhukar Hattta, or Madigasaya, an Atradhyya or Saiva Brähman; his mother was named Madalâmbikâ; and he had a sister named Padmâvatî, who is described as having been very beautiful. The family seem to have left Bagewadi and gone to Kalyana, where Basava formed an alliance with the chief minister, by marrying his daughter, named Gângâmbâ; soon after which, Bijjala, having seen the beautiful Padmâvatî, became enamoured of and married her; and in consequence of these connections her brother was appointed minister and general, in succession, to his brother-in-law. The king gave himself up to the charms of his beautiful bride, and left all power in the hands of Basava, who employed the opportunity thus afforded him to strengthen his own influence, by displacing all the old officers of state and putting in adherents of his own, whilst at the same time he sedulously cultivated the favour of the prince. He likewise began to promulgate a new rule of faith, differing from both that of the Jains and that of the Brâhmans, hitherto the most popular sects. He abolished the distinction of castes, all his followers being enrolled by a particular ceremony into a new and equal order. He himself, and the priests under him, named Jâmagamas, were regarded as incarnations of the deity. They observed the same strict abstinence from animal food as the rival sect, and were equally strict and minute in the circumstances to be observed in cocking and eating; but they rejected many of the previously entertained opinions regarding purity and impurity. The great objects of adoration were the Linga, and Nandi, or the sacred bull that carries Siva, of which Basava proclaimed himself an incarnation. The effigy of their creed, a small stone Linga in a silver box or shrine, was suspended to the neck, instead of being bound round the arm, according to the practice of the Atradhya. It is evident that there is much of the Saiva doctrines, professcd by the Atradhya Brâhmans to which Basava belonged, incorporated in the new creed. Basava increased rapidly in power, and at length roused the fears of Bijjala, who endeavoured to seize his person. He made his escape, however, and died. Pursuit was ordered; but Basava, collecting some of his followers, attacked and disarmed the party. His adherents flocked to him; and Bijjala, advancing in person to quell
the insurrection, suffered a complete defeat. He was compelled to submit to his victorious minister, who returned with him to Kalyâna, reinstated in all his dignities. Basava, on his return, not only resumed all his former power and authority, but even attempted the life of Brijala, probably with the intention of governing unmolested during the minority of his nephew, the son of the king and Padmâvâti, who is named Inamdi-Brijala and Vira-Brijala. In this he eventually succeeded; but authorities differ as to the manner. The Jain chronicle relates that the king, having marched against the Silahâra, a rebellious feudatory, the Mahâmukhâlava of Kolhabur, was returning successfully from the expedition, when Basava found means to poison him on the banks of the Bhûma. The Pârvat states that he was assassinated in the midst of his court by three of Basava's followers, named Jagaddhava, Bommayya, and Mallayya. While a third legend asserts that Madiwâla, Mâchayya, and Bommayya, the Nâdadhi or torch-bearers of Basava, having concealed their weapons in the roll of cloth serving for a flannelet, stabbed the king whilst preceding their master into his presence. This event is said in the Brijalâla-kalâva to have occurred in the year 3255 of the Kaliyuga, which corresponds with Saka 1076 (A.D. 1154-5). Brijala's death, however, according to the inscriptions, did not occur till twelve years later, in Saka 1089 (A.D. 1167-8). It is probable, therefore, that there may be a clerical error in the manuscript. The murder, however perpetrated, did not go unpunished. Basava, dreading the vengeance of the young king, here called Yuvaraîja, probably the Bâgyamûrâ-Savidea of the inscriptions, fled to Vrishabhapura, on the Malabar coast. Thither the king pursuing him, laid siege to the city. It was reduced to extremity, and Basava in despair threw himself into a well and was drowned. His body was taken out and ignominiously thrown without the city walls; and thenceforward the name of the city was called Ulav, because Basava thought he would there save himself, a name which it still retains. The sect, however, found a more able, or at least a more successful, leader in Channasava, the son of another sister of Basava, named Akka-Nâgamuna, or according to others Nâgalâkshika, by whom the Lingâyata belief was completely established. It is now the prevailing form of worship throughout the whole of the country, where the Kanarese language is spoken, comprising the greater portion of the Nizam's Dominions, the Southern Marathá Country, Sundâ, Mâisur, Ballâ, &c. 1

Brijala was succeeded, in Saka 1089 (A.D. 1167-8), the Sarvajit-senorâiva, by his eldest son Somevisa, also called Savidea and Râjamûrâ. His inscriptions are found at Basalâma, Amawatti, and Tâlgund in Mâisur; at Muniçeri, Bhatehalli, Lakkundi, Nasses, and other places, in the Dharwad District; at Ingleswar in the Kaladgî

---

1 Glazi, the 'Woodvi' of maps, is about fourteen miles to the west of Vallapur in the North Kanara District, at the foot of the Ghats; it is a celebrated place of Lingâyat pilgrimage. — The above account of Kasaara's death is taken entirely from the Jain chronicle. The Lingâyata maintain that he was absorbed into the Sûra, at the temple of Vâgramûrâ, at Kapâla-Sangam, which is at the junction of the Kisthâ and the Malabar-dock rivers in the Kaladgî District; and a depression in the surface of the Sûra is still shown as the spot at which he entered it.
District; and at Kukkanur and other places in the Nizam's Dominions. His principal feudatories and officials were,—the Dandandhyaka Kesava or Kesinayya, who in Saka 990 (A.D. 1168-9) was governing the Taddevad Thamand, the Panangal Five-hundred, and the Banavase Twelve-thousand; the Dandandhyaka Tojimayya, who was the governor of the Belvola country, and who in Saka 992 (A.D. 1170-1) conquered the Kukkanur Ayyakara; the Mahapradhmas and Sennapati Madhavayyanayaka; and the Mahamandasivara Vijaya-panduya, evidently a second of the same name, of the Pandya family, who in Saka 996 (A.D. 1174-5) was governing the Banavase country. His capital was Kalyana; but he seems also to have had a seat of government at Modeganur. His reign was apparently an uneventful one, none of his inscriptions recording any wars or conquests of any great importance.

Somevvara was succeeded, either late in Saka 997 (A.D. 1175-6), the Manmatha Sambalaka, or early in Saka 998, the Durmukha Somasvarya, by his younger brother Sankama, also called Nissanka- malla II. But the synchronous dates of their inscriptions show that his brothers Ahavanalla and Singhana were associated with him in the government. And the localities in which the inscriptions of the three brothers are found show that, even before Somevvara IV. in Saka 1004 (A.D. 1182-3) re-established the Western Chalukya sovereignty for a short while in the southern parts of the Chalukya dominions, the power of Sankama, Ahavanalla, and Singhana, in that part of the country, must have been of a very limited and partial kind, and probably had already begun to be disputed by Somevvara IV. The inscriptions of Sankama are found at Kaudur and Kukkanur, and a few other places, in the Nizam's Dominions; at Ron, Sudi, and a few other places, in the Dhawad District; and at Balagambve, Harikar, and Halebid, in Maisur; and they range from Saka 999 (A.D. 1177-8) to Saka 1012 (A.D. 1189-1). His capital was Kalyana; but Modeganur also was one of his seats of government. His principal feudatories and officials were,—the Mahapradhmas and Dandandhyaka Kesiraja, who in Saka 1001 (A.D. 1179-80) was governing the Banavase country, with a certain Sampakam, of the Gutta family, apparently in subordination to him; and Vikrama, of the Sind family, who in Saka 1012 was governing the Kusukad Seventy. This Vikrama was a cousin, by marriage, of Sankama, being the son of Chavunda II. by his second wife Siriyadevi, who was the sister of Bjiyala. The inscriptions of Ahavanalla are found at Hodal and Chikka-Muddanur in the Nizam's Dominions; at Anveri in the Dhawad District; and at Balagambve and Halebid in Maisur; and they range from Saka 1002 to Saka 1015, which was the eighth year of his reign. One of them mentions, as his feudatory, Vikramaditya of the Gutta or Gupta family, or lineage of Chandragupta. The only inscription of Singhana known to me is a copper-plate grant found at Behatti in the

1 Elliot MS. Collection, Vol. II., pp. 133 to 188; and P. S. and O. C. Inscriptions, Nos. 101, 183, 185, 188, and 209.
2 Elliot MS. Collection, Vol. II., pp. 57, 58, and 109 to 207; and P. S. and O. C. Inscriptions, Nos. 124, 183, 180 to 193, and 209.
3 Elliot MS. Collection, Vol. II., pp. 229 to 231; and P. S. and O. C. Inscriptions, Nos. 189 to 193, and 209.
Dhārwād District; it is dated Saka 1105 (A.D. 1183-4), and records a grant of the village of Kukkanur in the Belvola Three-hundred. One of A'havamalla's inscriptions speaks of wars between him and the Chulas, the Hoysalas, and a Vijayāditya, who seems to have been the second of that name of the family of the Kālambas of Goa. But, with this exception, the inscriptions of these three brothers do not give us much insight into the history of the period and the events that led to the downfall of the Kalachuris. This must have occurred in, or soon after, Saka 1105 (A.D. 1183-4), as nothing is known of the family after that date; and it was affected by the Hoysalas, under Ballāla II. or Vira-Ballāla, who shortly after acquired the sovereignty over the whole of the country of Kuntala.

SECTION VIII

THE HOYSALAS.

The Kalachuris were succeeded by the Hoysalas, Hoysanaga, Poysalas, or Poysanas. And,—as one of Sankara's inscriptions records a grant of the village of Kaurur or Kaulur, in the Māsavādi country, by the Mahāmandalesvara Vira-Ballāla or Ballāla II.; and also as the regal titles were first assumed by Ballāla II., the title of Mahāmandalesvara only being borne by himself in his early years, and by his ancestors,—it seems probable that, just before they obtained the supreme sovereignty, the Hoysalas were feudatories of the Kalachuris, as the Kalachuris had been of the Western Chālukyas before them.

The following is the Hoysala genealogy, as established by the inscriptions, and commencing with Vinayāditya, who is the first historical person in the family, though the original founder of it is said to have been one Sala:

```
Vinayāditya:
  (Saka 900 and 901)

  Ereyaṅga.

  Ballāla I.
  (Saka 1000.)

  Vishnuvardhana.
  (Saka 1002 and 1003.)

  Udayāditya.

  Narasimha I.

  Ballāla II.,
  or Vira-Ballāla.
  (Saka 1112 and 1122.)

  Narasimha II.
  (Saka 1121.)

  Somasvāra.
  (Saka 1174.)

  Narasimha III.
  (Saka 1178 and 1188.)

  Ballāla III.
  (Saka 1282.)
```

1 Elliot MS. Collection, Vol. II., p. 199.
The Hoysalas belonged to the lineage of Yadu; and hence Yudha-Narayana was one of their family-titles, as it was also of the Yadavas of Devagiri. And the tradition as to the derivation of their dynastic name is that an early member of the family, Sala, by name, living at the city of Sasanapura, preserved the life of an ascetic at that city, by destroying a tiger that had come to devour him while engaged in the performance of his religious duties. The words used by the ascetic, in calling for succour, were \textit{Poy Sala} or \textit{Hoysala}, i.e. \textit{"Slay, O Sala!"} By this achievement Sala, and after him his descendants, acquired the name of Poysala or Hoysala, and became entitled to carry the device of a tiger on their banners.\footnote{Ind. Ant. Vol. II., p. 301.}

When, however, the family first becomes historically known, the Hoysalas were settled at Dwaravatipura, Dvarasamudra, or Dhurasamudra, the modern Halebid in Mysore.\footnote{Lat. 13° 19' N., Long. 76° 2 E.} From this they derived another family title, which also was shared by the Yadavas of Devagiri,—that of Dvāraśatī-parivar-ādhiśvāra, or \textit{supreme lord of Dvaravati, the best of cities}.\footnote{Śrīdākṣaśra.} They were Mādhavindraviras, entitled, as has been said, to carry the banner of a tiger.\footnote{Mysore Inscriptions, p. 228.} And their family-goddess was Väsentikadevi of Sasanapura.

Vīnāyādivi, whose wife was Keleyabbe, is the first of the family of whom we have any authentic mention. The number of generations that had intervened between him and Sala is nowhere recorded; and, as none of the inscriptions mention his immediate ancestors, he seems to have been the first of the family to enjoy any substantial power. Of his own time there is only one inscription,—the first part of a stone-tablet at Simgere in Mysore,\footnote{As, however, the inscription specifies the name of the asceticus as Sarvakā. Saka 961 must be a mistake for Saka 959 (a.d. 1047-8). Even this, however, seems too early a date for the viceroyship of Vikramāditya VI.} the latter part of which belongs to the time of his grandson Vishnuvardhana. It gives him the title of Tribhuvanamalla I., and speaks of him as a Mādhavindravira, subordinate to the Western Chālukya king Vikramāditya VI.; and it records that in Saka 961\footnote{Mysore Inscriptions, p. 228.} he was, or had been, governing all the country included between the Konkan, the country of Bhadadayayi, Talukād, and Sāvimale. And an inscription at Nīrānd in Mysore,\footnote{Here, again, as the inscription specifies the name of the asceticus as Nala, Saka 967 must be a mistake for Saka 956 (a.d. 1073-7).}—the preamble of which must refer to him, though, in addition to Tribhuvanamalla, it calls him Vīrangara, which title in the later inscriptions is given only to his grandson Ballāla and Vishnuvardhana,—makes him a contemporary of the Ganga king Kungalivarman, and records that in Saka 987\footnote{707-8} he was ruling the Gangavādi Ninety-six-thousand. The inscriptions of his descendants also state that he conquered the Konkan; but it is not probable that this conquest extended anywhere north of the present district of North Kanara, as the Kādambas of Goa were sufficiently powerful to hold him in check in that direction, in addition to their being at that time on friendly terms with Vikramāditya VI., who was the Chālukya viceroy at Banavasi, and of whom Vīnāyādivi himself was, as has been stated, a feudatory.
Of the time of his son, Ereyanga, there are no inscriptions. In one of the later inscriptions, in which his name is written both Ereyanga and Ereganga, he is said to have made conquests in the north, and to have subjugated the territories that had been held by Bhoja of Dhâra, the king of Mâlava. His wife was Bhakaladevi.

Of his eldest son, Ballâla I., the only record that we have is that he overcame Jagadeva, the Sântara king of Patti-Pombuchchapore, whom we have already mentioned in connection with the Western Châlukya king Jagadekamalla II., and that in Saka 1025 (A.D. 1103-4), the Svabhâmam suvâtâvara, while governing at his capital of Belâpura, the modern Belur 1 in Mâisur, he married Padmaladevi, Châvaladevi, and Boppadevi, the three daughters of the Devalandyaka Mariyâne, who had been invested by Vinayâditya with the lordship of Sindigere.

Of the time of Vishunuvarhana,—also called Brîti, Bittiga, Tribhuvanamalla II., Bhujabalaganga, Viraganga, and Vikramaganga,—we have only three inscriptions 2; two of them are dated Saka 1039 (A.D. 1117-8), the Hemalumbi suvâtâvara, and Saka 1060 for 1059 (A.D. 1137-8), the Pingala suvâtâvara; the date of the third is not known. His wife was Sântaladevi, also called Lakumâdevi in one of the inscriptions. The inscriptions of himself and of his successors give many details concerning him, and show that it was he who first established the independence of the Hôysalâs, though he did not assume any higher title than that of Mahamahâdevanava. The earliest facts that we have in connection with him are that he fixed the boundaries of the Hôysala kingdom, and that he took and burnt Talakâd or Talavanapura, the capital of the Gangas, and established himself in their dominions; it was by this achievement that he acquired the titles of Bhujabalaganga, Viraganga, and Vikramaganga. One of the passages descriptive of him in the later inscriptions states that, when he set out on his campaign, "Kânci fled before him; Konga was shaken to its foundations; the excellent Virattakote (or Hângal) cried out; Koyatur (which is probably a shorter form of Koyimmuttur or Combatore) was disembowelled and destroyed; the famous Chakragotta (or the Chakrakota of which we have had mention in connection with the Western Chalukya king Vikramâditya VI.) made way for him; and the seven Konkanas threw down their arms and took refuge in the ocean." 3 He is also said to have been victorious against the Pândya and Tulu kings,—to have broken the power of Jagatiyâra of Patti-Pombuchchapura,—to have subdued the Kâdambas of Gaya under Jayakara II.,—to have conquered the Vengiriking and Narsimha,—to have taken Uchchangi,—and to have become the lord of the Mahe kings. He also acquired the Kôngu country, Nonambavâdi, Kolâlapura, Kovatur, Tereyur, Vallur, and Kânci. His seat of government was at Belâpura; and his power is said to have extended over Talakâd, Kôngu, Nangâli, Gangavâdi, Nolambavâdi or Nonambavâdi, Mâsâvâdi, Huligere, Halesige, Banavase, and Pânungal. The

1 Lat. 13° 10' N.; Long. 76° 33' E.
2 Mystery Inscriptions, p. 330.
3 P. S. and O. C. Inscriptions, Nos. 18 and 289; and the Sindigere inscription quoted above.
Halasige district was acquired by the conquest of Jayakesi II. of the family of the Kädambas of Goa, and the Banavása and Pánungal districts by the conquest of Tailapa II. of the family of the Kädambas of Banawási and Hángal. Víchnuvardhana, however, does not seem to have retained any of the Kädamba districts for any length of time. It was probably in his time that the Kónkana was conquered, and tribute was levied from Víchayáditya II., of the family of the Kädambas of Goa, by some unspecified chiefs, or who were afterwards the feudatories of Ballāla II. The boundaries of his kingdom are specifically defined in one of his inscriptions, and are said to be Sàrimala on the north, the lower Nangali Ghaut on the east, the Kongo, Chera, and Anamale countries on the south, and the Bárakanur Ghaut road to the Kónkana on the west. In one of the later inscriptions he is said to have invaded the Belvola country up to the Kríshnaverma, and to have ingratiated himself with Permádi or Víkrámáditya VI. But this would seem to be an exaggeration; as, though he undoubtedly did invade the Chálukya dominions, yet the Sindhu inscriptions tell us that he was repulsed, on behalf of the Chálukyas, by Añghuṣa II., and again by Permádi I., who pursued him into his own territories; besieged Dhrorasamudra, and captured the city of Belupur. One of these Sindhu inscriptions enumerates, as the dominions of Víchnuvardhana, the countries of Bengirí or Vengirí, Chera, Chola, Málaya, Maleyol, Tali, Kolli, and Pallava, the city of Kónga, and the countries of Banavása, Kândambale, and Harye.

The inscriptions give no account of Udayáditya beyond the mention of his name; and it seems unlikely, therefore, that he ever had any part in the government of the Hoyasala kingdom.

The successor of Víchnuvardhana was, therefore, his son, Nárasimha I., whose wife was Echáladóvi. No historical details are mentioned in connection with him except that the Nirgund inscription, speaking of ‘his standards reaching as far as the peaks of Devagiri,’ would seem to imply that he made an expedition in that direction; this, however, requires to be verified.

He was succeeded by his son Ballála II.,—usually called Vírs-Ballála, but also known by the name of Gíridurgamálá or ‘the conqueror of hill-forth’—whose wife was Pádmáaládevi. His inscriptions are found at Belur, Hallóbíd, Sórab, Tálíngud, Harihár, and Bálagámavá, in Músí; and at Balagánur, Bónkandó, Sàtänhalí, Álavándi, Hángul, Mélgrund, Mewundí, Annpíerí, Nágámvá, and Gudag, in the Dharwád District. They range from Saka 1114 (A.D. 1192-3) to Saka 1133 (A.D. 1211-2), the Prájñopatí samvatsárá;
and they fix Saka 1113 (A.D. 1191-2), the Virodhakrit, as the commencement of his reign. It was he who first of his family assumed the regal titles, and, by defeating Brahma or Barma, the general of the Kalachuri army, established the power of the Hoyasalas north of the Tungabhadra in the Kalachuri dominions; but this must have been some seven or eight years before the commencement of his own reign, and while he was serving as the commander-in-chief of his father's forces. He seems, however, never to have penetrated permanently north of the Malapahari or Mahaprabha river. In Saka 1114, we find him established at the capital of Lokkikundi, the modern Lakkundi near Gadag in the Dhārvād District. And before that time, in addition to defeating the Kalachuris, he had met and defeated Jaitraimha or Jaitugrī I., the son of Bhilama of the Yadava dynasty of Devagiri, by which victory he acquired the supremacy over the country of Kuntala; this battle between Ballala and Jaitraimha is said by tradition to have been fought at Lakkundi itself. An inscription of his son, Narasimha II., also gives a graphic account of a battle between him and a certain Semana or Sēvūna, whom he besieged and defeated at Saratur near Gadag, and pursued from there up to the Krishna, where he slew him, and who was probably the commander-in-chief of Jaitugri's army. In the same campaign Ballala besieged, besides Saratur, the hill-forts of Bramarage or Yelburga, Virrushkot or Hāngal, Gatti, Bellittag, Rattapalli or Ratshalli in the Dhārvād District, and Kurugud near Ballari. His conquests also included the Chola and Pandyja kings, to the latter of whom he restored his forfeited kingdom when he humbled himself before him, Uchchangi,—part of the Konkana,—and the districts of Banavase and Pannungal. His first attempt on the last district was made in Saka 1118 (A.D. 1196-7), when he besieged Pannungal which was then the capital of the MahāmundaSālavra Kāmadeva, of the family of the Kādambas of Banavase and Hāngal, who was governing the Pannungal Five-hundred. In this attempt he was unsuccessful, being repulsed by Kāmadeva's generals Sohali and his son Padmaya or Padman, the former of whom was killed in the battle. In addition to Lokkikundi, he had also a capital at Annapuri in the Dhārvād District. In Saka 1114 (A.D. 1192-3), we find his Mahāpradhāna and Dandanaṉaka, Ereyana or Eragna, governing the Banavase Twelve-thousand and the Sāntalige Thousand; in Saka 1121 (A.D. 1199-1200) his feudatory, the MahāmundaSālavra Rāyadeva, was governing the Belvola country; in Saka 1124 (A.D. 1202-3) his feudatory, the MahāmundaSālavra Jagadala-Bhattamadeva, was governing the Kuntala country; and in Saka 1125 his Dandanaṉaka, Kamathada-Mallisetti, was governing the Sāntalige Seventy and the Nāgarakhande Seventy in the Banavase country.

Narasimha II.

He was succeeded by his son, Narasimha II., who last entirely, through the increasing power of the Yadavas of Devagiri, the

1 Lat. 15° 24' N., Long. 76° 47' E.
2 Sir Walter Elliot, Madras Jour. of Lit. and Science, Vol. VII., p. 216.
3 P. S. and O.-C. Inscriptions, No. 125, l. 38.
kingdom that his father had acquired in the old Western Chalukya dominions. He retired to his capital of Dwárasamudra, and seems to have made no attempt to come north of the Tungabhadra again. Only one inscription of his time has been discovered,—at Harîhar in Mâisur, dated Saka 1145 (A.D. 1233-4) the Svabhânu samâvatara. He is said to have dispossessed the Pandya king of his dominions, and to have given them to the Chola king. But his reign seems to have been a quiet one; and the chief event in it was the building of the temple of the god Harîhar Ê at Harîhar by his Mahâpradhâna and Dandândyaka Polâlra.

His successor was his son Somesvara, of whose time we have two inscriptions,—a stone-tablet at Nîrgund in Mâisur; and a copperplate grant now in the Bangalore Museum, but where found originally I do not know. The latter is dated Saka 1175 for 1174 (A.D. 1242-3), the Parîdhâvi samâvatara; the former is not dated. His wives were Bijjuladevi and Somâladevi. And his capital was Vikrâmâpur, "which he had established for his own pleasure in the Chola country, conquered by the power of his arm."

His successor was his son Narasimha III, by his wife Bijjuladevi. Of his time we have six inscriptions,—at Belur, Chitaldurg, Harîhar, and Somânapur, in Mâisur; the earliest of them is dated Saka 1176 (A.D. 1254-5), the Ananda samâvatara, and the latest, Saka 1208 (A.D. 1286-7), the Vyaya samâvatara. His capital was Dwárasamudra. All the history that we have in connection with him is that his Mahâpradhâna and Dandândyaka Perumâledeva, also called Raûttârâya and Javanike-Nârâyana, conquered and slew a certain king named Râtapâla.

Of the time of his son and successor, Ballâla III, we have only one inscription,—at Chitaldurg; the figures of the date are effaced, but, as the name of the samâvatara is specified as Sâdhârana, the date must be Saka 1232 (A.D. 1310-1). The inscription, however, tells us nothing about the history of his reign. And the year in which it is dated saw practically both the end of his reign and the extinction of the power of his dynasty. As will be seen in the following section, Allâ-ud-din, the second of the Khilji emperors of Delhi, had already invaded the Dekkan, and had commenced and almost completed the conquest of the Yâdavas of Devagiri. As yet, the Hoysalas had remained unattacked. But in A.D. 1310, Allâ-ud-din sent an army under Malik Kâfûr and Khwâjâ Hâji to reduce Dwárasamudra. Leaving part of their forces at Paithân on the Godâvari, to overawe and hold in check Sankara of Devagiri,—Malik Kâfûr and Khwâjâ Hâji continued their march to the south, entered and laid waste the Hoysala kingdom, engaged, defeated, and captured Ballâla III., and took and despoiled his capital of Dwárasamudra. The complete subjugation of the province of Dwárasamudra, and the annexation of it to the empire of Delhi,
were not effected till A.D. 1327, in the reign of Muhammad Tughlak.\(^1\) Meanwhile, though the Muhammadan chronicle does not record the fate of Ballāla III., it would appear that, after his defeat and capture in A.D. 1310, he was liberated, and continued for a short time longer the semblance of a reign at the former capital of Belāpura; and that, after the events of A.D. 1327, in which Dvārasamudra was demolished, the then representative of the family retired to Tondanur, the modern Tournur near Seringapatam, which continued to be the seat of an enfeebled power for about fifty years more.\(^2\) The power of the Hoysalas as a dynasty, however, was practically extinguished by the conquest of A.D. 1310.

---

\(^1\) Forishta, Vol. I., p. 413.
\(^2\) Mysore Inscriptions, p. 101; and Rice’s Gazetteer of Mysore and Coorg, Vol. II., p. 297. Forishta (Vol. I., p. 418-9) tells us that, in A.D. 1338, Bāhā-ud-din, more commonly known by his original name of ‘Koornshatip,’ rebelled against his uncle, Muhammad Tughlak, and, being defeated, deserted his government of Nagar and fled to the Hoysala court; and that he was given up to the king by the then representative of the family, whom Forishta calls Ballāpura.

SECTION IX.
THE YADAVAS OF DEVAGIRI.

On the downfall of the Kalachuris, the southern parts of their dominions fell, as we have seen, into the hands of the Hoysalas of Dvāranamudra. And, at the same time, the northern parts were appropriated by another branch of the Yādava family, the members of which,—since, like the Hoysalas, they had the family-titles of Yādava-Nārāyaṇa and Dvārakatīrtheśvara,—must have been of the same original stock with the Hoysalas, though, for some reason or other, the connection between the two families is nowhere acknowledged in the inscriptions. These Yādavas eventually settled themselves at Devagiri, the modern Daulatabad, near Aurangābād. Their banner bore the device of a golden Garuda.

The following is the complete genealogy of this dynasty:

Singhana I.

Mallugi.

Bhillaum.

(JASA 1153 to 1158.)

Jaitugi I.

(JASA 1153 to 1180.)

Singhana II.

(JASA 1180 to 1200.)

Jaitugi II.

Krishna.

(Mahādeva.

(JASA 1190 to 1200.)

(JASA 1190 to 1200.)

Rāmachandra.

(Amana.

(JASA 1200 to 1205.)

Samkara.

Bhima. A daughter,

(married to Harshadeva)

The names of Singhana I. and Mallugi are supplied by a recently discovered copper-plate grant of Rāmachandra, which seems to have been found somewhere in the neighbourhood of the Godāvari in the Aurangābād District. It is recorded therein of Singhana I. that

1 Lat. 18° 57' N., Long. 73° 25' E.
3 Unpublished.
he subdued the king of the Karnatakas, and punished the Pandya king, and that the king of Gurjara avoided meeting him in battle. Of his son Mallugi, no details are given.

Mallugi's son was Bhillama, beyond whom none of the other inscriptions as yet known carry back the genealogy. We have already had mention of him in connection with the Hoyala king Ballala II., by whom, apparently in Bhillama's life-time, his son Jaitugi I. was defeated in a battle fought, according to tradition, at Lakkundi in the Dhaward District. As Ballala is said to have by this victory acquired the country of Kuntala, the prior acquisition of which by Bhillama himself is recorded in his own inscriptions and in those of his descendants, Bhillama must have already established a fairly extensive kingdom. Of his time we have four inscriptions. The earliest of them is at the Jaghir village of Muttigi; it gives him the usual regal titles, and is dated Saka 1111 (A.D. 1189-90), the third year of his reign, while he was ruling at Tenavala, with the Mandaliya Sooru as his Mahapradhana and Senapati. This inscription, therefore, fixes Saka 1100 (A.D. 1188-89), the Plavanga satavastara for the commencement of his reign. In this inscription he is also called Malava-samtha, or 'the champion against the Malavas,' and Gajara-cārasa-amalka, or 'the god to the elephants which are the Gurjaras.' Another, of the same date, is at Anugiri in the Dhaward District, and speaks of that place as the capital, from which his feudatory, the Mahamandalesvara Bāchirāja or Bēchan, was governing the Belvola country. Another, at Bhairavdiçe in the Kaladgi District, is dated Saka 1113 (A.D. 1191-2). And the last, at Hippargi in the Kaladgi District, is dated Saka 1114 (A.D. 1192-3), while the Mahamandalesvara Gonamarasa, who had been his feudatory, was governing the Taddavadi country.

Bhillama was succeeded, in Saka 1113 (A.D. 1191-2), the Virodhikrit samathara, by his son Jaitugi I., also called Jaitrasimha and Jaitrapala, who had held the supreme command of his father's army when it was defeated by Ballala II. Of his time there are three inscriptions,—at Bijapur, Mauqulli, and the Jaghir village of Rāneji and Akkoja, in the Kaladgi District. The first of them only is dated,—in Saka 1118 (A.D. 1196-7), the sixth year of his reign. We have no further historical details about him, except that the Aurangabad grant of his descendant Rāmachandra states that he slew the king of Trisalalina and took his whole kingdom. Vijayapura, or Bijapur, seems to have been his capital.

He was succeeded, in Saka 1131 (A.D. 1209-10), the Saka samathara, by his son Singhana II., also called Sinha, Simha, Simhara, and Thrivanamallia. It is in his time, in Saka 1132, that we first have Devagiri mentioned as the capital. In the early years of his reign we find him using, in addition to the titles of his ancestors, those of 'the uprooter of the water-lily which was the head of the king of Telunga,' and 'the conqueror of the Kalschuri king.' And in the Aurangabad grant he is said to have conquered

---

1 This must refer to some success against the Hoyala king, Vishnuvardhana.
2 Elliot MS. Collection, Vol. II., pp. 323 to 362.
3 Id., Vol. II., pp. 369 to 373.
4 Lat. 16° 50' N., Long. 78° 47' E.
Ballāla, Hammira, Kakikala, the Andhra king; the lord of Bhambhāgiri, Bhoja, and Arjuna. Some of these statements remain to be verified; but the Bhoja who is mentioned here is Bhoja II., of the family of the Silāhāra Mahāmandalesvaras of Kolhapur, by the conquest of whom Singhana II., in the early part of his reign, acquired and annexed to his own kingdom the whole of the Silāhāra territories above the Ghats. We have thirty-eight inscriptions of his time;—at Ingulige, Golfur, and Hagaritigae, in the Nizām's Dominions; at Bijāpur and a few other places in the Kalātgi District; at Khedrāpur in the Kolhapur State; at Mumawalli in the Belgaum District; at Gadag, Chaudādämpur, Lakshmeshwar, Rattelali, Tiliwalli, and other places, in the Dhārāwāl District; and at Balagāmve, A'navatty, and Yalawāl, in Mauṣur. In Saka 1137 (A.D. 1215-6) his Mahāpradhāna Hemmāyanāyaka was the manager of the customs duties of the Banavase country; in Saka 1141 (A.D. 1219-20) Singhana had the whole of the Banavase Twelve-thousand under him; in Saka 1145 (A.D. 1223-4) his Bandanāyaka Jagadala Purushottama was governing the Terrigale or Terrugal Six-thousand; in Saka 1162 (A.D. 1240-1) his Mahāpradhāna Jaitrapāla was governing the Hagaritigae Three-hundred; in Saka 1163 (A.D. 1241-2) his Mahāpradhāna Lakshmpāla was governing the Nāgarakhanda country; and in Saka 1169 (A.D. 1247-8) his Mahāpradhāna and Senāpatty Bāchirāja was governing the Kurnataka and other countries, at the capital of Pulikaranagara or Lakshmeshwar.

His son, Jaitugi II., must have died in Singhana's lifetime. He certainly did not reign, as Singhana II. was succeeded immediately by his grandson Krishna; and we have no inscriptions of Jaitugi II., and no record of him beyond the mention of his name.

Of the time of Krishna, also called Kaunhara, Kauhāra, Kandhara, and Kandhara, we have six inscriptions, at Chikka-Bāgwādi and Mumawalli in the Belgaum District; and at Gadag, Nāgamve, Behatti, and Chaudādämpur, in the Dhārāwāl District. His accession was in Saka 1169 (A.D. 1247-8), the Pravaniga successor; and his capital was Devagiri. In Saka 1171 (A.D. 1249-50) his minister was Malliṣeti, who governed the Kuhundi or Kundi country from his residence at Mūdugāl. And in Saka 1175 (A.D. 1253-4) his Mahāpradhāna, in charge of the southern portions of his kingdom, was Chaundarāja, the son of the general Virhars, who had previously acquired for his sovereign the territories of the Rattas, the Kālāmras who were glorious in the Kunkana, the Pāndyas who shone at Guttī, and the turbulent Hoysalas, and had set up his pillars of victory in the neighbourhood of the river Kāverī. And the inscription that mentions Chaundarāja records a grant which, with his sovereign's permission, he made at Kukkanur, where he had arrived in the course of a victorious campaign.

Krishna was succeeded in the first instance by his younger brother, Mahādeva, called Urugmāravabhama in the Aurangabād grant.

---


which contains an expression intimating that he forcibly usurped the sovereignty. We have fourteen inscriptions of his time,—at Kuligeri and Yāligi in the Nisām’s Dominions; at Ingleswar in the Kālâgī District; and at Chaudādām�, Sangur, Purā, in the Kod Tālukā, and other places, in the Dhārward District. They range from Saka 1184 (A.D. 1262-3) to Saka 1192 (A.D. 1270-1), and fix Saka 1182 (A.D. 1260-1), the Randir samudrā, for the commencement of his reign. They do not give many historical details. But in Saka 1184 (A.D. 1262-3) and Saka 1186 we find, as his feudatory in the neighbourhood of Chaudādām�, the Mahāmāndalēsvara Guttaran of the Gulta or Gupta lineage; in Saka 1187 his Mahāpradhāna was Toragaledvārāra, who made a grant at Vijayapura; and in Saka 1191 (A.D. 1269-70) his Mahāpradhāna and Savadarikirī or ‘general manager’ was Tipparana. His capital, throughout his reign, was Devagiri.

Mahādeva’s son, Amana, is mentioned only in the Aurnagbād grant. He seems to have made an attempt to succeed his father, but to have failed, as the inscription describes Rāmachandra as forcibly wresting the kingdom from him.

The succession accordingly went back to Rāmachandra or Rāmadera, the son of Krishna, in Saka 1193 (A.D. 1271-2), the Prājapati samudrā. Under him also Devagiri continued to be the capital. Of his time we have, in addition to the Aurnagbād grant, nineteen inscriptions,—at Thānā in the Konkan; at Neregā in the Hāngal Tālukā, Lakshmeshwar, Chaudādām�, Ratnahalli, and other places, in the Dhārward District; and at Balagāme, Harihar, and Dāvanger, in Māsam. In Saka 1194 (A.D. 1272-3), his Mahāpradhāna Achyutanāyaka was governing the Sānti, or Salsetto, district in the Konkan. In Saka 1199 (A.D. 1277-8), his feudatory was the Mahāmāndalēsvara Sālana-Tikkama, who had come to Harihar in the course of a victorious expedition to the south, which had probably been directed against the Hoyaḷas of Dwārakamādura in consequence of their threatening, or perhaps invading, the southern and south-western parts of his dominions; as, in this inscription, Rāmachandra is described as seizing the goddess of the sovereignty of the Hoyaḷa kings, and Sālana-Tikkama is called ‘the establisher of the Kāḷamā kings’ and ‘the overthrower of the Hoyaḷa kings.’ In Saka 1211 (A.D. 1289-90), in one of the Thānā grants, Rāmachandra is described as reigning over the whole country of the Konkanas. In Saka 1217 (A.D. 1295-6), his Mahāpradhāna Mallidēva was governing the Pulikara or Puligere Three-hundred. And Rāmachandra is mentioned as emperor in the concluding lines of a manuscript of the Nāmasākāraṇasāstra which was written in Kaliyuga 4398 (A.D. 1297-8) at Saṉvaragiri in the Konkanas. It is therefore clear that Rāmachandra’s sway extended over all the dominions, in the central and southern parts of the Bombay Presidency, of the dynasties that had preceded his.

1 Elliot MS. Collection, Vol. II., pp. 477 to 507; and P. S. and G. C. Inscriptions, Nos. 110 and 111.
3 Jour. As., Vol. X., p. 104.
The latest of Râmachandra's inscriptions, and the last of his dynasty that is at present known to be extant, is dated in Saka 1220 (A.D. 1298-9). But, prior to that date, there had commenced the course of events which led to the entire subversion of the power of the Yâdavas of Devagiri. For the history of these events, as well as for all that we know about Samkara and Bhima, the sons, and Haripala, or perhaps Haripala, the son-in-law, of Râmachandra, we must turn to the chronicle of Ferozshah. And, as the account is that of the complete extinction of the last of the ancient Hindu dynasties of Western India, it is worthy of being given in some detail.

In A.D. 1294, Allâ-ud-din, the nephew, and subsequently the successor, of Jehâl-ud-din, the first of the Khilji emperors of Delhi, —with the permission of the king, collected a body of eight thousand chosen horse at Karâh-Mânikpur on the Ganges, which was the seat of his government, and set out to invade the Dekkan. Crossing the Narmada, which was then the northern boundary of the Devagiri kingdom, he proceeded by way of Ellichpur, and pressed on by forced marches till he arrived in the neighbourhood of Devagiri itself. Râmachandra, or Râmdeva as he is called in the Muhammadan chronicle, collected such forces as he could muster on the spur of the moment, and opposed the invaders at a distance of about four miles from his capital. But, being defeated, he was forced to retire into the hill-fort above the city, and the city itself was easily taken, entered, and pillaged by Allâ-ud-din's troops. Allâ-ud-din having given out that his force was only the advance-guard of the emperor's army,—the neighbouring chiefs, each busy with his own preparations for defence, were prevented from coalescing with Râmachandra against the invaders; —and Râmachandra, seeing that he must soon be obliged to surrender, and apprehending that the king of Delhi intended to make an entire conquest of the Dekkan, became anxious to secure peace before any other forces arrived. He accordingly offered a large amount of gold and jewels, sufficient, with the booty that Allâ-ud-din had already obtained, to indemnify him for the expenses of his expedition; and his proposals were accepted by Allâ-ud-din, who released his prisoners, and promised to quit the town on the morning of the fifteenth day from his first entrance. Meanwhile Râmachandra’s son, Samkara, who, on the first appearance of the enemy, had retired to collect troops, advanced with a large army to within a few miles of the city. Râmachandra sent word to him that peace had been concluded. But Samkara, relying on the numerical superiority of his forces, disregarded the injunctions of his father, and sent a message to Allâ-ud-din, calling on him to restore whatever plunder he had taken and to leave the province quietly. Thereupon Allâ-ud-din left a force of a thousand horse to invest the fort and to prevent a sally, and marched with the rest of his army to attack Samkara. A battle ensued, in which the Muhammadan troops, overpowered by

---

1 Briggs' translation, Vol. I., pp. 394 to 420; see also Elphinstone's History of India, Carmichael's edition, pp. 386 to 409. My account is of course only an abstract; but I have found it convenient in many places to use the actual words of Ferozshah as rendered by his translator.
numbers, fall back on all sides. They were joined, however, by the force which had been left to invest the fort. And the Hindus, prevented by the dust from discovering the numbers of this force, supposed that the king's army, of which they had heard, had arrived. A panic seized them, and they broke and fled in all directions. Allâ-ud-din did not think it prudent to pursue them, but returned and again invested the fort. Râmachandra now found himself to be in great difficulties; especially because a number of bags, supposed to contain grain, which had been taken into the fort for the support of the garrison, were found to contain only salt. He accordingly again commenced negotiations, and peace was ultimately concluded, the terms being that Allâ-ud-din should receive, on evacuating the country, six hundred manadas of pearls, two manadas of diamonds, rubies, emeralds, and sapphires, one thousand manadas of silver, and four thousand pieces of silk, besides, says Firdaša, "a long list of other precious commodities, to which reason forbids us to give credit." Also the cession of Ellichpur and its dependencies was demanded, that Allâ-ud-din might leave there a garrison for the collection of the revenues which were to be remitted to him at Karrah-Mánikpur. Allâ-ud-din accordingly released all his prisoners, and, on the twenty-fifth day from his first arrival before Dvâgâri, marched in triumph out of the city and proceeded on his return to Karrah.

It was shortly after these events that Allâ-ud-din inveigled the king, Jâlal-ud-din, into meeting him, with only a small retinue, at Mánikpur. On the 19th July, a.d. 1295, Jâlal-ud-din was treacherously murdered there by Allâ-ud-din's adherents. And Allâ-ud-din then ascended the throne of Delhi.

For some years after this, the Vâyâvas of Dvâgâri remained unmolested. But, Râmachandra having become irregular in the payment of his tribute, in a.d. 1306 Allâ-ud-din placed an army of a hundred thousand horse under the command of one of his amnads, Malik Kâfûr, and sent him to subdue the Dekkan. The expedition was reinforced on its way by the troops of Ain-ul-Mulk Multâni, the governor of Malwa, and of Alâf Khân, the governor of Gujarât; and one of the principal objects of it was to recover Dvâladvâ, the daughter of Kanladvâ who, on the defeat and flight of her husband, Karnaýa of Gujarât, in a.d. 1297, had been taken into the harem of Allâ-ud-din and had become a favourite with him. Karnaýa, taking Dvâladvâ with him, had fled to Bâgâlân, one of the districts dependent on Gujarât and bordering on the Dvâgâri dominions. He refused the demand of Malik Kâfûr that she should be given up, and eventually, listening to overtures from Dvâgâri, promised her, then in her thirteenth year, in marriage to Samkara. Karnaýa, however, was shortly after this attacked by a division of the army under Alâf Khân, and, being totally defeated, fled to Dvâgâri. Bhimadvâ, the brother of Samkara, who had conducted the negotiations for the marriage, and

1 Apparently Karnaýa II., the last of the Vyâghrapalli or Vâyâva branch of the Chalukyas of Anhilâd; Ind. Ant., Vol. VI., p. 218.
2 Bagâlân, with Chânad as its capital, appears to have been subsequently the north-west division of the province of Anhilâd.
who with only a small retinue was conveying Devaladevi to Devagiri, was intercepted by a small body of Alaf Khan’s troops, and, in the skirmish that ensued, Devaladevi was captured and taken to Alaf Khan’s camp. Alaf Khan straightway returned with her to Delhi; and she was soon after married to Allá-ud-din’s eldest son, Khizr Khán.

Malik Káfur, however, went on into the Dekkan, and, having subdued a great part of the Marathá country, which he distributed among his officers, proceeded to the siege of Devagiri. But Rámačandra, being in no condition to make successful opposition, left Sankara in the fort, and advanced with presents to meet the conqueror, in order to obtain peace. Malik Káfur, accordingly, drew up an account of his expedition and sent it to the king, and, some time after took Rámačandra with him to Delhi, with rich presents, to pay his respects. Rámačandra was received there with great marks of favour and distinction, and royal dignities were conferred upon him; and, not only was he restored to his government, but other districts were added to his dominions, for all of which he did homage and paid tribute to the king of Delhi. The king, on this occasion, gave him the district of Nasári, near Gujarát, as a personal estate, and a truc de tankas to pay his expenses home. For the rest of his life Rámačandra did not neglect to send the annual tribute to Delhi.

In A.D. 1309, Rámačandra entertained Malik Káfur and Khwája Háji at Devagiri, where they halted on their way to subdue the king of Worangal.

In A.D. 1310, Allá-ud-din, as has been mentioned in the preceding section, sent Malik Káfur and Khwája Háji with a large army to reduce the Hoysalas of Dvárasamudrá. Having reached Devagiri, they found that Rámačandra was dead, and that Sankara was not well affected to the Muhammadans. Leaving a part of his army at Paithán on the Godavari, to overawe Sankara and hold him in check, Malik Káfur continued his march to the south, and, having effected the conquest of Dvárasamudrá, where the reigning king was Ballá III., returned to Delhi in A.D. 1311, apparently without having found any cause for the time being for active operations against Sankara. But Sankara subsequently withheld his tribute. Accordingly, in A.D. 1312, Malik Káfur for the fourth time proceeded into the Dekkan, and seized Sankara and put him to death. He then laid waste Maháráshtra and the Karnáta, and Chaul and Dábhol on the coast as far as Mudgal and Raichur, and took up his residence at Devagiri, from which place he realised the tribute from the princes of Telingana and the Karnáta, and remitted it to Delhi.

Soon after this, however, Malik Káfur was summoned up to Delhi, and, while he was occupied in intrigues there, Harapála or Haripála, the son-in-law of Rámačandra, stirred up the Dokkan to
arms, expelled a number of the Muhammadan garrisons, and asserted his power over the former territories of Devagiri. The intrigues at Delhi ended in the death of Allá-ud-din, said to have been caused by poison administered by Malik Káfur on the 16th December a.d. 1316. But shortly after this, Malik Káfur himself was assassinated, and Mubárík, the third son of Allá-ud-din, was placed on the throne. In a.d. 1318, Mubárík himself led an army to chastise Harapála. On the arrival of the king, Harapála and his adherents fled. But a detachment was sent in pursuit of them, and Harapála was captured, brought back, flayed alive, and decapitated, and his head was set up over the gate of his own capital. This completed the extinction of the Yádava dynasty.

Up to a.d. 1338, Devagiri seems to have not been looked upon as a place of much importance, though it was the scene of many of the contests that occurred between the Muhammadans and the Maráthás during the completion of the subjugation of the Deccan. But, in that year, Muhammad Tughlák, who had ascended the throne of Delhi in a.d. 1325, visited Devagiri on one of his campaigns, and was so much pleased with the situation and strength of the place, and considered it to be in so much more central a position than Delhi itself, that he decided upon making it the capital of his empire. He changed its name from Devagiri, or 'the mountain of the gods', to Daulatábád, or 'the city of wealth', which name it still retains. But, though he three times compelled the population of Delhi to migrate to Daulatábád, his project of making it the capital of the empire failed in the end. Since the time of its change of name, however, Devagiri or Daulatábád has continued to be a Muhammadan town. In about a.d. 1342, it was visited by Ibn Batuta, a traveller from Tangiers, who describes the city as consisting of three parts,—Daulatábád, Kataka (probably the citadel), and Dwaikír or Devagiri.

SECTION X.
THE RATTAS OF SAUNDATTI AND BELGAUM.

We have been occupied hitherto with the history of the supreme dynasties, noticing only incidentally the great feudatory families of Mahamundalescuras, through whom,—in addition to their Mahāpradhānas, Pradhānas, Senāpatis, and Dandanīyakas,—the sovereign paramount carried on the administration of their dominions. We have now to deal in detail with these feudatory families, the members of which enjoyed a status very different from that of the other officials just named, inasmuch as,—instead of being only individual officers, of haphazard origin, selected for their personal abilities and invested with special powers,—they were the hereditary governors of different provinces of the kingdom, subordinate to whatever dynasty happened at the time to exercise the supreme sway.

The dynasty of the Rāshtrakutas died out, as we have seen, in the person of Kakka III., or Kakkala, in Saka 895 (A.D. 973-4). They left, however, an impress of their power and dominion in this part of the country, which long survived themselves, in the Ratta Mahāmandalescuras, who, for about three and a half centuries,—first as the feudatories of the Rāshtrakutas, then as the feudatories of the Western Chālukyas, and then apparently of their own independent authority until they were conquered by the Yādava of Devagiri,—had the government of the Kundi or Kulundī Three-thousand province, a division of the Kuntala country, which included the greater part of the Belgaum District and the south-western parts of the Kalâgṛ District. Their capital was first Suganbhavarti, the modern Saundatti 1 in the Belgaum District, and afterwards Venugrama or Veḷugrama, the modern Belgaum itself; and their inscriptions are found at these two places, and at Watnâl, Sogal, Mutwâd, Nesargi, Hannikeri, Komur, Kalhole, and Bhoj, in the Belgaum District,—at Khamâpur and Râyâbâg in the Kolâpar State,—and at Lokâpur on the highroad between Belgaum and Kalâgṛ.

In some of their inscriptions the members of this family call themselves Rāshtrakutas; and in one or two passages they assert that they belonged to the lineage of Krishna II. of that dynasty. But in the majority of instances they use the name of Ratta; and, though they may possibly have been of the same original stock with the Rāshtrakutas, the probability is that they were only some local division of the Reddi caste. They were of the Jain religion. They had the title of Lattalur-parnavaradhibhâcara or Lattanur-parnavaradhibhâcara, 'supreme lord of Lattalur or Lattanur, the best of cities';

1 Lat. 15° 47' N., Long. 78° 12' E.; the chief town of the Paragall Tâlkâ.
but this city, which was therefore the place from which they originally started, has not yet been identified. They were entitled to carry the banner of a golden Garuda,¹ and to use the mark of red-lead or vermilion.² What the latter was, I have not been able to determine; but, as to the former, the only copper-plate grant of this family that has been discovered has on its seal a human figure, kneeling on its right knee, which must be Garuda. They were also entitled to have the musical instrument called śrīcālī played before them.

The following is the Ratta genealogy:

```
Merada.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prithvirāma. (Saka 707.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pittuga.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sāntivarmā. (Saka 902.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kārāvīrya I. (Saka 902.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dāvāra, or Dāyimā.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erūga.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sena I.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kānnaikāra I.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kārāvīrya II. (Saka 1009 and 1018.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sena II.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kārāvīrya III. (Saka 1065 and 1080.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakshmideva I. (Saka 1130.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kārāvīrya IV. (Saka 1121 and 1146.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mallikārjuna. (Saka 1125 and 1150.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lakshmideva II. (Saka 1150.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```
Merada and his son, Prithvirāma, were originally teachers of the Kāraya sect of the holy Mallāpatirtha. Prithvirāma was the first of the family to be invested with the rank and authority of a Mahābīrāma or Mahābīrāmāsura,—by the Rāshtrakuta king Krishna II., about Saka 797 (A.D. 875-6). Of Pitsuqa, the son of Prithvirāma, we have no record, except that he confronted and repulsed a certain Ajayavarna, who came to attack him, and that his wife was Nījikabbe or Nījīyabbe. Of the time of his son, Sāntivarmā or Sānta, whose wife was Chandikabbe, we have one inscription, at Saundatti, dated Saka 903 (A.D. 980-1) the Vikrama samvatāsura. It mentions him as the feudatory of the Western Chālukya king Tula II., but does not give any further historical information about him.

After Sāntivarmā there is a break in the genealogy, there being nothing to show whether Nāna was his uncle or brother, or in what way he was related to him. Of Nāna, also called Nannapayyavarna, we have no details. Of the time of his son, Kārtavira I. or Katta I., there is one inscription, at Sogal near Saundatti. It is of the same date as the inscription of his predecessor, Sāntivarmā, viz. Saka 902 (A.D. 980-11), and records that he was governing the Kundi country as the feudatory of the Western Chālukya king Taila II. Another and later inscription speaks of him again as the feudatory of Taila II., who is mentioned therein by his title of Aḥavamalla I., and also records that it was he who fixed the boundaries of the Kuhundi or Kundi country.

Of Dāvari or Dāyima, Kannakaira I. or Kanna I., and Erega or Eraga, we have no inscriptions or historical information. Of the time of Anka there are two inscriptions,—at Saundatti. One of them is the first part of a tablet which also bears a later inscription; it is dated Saka 970 (A.D. 1048-9), the Sarvadārhi samvatāsura, and records that he was the feudatory of the Western Chālukya king Somesvara I. The other is a fragment of the same date.

Of Sena I. or Kālasena I., and his wife Mallāladevi, we have no details. His eldest son, Kannakaira II. or Kanna II., is mentioned as one of the feudatories Mahāamaladevasura in the Tidgundi grant, from the Kaladgi District, of the Western Chālukya king Vikramaditya VI., which is dated Saka 1004 (A.D. 1082-3), the Dundubhi samvatāsura. He is also mentioned as the feudatory of the same king and of his son Jayakarna, in an inscription at Konnur, in the Belgam District, dated Saka 1009 (A.D. 1087-8), the Prabhaka samvatāsura. And he seems to have been alive, and to have continued in authority, in conjunction with his younger brother Kārtavira II., up to Saka 1018 (A.D. 1096-7), the Dātna samvatāsura; as he is mentioned, after the record of that date, in one of the Saundatti inscriptions.

---

5 Id., p. 104; P. S. and O.-C. Inscriptions, No. 88.
6 S. 767—11
Of the time of Káravirya II. or Katta II.,—also called Senam-Singha, or 'the lion of Sena,'—and his wife Bhágaladevi, we have four inscriptions,—a fragment at Saundatti, the date of which is lost, but the preamble of which shows that he had held office under the Western Chalukya king Somesvara II.; another at Saundatti, which is dated Saka 1099 (A.D. 1087-8), the Prabha in sasvatavar, one at Warnál, which is dated in either the same or the following year; and the above-mentioned Saundatti inscription of Saka 1018 (A.D. 1096-7).

Of Sena II. or Kálasena II., and his wife Lakshmidadevi, we have no details. Of the time of Káravirya III. or Kattana, and his wife Padmaladevi or Padmavati, we have four inscriptions,—two at Khánápur in the Kolhapur State, dated Saka 1065 (A.D. 1143-4), the Radhironjí in sasvatavar, and Saka 1084 (A.D. 1162-3), the Chitrakshirá in sasvatavar; one at Bíd-Hongal in the Belgaum District, dated Saka 1086 (A.D. 1164-5), the Táman in sasvatavar; and one at Kunur, the date of which is effaced. In the first, he is spoken of as the founder of the Western Chalukya King Jagadokamalla II., and in the third, as being, or rather having been, the founder of Tála III. of the same dynasty. But in the fourth he has the title of chakvasvarti, or 'universal emperor.' From this, and from the fact that his descendants, though they retain the title of Mahamandaleśvara, speak of themselves as enjoying adhirája, or 'complete sovereignty,' and do not give the names of any paramount sovereigns in their inscriptions, it is plain that, in the time of Sena II. or of Káravirya III., the Rattars established their independence, taking advantage of the general confusion that must have prevailed during the last few years of the Chalukya dynasty, in the occurrence of the events that finally ended in the complete subversion of it by Bijaia of the Kalachuri family.

Of Lakshmidadeva I., Lakshmana, or Lakshmídhara, whose wife was Chandaladevi or Chandrikádevi, we have one inscription,—at HANNIKERI near Sambigraha, dated Saka 1130 (A.D. 1208-9), the Vihíva in sasvatavar. It is in this inscription that we first find that the capital of the Rattars was moved from Sugandhavarí to Vemugrama, and that, in addition to the Kundi Thres-thousand, they possessed also the Vemugrama Seventy, a district which they appear to have acquired by conquest from the Kádambas of Goa. This inscription speaks of Lakshmidadeva I., as a descendant of the Ráshtrakuta king Krishna II., to whom it gives the title of Kándhara-p unsur-adiśvara, or 'supreme lord of Kándhárapura, the best of cities.' This may have been one of the original cities of the Ráshtrakutas; but the present mention of it is an isolated one.

Of the time of Káravirya IV., and his brother Mallikárjuna, who reigned conjointly with him as Yuvrajás, we have seven inscriptions,—one at Sankeswar near Chikkodi, dated Saka 1121 (A.D. 1199-1200), the Siddhárdhi in sasvatavar, and Saka 1124, the Dandubhi in sasvatavar; one at Rayabáig, dated Saka 1124 for Saka 1123

---

2. Elliot M.S. Collection, Vol. II., pp. 341 and 342.
5. Elliot M.S. Collection, Vol. II., p. 341.
(A.D. 1201-2), the Durmati samvatara; two, which were formerly at Belgaum but were removed from there and have now been entirely lost sight of, dated Saka 1127 for Saka 1126 (A.D. 1204-5), the Raktakshi samvatara; one at Kalhole near Golak, of the same date; one, a copper-plate grant, at Bhoj near Chikkodi, dated Saka 1131 for Saka 1130 (A.D. 1208-9), the Vishava samvatara; and one at Neergi near Sampganum, dated Saka 1141 for Saka 1140 (A.D. 1218-9), the Bahudhânya samvatara. From the dates of his earlier inscriptions, it is plain that Kârtavirya IV, first shared the government with his father Lakshmideva I. His wives were Echâdâevi and Mâdâevi or Mahâdevi.

Of the time of Lakshmideva II., also called Boppana-Singa, or 'the lion of Boppa,' we have only one inscription,—at Saundatti; it is dated Saka 1151 for Saka 1150 (A.D. 1228-9), the Sarvâdhâri samvatara. This is the last notice that we have of the Rattas. Lakshmideva II. seems to have been the last of his race, and to have succumbed to the rising power of the Yadavas of Devagiri. By Saka 1150 we find Singhana II. of that dynasty making grants and setting up inscriptions in the neighbourhood of Kolhapur, in the Kalâdgi District, in the Torsgal Six-thousand, in the Belvola country, and in Dhârwâd and Maisur; in sufficient numbers to show that the whole of the country on the north, east, and south of the Kundil Three-thousand was then entirely subject to him; though, as is shown by the date of the inscription of Lakshmideva II., he had evidently left the Rattas unmolested up to them. In Saka 1171 (A.D. 1240-50), however, we find Singhana's son Krishna in possession of the Kundil Three-thousand. It must have been, therefore, in the latter part of Singhana's reign that the Rattas were subjugated by his minister and general Vichana, as recorded in the Behatti grant of Krishna dated Saka 1175.

---

2 Elliot MS. Collections, Vol. II., pp. 571 and 576.
6 Id., Vol. XII., p. 42.
SECTION XI.

THE KADAMBAS OF BANAWASI AND HANGAL.

As in the case of the Western Chalukyas and Chalukyas, so, in the case of the Kadambas and Kadambas, the difference in the first syllable of the name seems to imply that the Kadamba Mahadevadevaras of Banawasi and Hangal, and their relatives of Goa of whom we shall treat in the following Section, cannot claim a direct lineal descent from the early Kadamba kings of whom an account has been given in Section II. above.

The Kadambas of Banawasi and Hangal deduce their origin from the three-eyed and four-armed Mavuraravarna, the Mukkamana-Kadamba of one inscription—who was the son of the god Siva and the earth. This legend as to the birth of Mavuraravarna, taken in connection with the legend of the Kadambas of Goa, that the founder of their family, Jayanta or Trilochana-Kadamba, sprang from the earth at the foot of a kadamba-tree, where a drop of sweat fell from the forehead of Siva after the conquest of Tripura, suggests the inference that the Kadambas, and perhaps the Kadambas before them, were an aboriginal race; and not one of the Aryan tribes that immigrated from the north; especially if, as Mr. Rice intimates, the kadamba-tree is one of the body-producing palms which are so common throughout the districts ruled over by the Kadambas and Kadambas. At the same time it is worthy of notice that there is also a tradition that Mavuraravarna, not simply introduced but brought with him, twelve-thousand Brahmanas, of thirty-two gotras, purified by performing the agnihotra sacrifice, from the upagraha of Ahichchhata, and established them in the

1 Lat. 14° 23' N., Long. 73° 7' E.; in the first Taluka of the North Kaarea District.
2 Lat. 14° 46' N., Long. 73° 12' E.; the chief town of the Taluka of the same name in the Dharmal District.
3 P. S. and O. C. Inscriptions, No. 221.
4 Mysore Inscriptions, p. xxxii.
5 That liquor is distilled in some way or other from the kadamba-tree is shown by the legend in the Vaisnav-Purana, V., iv., where Varuna or Madira, at the command of her husband Varuna, established herself in the hollow of a kadamba-tree, in the woods of Vrkaerams; and Baladeva, roaming about, came there, and, smelling the pleasant fragrance of liquor, resumed his ancient passion for strong drink (invidas; madiras); Wilson's translation; Hall's edition, Vol. V., p. 55.—It is added in a footnote, there is no vinous exudation from the kadamba-tree; but its flowers are said to yield a spirit, by distillation: whence Kadambabri is one of the synonyms of wine or spirituous liquor.
6 There were evidently at least two places, whatever region or cities, called Ahichchhata.—General Cunningham (Archaeological Reports, Vol. 1., p. 235) identifies one of them with the modern Kammuti, about twenty-two miles to the north of Badam in the North-West Province. While Prof. Lewis (Map of Ancient India) identifies apparently the same one with the modern Farukhabad, about fifty-five miles to the south-east of Badam.—Prof. Hall (Vaisnav-Purana, Vol. II., p. 161, note 3) suggests that one of them was but far from the Vindhy mountains. A Suta inscription (P. S. and O. C. Inscriptions, No. 56) records that Suta, who was the son of Pulkas, and who was married to a Kadamba princess, was born at Ahichchhata on the bank of the river Similin.—For other references, see Ind. Ant., Vol. IX., p. 252, note.
The Kādambas of Banawāsī and Hāṅgāl were entitled to have the musical instrument called *perumattī* played before them,—to carry the banner of a monkey, or perhaps of Hanumān, the king of monkeys,—and to use the signet of a lion. One of their family-titles was *Banawāsī-puravara-dākṣīvara*, or ‘supreme lord of Banawāsī, the best of cities.’ And their family-god was Viṣṇu, under the name of Madhukēswara of Jayantipura or Banawāsī.

The fullest account of the genealogy is given in a stone-tablet inscription at Kārgudāri in the Hāṅgāl Tālaikō of the Dāhārā District; and, with a few additions from an inscription at Banawāsī, another at Hāṅgāl, and other sources, is as shown in the accompanying table. The Kārgudāri inscription states that Mayūrvān’s 1st was preceded by seventy-seven ancestors, who all reigned in succession; but as yet we have no further information regarding them. Including, as it does, a number of names as to which we have no historical data, it is of course open to doubt whether the list is altogether authentic; especially since the Ṛāśtrakula inscriptions from Nidāgūnd, Kyāsann, Tālgund, and A’dur, all in the neighbourhood of Hāṅgāl, show that at any rate up to Saka 939 (A.D. 1047-8) the Kādambas were preceded in the government of the Banawāsī province by the members of another family of Mahāmaṇḍāsvaras, called Chaḷlakotīs or Chaḷlaputakas, whose history has still to be worked out.

Out of the annexed list of names, the first, in chronological order, of which we have any historical information, is that of Kīrtīvāṁsa II. or Kīrtīdeva I., also called Taḷḷana-Singa or ‘the lion of Taḷḷa,’ the son of Taḷḷa or Taḷḷapa I. and Chaḷvandakādevi. We find him in Saka 990 (A.D. 1068-9), the Kīlaṅga saṃrāṭasara, governing the Banawāsī Twelvethousand, as the feudatory of the Western Chaḷukya king Soms-vara I. And in Saka 998 (A.D. 1076-7), the Nala saṃrāṭasara, and in Saka 999, the Pīngala saṃrāṭasara, he was still governing the same district, as the feudatory of the Western Chaḷukya king Vikramādiyāya VI.

In Saka 1010 (A.D. 1088-9), the Viḷhaḷa saṃrāṭasara, we find Sāntivasrīmashya II., Śānta, or Sāntaya, governing the Banawāsī Twelvethousand and the Pāṅgāl or Hāṅgāl Five-hundred, as the feudatory of Vikramādiyāya VI.* His wife was Siriyādōvī, of the Pāṇḍya family.

---

2. *Satkālaśatrāvastūbhīva*; equivalent to *rontkālaśatrāvastūbhīva*. Conf. the *saṃrāṭasaratā* of the Kādambas of Goa.
3. *Sāntivasra*. This was also used by the Kādambas of Gauḍa, and appears on their coins and on the seals of their copper-plate grants. No coins or copper-plate of the Kādambas of Banawāṣī and Hāṅgāl have been discovered yet.
4. *Ind. Ant.*, Vol. X., p. 239.
6. Elliot, *M.S. Collection*, Vol. II., p. 69; and P. S. and G. C. Inscriptions, No. 90, where, on the authority of *Inscriptions in Jharar and Mover*, it is wrongly entered as being at Huli in the Bulambār District. The original inscriptions appear to be not forthcoming now.
In Saka 1021 (A.D. 1009-1100), the Pramâdi samvatsara, in Saka 1030 (A.D. 1108-9), the Sarvadhâri samvatsara, in Saka 1044 (A.D. 1122-3), the Subhakrit samvatsara, and in Saka 1046 (A.D. 1124-5), the Krodhik samvatsara, we find Taila or Tailapa II. governing the Banavás Twelve-thousand and the Pânungal Five-hundred, as the feudatory of Vikramâditya VI.¹ In the inscription of Saka 1030, his capital is called Pântipura; this is only another name of Hângal, which in the inscriptions of this period is also called Viralakote and Viralâmârâ. His wives were Bâchaladevi, of the Pândya family, and Châmaladevi, who was the mother of Tailama. Taila II. appears to have died in Saka 1057 (A.D. 1135-6), the Râkshasa samvatsara, during, or soon after, a siege of Hângal by the Hoysalas under Vishnuvardhana.² The Banavâsi and Hângal districts were then subjugated for the time being by Vishnuvardhana; but they were not retained by him for long.

In Saka 1053 (A.D. 1131-2), the Virodhikrit samvatsara, Mayurâvâsmâ III. was governing the Banavâsi Twelve-thousand and the Hângal Five-hundred, presumably in conjunction with his father Tailapa II., as the feudatory of the Western Châlukya king Somesvara III.³

In Saka 1064 (A.D. 1182-3), the Paridhâri samvatsara, presumably in conjunction with his father Tailapa II., and in Saka 1067 (A.D. 1185-6), the Râkshasa samvatsara, after his father’s death, Mallikârjuna I., also called Tribhuvanamallarasa, another son of Tailapa II., was governing the Banavâsi Twelve-thousand and the Pânungal Five-hundred, as the feudatory of Somesvara III., — and again in Saka 1066 (A.D. 1144-5), the Raktâkahi samvatsara, as the feudatory of Jagadeksamalla II.⁴

And in Saka 1111 (A.D. 1189-90), the Sauny samvatsara, Kâmadeva or Kâvadeva, also called Tailamane-Anukâra or ‘the warrior or champion of Tailama,’ was governing the Banavâsi Twelve-thousand, the Pânungal Five-hundred, and the Puliguru or Lakshmanesvar Three-hundred, as the feudatory of the Western Châlukya king Somesvara IV., after subjugating the countries of Male, Tulu, the Konkamas, and the Western Ghânts. Kâmadeva’s wife was Kataladevi. There are two other inscriptions of Kâmadeva, at Hângal.⁵ One of them is dated in the sixteenth year of his reign, the Nâla samvatsara, i.e. Saka 1118 (A.D. 1196-7); which gives Saka 1108 (A.D. 1181-2), the Sârvari samvatsara, as his initial date. This inscription is on a cipiyal or monumental tablet, the sculptures on which are a very vivid representation of battle-scenes. It records that in Saka 1118 the Hoysala king Vira-Ballâla or Ballâla II. came and pitched his camp at the Anikere, the large tank on the west side of Hângal, and thence besieged the city. He was defeated, and repulsed for the time, by Kâmadeva’s forces under his generals Sohani and his son Pâdimûrâ or Pâdimayya, the former of whom was

² Elliot MS. Collection, Vol. I., pp. 723 and 725. 
³ Id., Vol. I., pp. 834, 835, and 806. 
⁴ Id., Vol. I., pp. 685, 723, 725, and 727. 
⁵ Id., Vol. I., p. 712. 
⁶ See note 6, p. 63. 
⁷ P. S. and O. C. Inscriptions, Nos. 106 and 107; Elliot MS. Collection, Vol. II., p. 663.
GENEALOGY OF THE KA'DAMBAS OF BANAWA'SI AND HANGAL

Mayuravarma I.
  Krishnavarma.
    Nagavarma I.
      Vishnuravma.
        Mrigavarma.
          Satyavarma.
            Vijayavarma.
              Jayavarma I.
                Nagavarma II.
                  Santivarma I.
                    Ketivarma I.
                      A'dityavarma.
                        Chattaya,
                          Chatta, or Chattuga.
                            Jayavarma II.,
                              or Jayasimha.
                                Mavaldeva.
                                  Taila I.,
                                    or Tailapa I.
                                      Ketivarma II.,
                                        or Kirtideva I.
                                          (Saka 990 and 991.)
                                            Taila II.,
                                              or Tailapa II.
                                                (Saka 1021 and 1027.)
                                                  Mayuravarma III.
                                                    (Saka 1033.)
                                                      Mullikarjuna I.
                                                        (Saka 1054 and 1057.)
                                                          Tailama.
                                                            Kirtideva II.
                                                              (Saka 1103 and 1125.)
                                                                Kamadeva.
                                                                  Chokideva,
                                                                    or Jokideva.
                                                                      Vikrama,
                                                                        or Vikramanka.
killed in the battle. But Ballāla II. seems to have soon afterwards completely subjugated the Kādambas and annexed their territory. There are inscriptions at Satēnhallī in the Kōd Tālakā which show that Kāmdeva was still making active resistance, though he had apparently lost Hāngal itself, in Saka 1125 (A.D. 1283-4); the Būdhiḥirāgīrī samvattevara, but what became of him after that date is not yet known.

In addition to the above, there are several detached names, the owners of which claim to belong to the family of the Kādambas of Banawāsī and Hāngal, and about whom we have historical information, though they cannot as yet be referred to their places in the annexed genealogy. Thus, in Saka 941 (A.D. 1019-20), the Sīdhiḥirāti samvattevara, the Mahāmandaletara Kundamarana, also called Sattigana-Chatta, was governing the Banavasi Twelve-thousand, the Sāntalīga Thosand which would seem to have been somewhere in the north or north-west of Maïsur, and the Hayvo Five-hundred or the country between Banawāsī and Balagānung and the sea, up to the borders of the western ocean, at his capital of Bālipura or Balagānung, as the feudatory of the Western Chālukya king Jayasimha III. In Saka 956 (A.D. 1034-5), the Bhāra samvattevara, in Saka 960 (A.D. 1038-9), the Bahuddhānya samvattevara, and in Saka 966 (A.D. 1044-5), the Tārana samvattevara, the Mahāmandaletara Mayuravarnā II. was governing the Pānungra Five-hundred, as the feudatory first of Jayasimha III. and then of Somesvara I. In Saka 967 (A.D. 1045-6), the Pārthiva samvattevara, in Saka 969, the Sarvajit samvattevara, and in Saka 970, the Sarvadāhāri samvattevara, the Mahāmandaletara Chāmudārāya was governing the Banavasi Twelve-thousand at his capital of Bālīgāvī or Balagānung, as the feudatory of Somesvara I. In Saka 977 (A.D. 1055-6), the Manmatha samvattevara, the Mahāmandaletara Harikesari was governing the Banavasi Twelve-thousand, as the feudatory of Vijramālīya VI., who was then the viceroy for the above district and that of the Gangavādi Ninety-six-thousand. In Saka 989 (A.D. 1067-8), the Plavaṃga samvattevara, the Mahāmandaletara Sujīmarana was governing the Pānungra Five-hundred, as the feudatory of Somesvara I. In Saka 1002 (A.D. 1070-1), the Vikriti samvattevara, Nāgatiyaras or Nāgālīya, and his son Ketaraa, the lord of Ucchhāngigiri, were governing a One-thousand district, which was probably the Sāntulīga Thosand, in subordination to the Mahāmandaletara Vijayapālīya, of the Pāṇḍya family, who had acknowledged allegiance to the Western Chālukya king Tails III. up to Saka 1084, but who must have been independent at the time of this inscription. In Saka 1163 (A.D. 1241-2), the Virodhiṅkītī samvattevara, and Saka 1713 (A.D. 1251-2), the Virodhiṅkītī samvattevara,

---

1 Elliot MSS. Collection, Vol. II., pp. 309, 322, and 323.
2 Satīga is another form of the name Sāyāsrya. In the present instance it denotes the Western Chālukya king Sāyāsrya II.
3 Ind. Ant., Vol. V., p. 15.
4 Elliot MSS. Collection, Vol. I., pp. 87, 63, and 60.
5 Ad., Vol. I., pp. 91 and 92; and Ind. Ant., Vol. IV., p. 179.
7 Elliot MSS. Collection, Vol. I., p. 178. See also under Samadeva, the last name in the section.
8 P. S. and O.C. Inscriptions, No. 118.
Vira-Mallideva or Mallikārjuna II. was governing the Banavāsa Twelve-thousand and the Pānungal Five-hundred, apparently independently; and his initial date is fixed as either Saka 1137 (A.D. 1215-6), the Yava samavatsara, or Saka 1138, the Dhatu samavatsara, by two other inscriptions which, without specifying the Saka year, give the Khata samavatsara, which was Saka 1162, as both the fifteenth and the sixteenth year of his reign. And finally there is the Mahāmandalevara Somadeva, Soyideva, or Sovideva, who was governing apparently the Pānungal Five-hundred in the Durmukha samavatsara, his second year, the Vilambi samavatsara, his fourth year, and the Vīkari samavatsara, his fifth year; but there is nothing in his inscriptions to enable us to refer them to the Saka era. It is possible that he is the same person as the Soyinara mentioned above, who, as the feudatory of Somesvara I., was governing the Pānungal Five-hundred in Saka 989 (A.D., 1067-8), the Pārangga samavatsara.

1 Elliot MS. Collection, Vol. II., pp. 603 and 604.
2 Id., Vol. II., pp. 600 and 601.
3 Id., Vol. II., pp. 607 to 610.
SECTION XII.

THE KADAMBAS OF GOA.

There was another family of Kádamba Mahámandalesvaras, at Gopakapattana, Gopakapuri, Gova, or Goa, with a minor capital at Palásika, Palasige, or Palani, the modern Halse or Halsi¹ in the Khánuapur Taluká of the Belgaum District. They were undoubtedly of the same original stock as the Kádambas of Banavásái and Hángal, though no indication has yet been obtained as to the point at which the two genealogies may be joined. But the separation of the two families must be of considerable antiquity; as each branch has a different name for the founder of it, though it is possible that the two names may be shown hereafter to belong to one and the same person. The Kádambas of Banavásái and Hángal derive their origin from the three-eyed and four-armed Mayuravarna, the son of Siva and the earth. Whereas the Kádambas of Goa derive their origin from the three-eyed and four-armed Jayanta, otherwise called Trilochana-Kádamba, who sprang from a drop of sweat that fell to earth near the roots of a kadambari-tree from the forehead of the god Siva after the conquest of Tripura.

There are some indications that they were preceded at Goa by a Konkana branch of the Sihará family, the founder of which was Jhálahulla, and the representative of which, in Saka 930 (A.D. 1008-9), was Kálimáka, the feudatory of the Western Chalukya king Satyakaráya II.² This, however, is not as yet a certainty, and requires further investigation before it can be accepted as such.

Neither as to this, nor as to how the Kádambas first came into the Belgaum District and the Goa-mar territory, have we as yet any definite information.

Like the Kádambas of Banavásái and Hángal, the Kádambas of Goa had the family-title of 'supreme lord of Banavásái, the best of cities,' and were entitled to have the musical instrument called peruvilä played before them,—to carry the banner of a monkey,³ and to use the signet of a lion, which appears on the seals of the two copper-plate grants of this family that have been discovered, and on the gold coins of Permádi and Jayakesa III.⁴ Their family-god was Siva, under the name of Saptakotisvara.⁵ Their inscriptions are found at Goa itself,—at Halsi, Golihali, Bailur, Degánva, Kittur.

¹ Lat. 15° 22' N., Long. 74° 40' E.
⁴ The temple of Saptakotisvara is said to be 'Navrati' in Goa (Ibid., p. xiv.)
⁵ This is perhaps the 'Navrati' of the map, on the island of Pédiaf. The image is said to have been re-established by Máthavártya who, when he was the Maháválišáya of Harshara II., of Vijayanagara (about A.D. 1338), besought Goa and expelled the Tumbahías or Mahámandalesvaras (Ibid., Vol. IX., p. 227).

767—12
and Gudikatti, in the Belgaum District, and at Narendra in the Dhārwar District; and, contrary to the usual practice, they are generally dated in the Kaliyuga era instead of in the Saka era. Their genealogy is as below:

Guhalla.

Shashthadeva I.
Chatta, Chattala, or Chattaya.
(Saka 929.)

Jayakesi I.
(Saka 974.)

Vijayaditya I.

Jayakesi II.
(Saka 1047.)

Fermadi, or Sivachitta.
(Saka 1060 to 1097.)

Vijayaditya II., or Vishnuchitta.
(Saka 1069 and 1095.)

Jayakesi III.
(Saka 1097 and 1119.)

Tribhuvamalla.

Shashthadeva II.
(Saka 1169 and 1173.)

A daughter.
(Married to Kunanada or Kāhane.)

Of Guhalla, also called Vyāghramāri or 'the tiger-slayer,' we have no historical details. Shashthadeva I., Chatta, Chattala, or Chattaya, is mentioned in the Gudikatti inscription as being in Saka 929 (A.D. 1007-8), the Phavanga samvatsara, the feudatory of Jayasimha III. of the Western Chalukya dynasty; at that time Satyavaraya II. was still reigning, and Jayasimha III., his nephew, can have been only his viceroy. The second part of the same inscription mentions Jayakesi I. as being in Saka 974 (A.D. 1052-3), the Nandana samvatsara, the feudatory of the Western Chalukya king Somesvara I. And it is in other places recorded of him that he slew the king of Kāpardikadvipa, destroyed the Cholas, and uprooted Kannada, that he assembled the Kādambas, conquered the Alipras, and established the Chalukyas in their kingdom, that he caused the Chalukyas and the Cholas to become friends at Kāñcāi, and that

1 The initial date of the Kaliyuga is the vernal equinox of A.D. 3102 (Fed. Asl., Vol. V., p. 132). For convenience of comparison with the other tables in this paper, Saka dates are substituted for the Kaliyuga dates in the genealogical table of this family.
he established himself at Gopakapattna as his capital. Kāparidikadviṣa is perhaps the island and adjoining territories of Shatashasti or Salsette, as named after Kāpari II., of the Konkana branch of the Silāhāras, who was reigning in the Konkana in Saka 775 (A.D. 853-4) and Saka 799, in the time of the Bāhtrakuta king Amoghavardha I. And, if so, the king of Kāparidikadviṣa, slain by Jayakesi I., must be Nāgārjuna, who was intermediate between Ĉhitarāja (Saka 946) and Mummuni or Mummvāni (Saka 982), and as to the events of whose reign the Silāhāra inscriptions are silent. That the Silāhāras met with some serious reverses in or about the time of Nāgārjuna, is apparent from what is said of Anantapala or Anantadeva, the son of Nāgārjuna; viz., that he cast into the ocean of the edge of his sword those wicked heaps of sin, who, at a time of misfortune from relatives that had become hostile, obtained power and devastated the whole of this Konkana district, harassing gods and Brāhmaṇa.” In the Devadānyaksha of Hemachandra and Abhayatilaka, it is narrated that Karma I., of the dynasty of the Chaulukyaś of Anhilwād, married Mayamalladevi, the daughter of a Kādamba king Jayakesi who was ruling at Chandrapura in the Dekkan. Karma’s date being from a.d. 1003-4 to a.d. 1005-4, this Jayakesi of Chandrapura seems to be the present Jayakesi I.; but Chandrapura has not been identified,—unless perchance, it is a Sanskritised form of Chandagad, the chief town of the Mahāl of that name in the Belgaum District.

Of his son, Vijayāditya I. or Vijayārka I., the only definite record that we have is that his wife was Chattaladevi, the sister of Bijnaladevi who was the mother of Jagaddeva of the Sāntara family of Patti-Pombochchaphura.

His son, Jayakesi II., who styles himself Konkana-Chakravarti, or universal emperor of the Konkanas, was the contemporary, and in the inscriptions is called the elder brother by courtesy for cousin, of the Jagaddeva referred to above. The only inscription of his time that we have is a stone-tablet at Narendra, which is dated Saka 1047 (A.D. 1125-6), the Vīsvarasu samantraya, while, as the feudatory of the Western Chālukya king Vikramāditya VI., he was governing the Konkana Nine-hundred, the Palasige Twelve-thousand, the Payve orgayyove Five-hundred, and the Kavadiyapacand-and-a-quarter, which would seem to be the Kāparidikadviṣa mentioned above and to include the northern provinces of the Konkanas. In his earlier years he seems to have made an attempt to throw off the Chālukya supremacy; as it is to his time that we must refer the events which led to A'chugi II. of the Sinda family, another feudatory of Vikramāditya VI., taking Goa and giving it to the flames, and seizing upon the Konkana; and he is undoubtedly the Jayakesi whom Permadi I., the son of A'chugi II., met and put to flight. His quarrel with the Chālukyas, however, must have been

---

2. *Ind. Ant.* Vol. IX., p. 37. *The full bearing of this passage cannot be determined till we obtain an explanation of narasenovarajavata and Varahapattikavi.*
soon and permanently made up again, as Vikramādītya VI. gave him his daughter Malladāvi in marriage. Jayakeshī II. was also at some time or other conquered by the Hoysala king Vishnuvar-

dhana, who thereby acquired the Halasigē or Palasigē district; but it must have been soon recovered by the Kādambas. Jayakeshī II. also appears to be the Mahāmandaleshvar Jayakeshī who is mentioned, in one of the Western Chālukya inscriptions at Lakṣmeshwar dated Saka 1069 (A.D. 1147-8), the Prabhava samvatara, among the persons of distinction to whom presents were given at the time of making a grant to the god Somanātha.

The sons of Jayakeshī II. were Permādi, also called Permā and Paramardi, and Vijayādīya II., also called Vijayārka II. They also acquired respectively the names of Sivachitta and Vījanuchitta, by their devotion to the gods Śiva and Viṣṇu. Permādi had also the title of Malavara-mārī, 'the slayer of the Malayas, or the people of the Gauḍ country,' which corresponds to Malaparāl-ganāla, one of the titles of the Hoysala dynasty. And Vijayādīya II. had also the title of Vānihbhushana or Saravatithushana. Permādi's wife was Kāmaladevi. In one passage her father Kānamadeva is said to be of the Somavamsa, or race of the moon, and her mother Chattaladēvi to be of the Pāṇḍya family; while in another passage Kānamadeva is said to be of the Sūryavamsa, or race of the sun, and Chattaladēvi to be of the Somavamsa. It was Kāmaladevi who caused to be built the small but elaborately sculptured temple of the god Kamā-Nārāyana and the goddess Mahālakṣmi at Deogāve, which contains three of the inscriptions of this family; it was constructed by Tippejō, the satrudhāri or 'mason' of the god Bankeśvaradeva, and the son of the satrudhāri Holloja of Huvina-Bāge or probably Rāyabāg in the Kolhapur State, and by Tippejō's son Bagojī. Vijayādīya's wife was Lakṣmesīdeva, the daughter of a king Lakshmidēva. The two brothers reigned conjointly, from Kaliyuga 4248 (Saka 1069; A.D. 1147-8), the Prabhava samvatara. The earliest of their inscriptions, at Golihalli, is dated in the fourteenth year, the Vikrama samvatara (Saka 1082; A.D. 1160-1), the seventeenth year, the Svarāhāna samvatara (Saka 1085; A.D. 1163-4), and the twenty-sixth year, the Nandana samvatara (Saka 1094; A.D. 1172-3), of the reign of Permādi.

He was then, at his capital of Gove, ruling over the Konkanā Nine-hundred, the Palasigē Twelvethousand, and the Venngrāma or Belgam Seventy. The Bāllur inscription is dated in the twenty-first year of his reign, the Sarvajīt samvatara, which was Kaliyuga 4268 (Saka 1089; A.D. 1167-8), and also in his twenty-second year, the Sarvājīt śunvatara. In one of the Halasigē inscriptions, we find him, in the twenty-third year of his reign, Kaliyuga 4270 (Saka 1091; A.D. 1169-70), the Virodhī śunvatara, making a grant of the village of Sindavalli in the Kalagiri kṣapata of the Palasigē district. In one of the Deogāve inscriptions, we find him, in the twenty-eighth year of his reign,
Kaliyuga 4275 (Saka 1096; A.D. 1174-5), the Jaya samvatsara, reigning at Gopakapuri, and making a grant of the village of Dagámve in the Dagámve kampana of the Palásiká district. 1 And by another inscription at Golihalli, in Kaliyuga 4288, the Manmatha samvatsara, he and his mother Malaladevi were reigning at Gova; the proper date of this inscription, however, seems to be Kaliyuga 4270 (Saka 1097; A.D. 1175-6), which was the Manmatha samvatsara, Kaliyuga 4283 being the Subhakrit samvatsara. Of Vijayaditya II, we have only one inscription; it is at Hulusi, and is dated Kaliyuga 4270 for 4272 (Saka 1093; A.D. 1171-2), the Khara samvatsara, and the twenty-fifth year of his reign, and records the grant of the village of Balakshi in the Kalagiri kampana of the Palasi district. 2 He appears to be the Vijayaditya who, in a Hossina inscription at Balagánve, is mentioned as having been made to pay tribute by some chiefs who were subsequently the feudatories of the Hossina king Ballén II. 3

The succession was continued by Jayakesi III, who also had the title of Mālavarā-māri, the son of Vijayaditya II. Of his time we have two inscriptions,—a copper-plate grant at Hulusi, which is dated, in the thirteenth year of his reign, in Kaliyuga 4288 (Saka 1109; A.D. 1187-8), to which, according to the Telinga computation, the Siddhārthi samvatsara is allotted, instead of the Pārvatga samvatsara; 4 and a stone-tablet at Kittar, which is dated, in the fifteenth year of his reign, in Kaliyuga 4289 (Saka 1110; A.D. 1189-90), to which the Durnati samvatsara is allotted instead of the Kilaika samvatsara. 5 His inscriptions, taken with those of Prueva, fix Kaliyuga 4276 (Saka 1097; A.D. 1175-6), the Manmatha samvatsara, for the commencement of his reign. The first of his inscriptions records that he established the god Ādivarāha in a temple in front of the already existing temple of Narasimha at Palásikā, and allotted to the idol the village of Kiri-Halaśige, or the smaller Halasige, and a variety of other grants. His second inscription contains an interesting account of a trial by ordeal. There being a dispute between Sivasakti, the Ādīśhvara or priest of the god Kallesaravadeva of Kittar, and Kalyānasakti, the Ādīśhvara of the Mulaśthānadeva or the ‘original god of the locality,’ regarding the ownership of a field,—the two contending parties met before the Dandānayaka Isvara, and agreed to put it to the test of the phaladieva or ‘ ordeal by holding a red-hot ploughshare.’ Accordingly, on Sunday the seventh day of the dark fortnight of the month Aśādha, they met again in the presence of the principal villagers of Dagrāmve, assembled at the temple of the god Mālikkārjuna of that village. And then Kalyānasakti, taking the sacred symbols on his head, declared that the field belonged to the Mulaśthānadeva; while Sivasakti, holding a red-hot ploughshare in his hand, made oath that the field belonged to the god Kallesvar. On the following day, the principal villagers examined the hand of Sivasakti, and, presumably finding it uninjured, decided that he had won his cause, and that the field in dispute belonged to the god Kallesvar.

---

3 Id. and O. C. Inscriptions, No. 192.
Of Tribhuvanamalla and his wife Mānikeśvari, we have no historical details. Of the time of his son Shashthadeva II, the last of the family as far as our present knowledge goes, we have one inscription,—a copper-plate grant from Goa, which is dated, in the fifth year of his reign, in Kaliyuga 4348 for 4351 (Saka 1172; a.d. 1250-1), the Sādhārana samanatara; this fixes Kaliyuga 4347 (Saka 1168; a.d. 1246-7), the Prabhava samanatara, as his initial date. It records a grant, at Goa itself, to the god Śiva under the name of Govardana. The grant is made by Shashthadeva II. in conjunction with a certain Kāmādeva or Kāvana,—the son of Lakshmideva and the brother-in-law of Shashthadeva himself,—who, both in the body of the inscription and on the seal of the plate, is called ‘the establisher of Shashthadeva’. It would seem, therefore, that the power of the Kādambaras of Goa was then on its last legs, and that it died out with Shashthadeva II. In fact,—as the Venugrama Seventy district was, as we have already seen, in the possession of the Rattas in Saka 1150 (a.d. 1208-9); and as Viṣṇuvaditya, of the Kollāpura branch of the Silahāra family, is stated to have re-established the kings of Śrīnagarmandala, or Thāna, and of Govā, the former of whom certainly, and the latter of whom perhaps, belonged to the Kolkana branches of his own family,—the probability is that the kingdom of the Kādambaras of Goa was practically destroyed at the death of Jayakasi III, and that whatever power Shashthadeva II. enjoyed was only of a transitory and very limited nature.

1 Sri-Shashthadasi-pratibandhagāthī Śrī-Kāmādeva-kumāryaśastra.
SECTION XIII.

THE SINDAS OF ERAMBARAGE.

The Sindas, who have already been mentioned in connection with some of the Western Chalukya and the Hoysala kings, were another family of Mahâmandaleswâras who played an important part in the history of these districts. Their inscriptions are found at Pattadakal, Araiibidi, and Aikole, in the Kalâdi District,—and at Naragol, Kodikop, Ron, and Sudi, in the Dhâwrâ District. Their capital was Erambarage or Erambarage, which is probably, as Sir Walter Elliot has suggested, the modern 'Yelburga' or 'Yelboorga of the maps, in the Nizâm's Dominions. And they possessed the extreme south-west corner of the Nizâm's Dominions, the southern parts of the Kalâdi District, and the north-east portion of the Dhâwrâ District, from the beginning to nearly the end of the twelfth century A.D.

The name of the founder of the family is not given in the inscriptions that have as yet been brought to notice. But the genealogy, as far as those inscriptions go, is as given in the accompanying table.

Of A'chugi I., or A'cha, and his successors, down to and inclusive of Singa II., we have no information beyond the bare mention of their names.

A'chugi II.,—also called A'cha, A'chi, A'chama, and Tribhuvanamalladevâra-Kesari, or 'the lion of Tribhuvanamalladeva,'—was the feudatory of the Western Chalukya king Vikramâditya VI. His wife was Mâleva or Mâladevi. We have one inscription of his time,—at Kodikop, dated Saka 1044 (A.D. 1122-3), the Subhakrîsa-marâtava. He was then governing the Kâsâkâ-4 Seventy, and several other towns the chief of which was Narayanga-Alabegere, the chief town of the Narayanga Twelve which was in the Belvola Thres-hundred. His own inscription does not give any further historical information about him. But the later ones record that he was 'a very handmill for grinding the wheat which was (the race of) Jaggu,' and that he was the disgrace of Hallakavadikeya-Singa; that, at the command of his master, Vikramâditya VI., he pursued and prevailed against the Hoysiles, took Gove or Gom, put Laksâmas to flight in war, caused the Pândyas to retreat, dispersed the Malpas or people of the Western Ghauta, and seized upon the Konkana:

A'chugi I., &c.

A'chugi II.
that he gave Gove and Uppinakatti to the flames; and that he defeated, captured, and drove back Bhoja, who, with his troops, had invaded his country. This Bhoja must be the Mahāmandalesvara Bhoja I. of the family of the Silākhāras of Kolhāpur, to be noticed in the next Section; and this repulse of Bhoja must have occurred at some time anterior to Saka 1031 (A.D. 1109-10),—probably about Saka 1020.

Of the time of his eldest son Permādi I.,—also called Perma, Pemmy, Paramardi, Hemmadi, and Jagadekamalla-Permādi,—we have four inscriptions, three at Naregal and one at Kodikop. Of the Naregal inscriptions, two only commemorate grants that had been made by village officers before his time. The third is of his own time, and is dated Saka 1026 (A.D. 1104-5), the Tārāṇa samāvatara. The Kodikop inscription is dated Saka 1066 (A.D. 1144-5), the Raktākshi samāvatara. His capital was Kramharage or Krambirahe, and he had the government of the Kisaṇkād Seventy, the Kelavādi Three-hundred, and the Nareyangal Twelve, as the feudatories, first of the Western Chālukya king Vikramaḍītya VI., and then of his son Jagadekamalla II. The inscriptions record of him that he vanquished Kulasakkārāntaka, besieged Chatta, pursued Jayakesi, who must be the second of that name of the family of the Kadamba of Goa, and seized upon the royal power of the Hōysalas; and that he advanced to the mountain-passes of the marauder Bittiga, or the Hōysala king Vīlanvarrāmbhaṇa, besieged the city of Dhoraṇa, pursued him till he arrived at the city of Belāpura, which he took, and followed him beyond that as far as the mountain-pass of Vahādi.

Permādi I. was succeeded by his younger brother Chavunda II., or Chāvunda II., a feudatory of the Western Chālukya king Taila III. By his first wife, Damaladevi, Chavunda II. had two sons, A'chi or A'chugi III., and Pemmiad or Permādi II. We have two inscriptions of his time,—one at Arasibidi, the details of which are very illegible; and one at Pattadalak, dated Saka 1084 for Saka 1085 (A.D. 1163-4), the Subhāṇa samāvatara. At that time he was governing the Kiṣṇakād Seventy, the Kelavādi Three-hundred, the Bāgadage Seventy, and other districts, while Damaladevi and A'chugi III. were governing as his regents at the city of Pattada-Kisuvolal or Pattadalak. By his second wife Siriyadevi, the sister of the Kalačhuri king Bijjala, Chavunda II. had two other sons, Bijjala and Vikrama or Vikramaditya. In an inscription at Ahole, dated Saka 1091 (A.D. 1169-70), the Virodhī samāvatara, we find these two brothers governing the Kisaṇkād Seventy, the Bāgadage Seventy, and the Kelavādi Three-hundred. This inscription does not mention them as the feudatories of any paramount sovereign; and it is possible that Chavunda II., having intermarried into the
Kalāchuri family, enjoyed a short period of independence after the downfall of the Western Chālukya. But in Saka 1102 (A.D. 1180-1), the Sārvāri samētsāra, we find Vikrama, at his capital of Krambarage, governing the Kesanā Sunday only, and as the feudatory of the Kalāchuri king Sankana. This is the last notice that we have of this branch of the Sinda family.

But there was at least one other branch of it. Thus, at Bhairammati in the Kalādi District there is an inscription, dated Saka 955 (A.D. 1033-4), the Srimukha samētsāra, of Nāgati or Nāgāditya and Sayya of the Sindavamsa, who were the feudatories of the Western Chālukya king Jayamāha III. They deduce their genealogy from a certain king Sinda, who was born in Abhikhala, and was the king of the Sindhu country, and was married to a Kadamba princess. And they claim to be of the Nāgavamsa or serpent race and to have the title of Bhogāvati-püramar-śūdhiravara, or "supreme lord of Bhogāvati, the best of cities," and to be entitled to carry the banner of a hooded serpent, and to use the mark or signet of a tiger. And the Tidgundī grant of the Western Chālukya king Vikramāditya VI., dated Saka 1004 (A.D. 1082-3), the Dandubhi samētsāra, mentions, as his feudatory, a certain Menja of the Sinda family, who seems to be of the same branch of it with Nāgāditya and Sayya, and who, like them, claims to belong to the Nāgavamsa and to have the title of "supreme lord of the city of Bhogāvatipura."

---

1 Elliot M.S. Collection, Vol. II., pp. 221 and 226.
2 P. S. and O. C. Inscriptions, No. 35; Elliot M.S. Collection, Vol. I., p. 25.
3 Bhogāvati, in mythology, was the capital of the Nāga or serpent king Vasuki, in Kṛṣṇal, one of the seven divisions of Patāla or the subterranean regions. Prof. Monier-Williams gives it also as a name of Ujjayini in the Drāva era.
4 Prabāpāta. 5 Pratipaladeva. 6 Ind. Ant., Vol. I., p. 89.
SECTION XIV.

THE SILA'HARAS OF KOLHAPUR.

There were two branches of the Silahara family in the northern and the southern divisions of the Konkan. Of the northern branch, notices have been published by Dr. Bühler and other writers. We have already mentioned Kapardi II. of this branch, whose date was Saka 773 (A.D. 851-2) and Saka 799 (A.D. 877-8), in connection with the Rástrakuta king Amoghavarsha I., to whom he seems to have been feudatory; and we have also seen that the Kádambas of Goa probably came in conflict with this family between the dates of Saka 946 (A.D. 1024-5) and Saka 982 (A.D. 1060-1). Of the southern branch, the representative in Saka 930 (A.D. 1008-9) was Rákulaśá, the feudatory of the Western Cháulkyn king Satyáśraya II., and this branch of the family possibly preceded the Kádambas of Goa in their possessions in the Konkan.

We are concerned here in detail only with a third branch of the Siláhara family, which was settled above the Ghats, and the inscriptions of which are found at Kolhápur and places in that neighbourhood, at Miraj, and at Sédhal in the Aithi Tálañá of the Belgaum District. The members of this branch of the family possessed the territory lying round Kolhápur and in the north-west part of the Belgaum District, from about the end of the tenth to early in the thirteenth century A.D.

Like their relatives of the northern branch in the Konkan, the Siláháras of Kolhápur claim to be of the lineage of the Vídápádhára Jímávádhána, who saved the Nága king Sákánáchuda from Garuda by offering his own body to be torn instead of his. And, also like them, they carried the banner of a golden Garuda, and had the title of Tagara-páruvar-ídhrésuvar, or 'supreme lord of Tagara, the best of cities.' Tagarápura therefore was the city from which, the Siláháras originally started. It is a place, however, that has not yet been satisfactorily identified. It was of sufficient importance to be mentioned in the second century A.D. by Ptolémé, in whose map of India it is entered in a north-easterly direction from Baruqana or Broach, and also, in the third century, by the author of the Periplus of the Erythraean Sea, who says that it was ten days journey to the east of Pátíhana which was twenty days to the south of Baruqana. Pátíhana,—which appears in Ptolémé's map under the name of Bátíhana, and, like Tagara, is entered in

an easterly or north-easterly direction from Barugaza,—is usually accepted to be Paithan, the ancient Pratishthana, on the banks of the Godavari, about two hundred and twenty miles to the south-east from Broach. No identification of Tagara, in accordance with the directions and distances mentioned above, has as yet been made. But, on the assumption that the directions and distances are not correct, it has been suggested that Tagara is Dvagiri or Daulatabad, about thirty-five miles to the north-west of Paithan; and again that it is Jurnar in the Poona District, about one hundred and five miles to the west by south from Paithan. Prof. Lassen and Col. Yule, again, have suggested that it is Kulburga in the Nizam’s Dominions. The fact that it is mentioned, as the residence of the grantee, in the Haidarabaud grant of the Western Chalukya king Pulakeshi II., dated Saka 594 (A.D. 612-3), and issued from Vatapi or Badami, seems to justify us in looking for it more to the south than is usually supposed. And, though this place appears altogether too far to the south, in connection with Sir Walter Elliot’s remark, that a native trader once told him that, on his way from Dhurwad to Nagpur, he had passed through a good-sized town of this name, with a bazar or market and a small river near it, four miles beyond Kulburga, it seems worth noting that there is a village called ‘Tagarapuram’ in the ‘Kellekkalum’ division of Coimbatore. My own opinion, however, is that Tagara is to be identified with Kolhapur,—or rather with Karavir, which is now only a small village on the north side of Kolhapur, but which, as the native name for the Kolhapur State, viz. ‘the Karavir Hukat’, and also the name of the local Parva, viz. ‘the Karavira-Mahottaya’, are deduced from it, must evidently have been in former times a place of considerably more importance than at present. There is a connection between the two names which is not at first sight apparent. Tagara is ‘the shrub Tabernemontana Coronaria’, (and also ‘a fragrant powder prepared from it’); it belongs to the same family with the oleander; it is still called lagar in Marathi, and grows freely in this part of the country, though whether it is originally an exotic, or a natural shrub, I cannot say; and the flowers of it are used in the worship of idols. And karavira is ‘the Nerium Odorum’, the fragrant oleander, which

---

3 Lat. 19° 13’ N., Long. 73° 57’ E.  
5 Lat. 17° 31’ N., Long. 76° 58’ E.  
6 Lassen’s Map of Ancient India; and see Brown’s Third Archeological Report, p. 35, note.  
7 Ind. Ant., Vol. VI., p. 73.  
8 Madras Jour. of Lit. and Science, Vol. VII., p. 236.  
9 Atlas of Southern India, Phuruch & Co., Madras, Plates 4 and 12.—It is in about Lat. 12° 3’ N. and Long. 77° 3’ E., a little to the west of a line connecting Talakad and Yelukund, both of which are places of note. It is, however, about three hundred and fifty miles from Kulburga, almost due south.  
10 Monier Williams' Sanskrit Dictionary, and Childers’ Folt Dictionary.—C. P. Brown, in his Telugu Dictionary, gives the name of ‘the tree called Morinda Tintoria’, but makes it also equivalent to the bead-leaved oleander and amjadone, which he separately gives as meaning ‘the broad-leaved rose hay, Nerium Odorum; Tabernemontana Grandiflora’. And Monier Williams gives amjadone as equivalent to lagara in the sense of Tabernemontana Coronaria.  
11 Some Malla, however, make a distinction, and call the single flower amjadone and only the double flower lagara.  
also grows freely, wild, all over this part of the country, and is similarly used in the worship of idols. Of course, neither the Tabernamontana Coronaria, nor the Nerium Odorum, is in any way whatever confined to this part of the country. Nor is there now any specially exuberant growth of either of them at Kolhapur. In this latter respect there may, perhaps, have been a difference in ancient times. But, even if so, the botanical connection between the two names, however interesting and suggestive, could hardly, without strong extraneous reasons, be taken to establish the identity of the two places. Some such extraneous reasons, however, of a valid kind, are, I think, forthcoming. Tagara is also 'the thorny shrub, Vangneria Spinosa'; and Karahata, which is the ancient name of the modern Karhad or Karad, at the junction of the Krishna and the Konan in the Satara District, is another name of the Vangneria Spinosa. Accordingly, as far as these names go, a connection might be looked for between Tagara and either Karavira or Karhad. Neither of these places agrees with Tagara according to the distance and direction from Paithan or Paithan, as given by the author of the Periplus of the Erythrean Sea. But neither do the other two places, Danatala and Jumr, which it has been proposed to identify with Tagara, suit in these respects; and it seems to be the general consensus of opinion that the distance and direction of Tagara from Paithan are not correctly given. Assuming this, either Karavira or Karhad would fit in well with the intimation of the author of the Periplus that Tagara was an inland mart for "articles of local production, brought into it from the parts along the coast." And either of them would supply what is not otherwise to be supplied from any information that we have, viz.: a large trade-centre, above but near the Western Ghats, to collect the ancient trade of this part of the country and also of these parts of the Konkan which lie along immediately under the Ghats, and which would find a more convenient outlet over the Ghats than towards the sea-coast. We have as yet discovered no place that could serve as such a trade-centre, for really ancient times, anywhere between Paithan on the Godavari and Palika, the modern Hali in the Belgaum District, about two hundred and eighty miles to the south by west from Paithan. Also, from either Karavira or Karhad, the inland trade route to Broach would, before the systematic construction of roads of modern times, naturally seek the open country lying to the east of the inland spur of the Ghats, and thus would naturally pass through Paithan; and this would explain why the author of the Periplus refers the position of Tagara to Paithan and not to Broach. And finally,—whether Karhad has, or has not, I cannot say; but Kolhapur still has a considerable import trade, partly for local consumption and partly for export again towards the east, in rice, jowari, wheat, gram, and other grains, salt, oil-seeds, coconuts, limes, mangoes, vegetables, and other "articles of local production," with the Ratnagiri District and

---

1 Monier Williams' Sanskrit Dictionary.
2 Iam: The quickest route from Karavira or Kolhapur would be via Miraj and Paithan; and the distance to Paithan would be about two hundred and thirty miles. From Karhad there would be more obstacles to be crossed before reaching the open country; and the distance to Paithan would be only about ten miles less.
the Sawaiwan State below the Ghauts; and in its own local productions of grain, coriander-seeds, glue, jaggery, honey, oil, turmeric, tobacco, chillies, &c., Kolhapur has still a considerable export trade with inland places which include, to the north, Ahmadsagar, only some fifty or sixty miles distant from Paithan itself. Of the two places, I prefer Karavira for identification with Tagara for the following reasons. Kachchi is nowhere spoken of as a capital of the Silhara. And, while it was known by the name of Karahataka in the eighth century A.D., it also seems to be undoubtedly, as Pandit Bhagwanlal Indrajit takes it to be, the Karahakataka of an early Palki-cave-inscription at Kudha near Rajapur in the Ratnagiri District; and this carries back the existence of the name to at least as early a period as that of the author of the Periplus, and shows moreover that the town was well known under that name at one of the places which the author of the Periplus must certainly have visited. Kolhapur, or Karavira, on the other hand, must always have been one of the chief seats of the Silhara power, though it is not expressly mentioned as the capital till Saka 1109 (A.D. 1187-8), in the time of Bhoja II. All tradition points to its being a place of extreme antiquity. And the tradition, in this respect, is borne out by the numerous Buddhist remains that are found at and in the immediate neighbourhood of Kolhapur, and notably by a crystal relic-casket which was found in a large stupa, discovered in making some excavations at Kolhapur about two years ago, and the lid of which bears an inscription in pure Maurya or Asoka characters, i.e. of about the end of the third century B.C. Graham states that "there are no ruins of any great magnitude, the remains of any large and flourishing town." And further he adds, "Kolhapur has long held a high station for the antiquity of her sacred shrines; and all the current legends state that her present capital originally existed as a purely religious settlement, of which the great temple, dedicated to Ambika or Mahalakshmi, remains to mark the site. The cloisters which formerly surrounded this great temple now lie buried many feet under the surface of the earth, which appears to have undergone at no distant period a very startling convulsion. Many phenomena favour this legend. The tiny temples are frequently brought to light on any excavation being made, and to this day no well for the purpose of irrigation is allowed within the sacred precincts. Two of the subterranean temples over which dwelling-houses have been erected are even now much frequented, one being dedicated to Kārttikāsvarā, and the other to Khandobā; and in further support of the oral tradition, that in olden times the dreary jungle was only marked by a multitude of holy temples and holy pools, the spring frequently gushes out when digging for a foundation. Stone slabs, covered with strange figures and ancient inscriptions, are found at a depth of upwards of fifteen feet from the surface; the heights of the same wall of the great temple are

1 Graham's Kolhapur, pp. 261 to 263.
2 Same as upper-plate grant of the Rāktrakuta king Dantidurga or Dantivarman II; dated Saka 670 (A.D. 749-50).
3 No. 19, p. 10, of the separate pamphlets of the Archaeological Survey of Western India.
4 Id., p. 29.
5 Kolhapur, p. 314.
6 Id., pp. 210-7.
unequal at different places; and the ground level is totally altered and destroyed. The convulsion which altered the ancient aspect of affairs must probably have been effected by an earthquake, slight geological facts also support this opinion,—in the upheaving of small elevations in the neighbourhood,—in the curious and singular arrangements of the clay about the locality,—and in the existence of the old bed of the river Panchaganga, at an elevation of at least seventy feet above its present level, which was discovered whilst digging for a foundation in the year 1842, and which is clearly evinced by the broad strata of small pebbles, perfectly and smoothly polished, evidently through the action of running water. Yet, in spite of its evident antiquity, whether religious or political, Kolhâpur or Karavira is nowhere mentioned under either of these names in any really ancient inscription as yet discovered. I have in fact no epigraphical mention of Karavira at all. And the earliest mention that I have obtained of Kolhâpur, under the name of Kollâpura, is one of the date of Saka 946 (a.d. 1024-25). * Tagara, on the other hand, is mentioned as late as Saka 534 (a.d. 612-3) as the name of a city still in existence. And we have, perhaps, a similar mention of it, of considerably later date, in the Silahâra inscription of Mārasimha, to be noted below. In it, Jatiga II., whose date would be about the end of the tenth century a.d., is called Tagaranāgara-adhikāraka, or, "king of the city of Tagara,"—a far more emphatic and specific expression than the usual familial title. This is in a metrical passage; and the usual title of Tagaranāgara-dhāraṇīvarṇa would have suited the metre just as well. The expression being at present an isolated one, it is hardly safe to assume conclusively that it was intentionally selected for its passage to indicate that Jatiga II. actually reigned at Tagara; from which it would follow that, as late as the end of the tenth century a.d., Tagara was still in use as the name of a city which must then have been somewhere in the Kolhâpur State or quite close to it. But the expression is certainly fairly open to being construed in that way. However, setting this passage aside for the present, the entire disappearance of Tagara as the name of a still existing city at some time subsequent to the seventh century a.d., and the appearance of Kollâpura in the eleventh century a.d. in a neighbourhood in which, equally with others, if not rather than in others, are entitled to look for Tagara, can, I think, be explained only on the theory of,—first, a complete change of name, such as from Tagara to Karavira, made to suit some medieval legend, but made in such a way as still to preserve some trace of the original appellation,—and subsequently a change of locality, such as from Karavira to Kollâpura. It appears to me that some tradition of an entire change of name having taken place at no very remote period is preserved in the following mythical account given by

1 Mire copper-plate grant of the Western Chalukya king Jayasimha III. The next mention of it, under the date of Saka 971 (a.d. 1048-9) is in the central inscription on the south face of the temple of Siddheshvara at Bhir, in the Bagalkot Taluk of the Bellary District. The presence in descriptive of the goddess Mahalakshmi, "who was established at the city of Kollâpura, the seat of cities."

2 Haidarabad copper-plate grant of the Western Chalukya king Pulikas II.
Graham from Chapter LVII. of the Karavira-Mahâtmya:—

"This sacred land of Kolhapur has existed from eternity. In seven different ages, it received as many distinct names. As, at one time, it was the residence of Kauna, it was termed Kâmałyana. At another time it was known as Padmalâya, after the name of its king Padma. In the third age, the god Siva passed his time here in the company of his wife Pârvati; and hence it was called Sivâlâyana. In the fourth age, Brahma gave himself up to devotion in this sacred land of Karavira; and it was then called Brahmalâyana. In the fifth age, in consequence of its being the abode of Yakulâ, it was designated Yakshâlâyana. In the sixth age, as the Râkshasas resided here, this place was distinguished by the name of Râkshaalâyana. In the seventh or last age, i.e., the present, this place was first called Kolhâpur and then Karavira." In this passage the name of Kolhapur is made to precede that of Karavira. But, according to other accounts, "this tract of country was originally called Karavira, from the goddess Mahâlakshmi using her mace in lifting this, her favourite retreat, from the waters of the great deluge. And it afterwards received the name of Kolhapur from the demon Kola, who was defeated and killed on a hill in the vicinity of the present capital." I am not prepared at present to suggest the correct etymology of the name Kolápura. But it seems plain to me that Karavira is the older and more important name of the two. And, after the change of name from Tagara to Karavira, the transfer of the political capital, from Karavira to the originally religious settlement of Kolhapur, may have been necessitated by some convulsion of nature such as the indications of which are given very plainly by Graham; and the evidently serious character of that convulsion would explain why no ruins of a large ancient town have been discovered at Kolhapur or at Karavira.

The Silâhâras of Kolhapur were Jains by religion. Their family-goddess was Mahâlakshmi of Kollapura or Kolhapur; and, though this town is not expressly mentioned as their capital till Saka 1100 (A.D. 1167-8), it must always have been one of the chief seats of their power, and it furnishes the most convenient appellation of this branch of the family, for distinguishing it from the other branches. Their genealogy is as given in the accompanying table.

All that is at present known about the earlier members of the family is derived from a copper-plate grant of Mârasimha, also called Gokkans-Anakâra and Guleyana-Singa, which was found somewhere in the neighbourhood of Miraj and is dated Saka 980 (A.D. 1058-9), the Vilambi samudrastra. In it, Jatiga I is called "the lion of the hill-fort of Pannâla," which is about ten miles to

---

1. Kolhapur, p. 234.—The way in which the local Mahâtmya, intrinsically of no historical value at all, may nevertheless be used to authenticate history, especially in the identification of ancient names of places, has been indicated by me in my identification of Vachip and Ratani (Fed. Ass., Vol. VIII., pp. 253-9).


3. Graham gives in brackets the word here; but I do not find that this word has anywhere the meaning of 'a mace.' The passage seems to be a play upon the two meanings of a word or phrase.

the north-west of Kolhapur; Jatiga II. is called "the king of the city of Tagara," as has been mentioned above; and Gonka is described as possessing the countries of Karhalata, Kundli, Mirinji, and the Konama. Karhalata is the modern Karad or Karhad in the Satara District; at the junction of the Krishna and the Koyna; and Mirinji is the modern Miraj about thirty miles in a north-easterly direction from Kolhapur. Kundli is the Three-thousand district which in Sakra 902 (A.D. 980-1) constituted the government of Kartavirya I., of the Batta Mahâmandalesvaras of Saundatti, and which, so far as the Batta inscriptions go, was still entirely in the possession of that family in Sakra 970 (a.d. 1048-9), in the time of Ajika, and again in Sakra 1004 (A.D. 1082-3), in the time of Kannakesa II.; but, unless this statement of Gonka holding the country of Kundli is an invention or an exaggeration, the Batta must, shortly before or after Sakra 970, have suffered some temporary loss of territory to which no allusion is made in their own inscriptions. And the possession by Gonka of part of the Konkana,—probably in the time of Nagâjuna of the north Konkana branch of the Silahâras, who was intermediate between Chaittaraaja (Sakra 946; A.D. 1024-5), and Mummun or Mumvanni (Sakra 982; A.D. 1060-1), and also to the events of whose reign the inscriptions of his family are silent,—is corroborated by a passage concerning Ananta-pala or Anantadeva, the son of Nagâjuna, which has already been quoted to show that the king of Kâparâkshika-va who was killed by Jayakesi I., of the Kâdamvus of Goa, must have been Nagâjuna, and in which the expression "a time of misfortune from relatives that had become hostile" plainly shows that Jayakesi I., who then overran and devastated the whole of that part of the Konkana, had taken advantage of dissensions and contests between the Silahâras of the Konkana and their relatives of Kolhapur. In the same inscription of Mârashimha, Guvala I. or Guhala is called "the lord of the hill-fort of Kiligila or Khilgila," this place, which was also Mârashimha's capital, has not yet been identified. Like his successors, Mârashimha styles himself only a Mahâmandalesvara, but gives no indication of any paramount sovereign of whom he was the feudatory. It is not likely, however, that the Silahâras were independent throughout the whole of the period for which we have records of them. The Silahâra princess Chandaladevi or Chandrâlekha, who was one of the wives of the Western Châlukya king Vikramâditya VI., was probably a daughter of Mârashimha.

The next name in respect of which we have any historical information is that of Bhoja I. He seems to be undoubtedly the Bhoja who invaded the territories of A'chungi I., of the family of the Sinda Mahâmandalesvaras of Kramarage, and who was successfully repulsed by A'chungi; this must have been in about Sakra 1020 (A.D. 1098-9).

There is an inscription of Ballâla at Honmur near Kâgal, which intimates that he ruled in conjunction with his younger brother Gandarâditya. But it is not dated; and it gives no historical information.

1 Lat. 17° 18' N., Long. 74° 14' E. 2 Lat. 16° 50' N., Long. 74° 43' E.
GENEALOGY OF THE SILA'HARAS OF KOLHA'PUR.

Jatiga I.
  Nāyīvamā,
or Nāyimma.
    Chandranāja.
      Jatiga II.
        Gonka, Gonkala,
        Gokala, or Gokalla.
          Mārasimha,
           (Saka 980.)
            Guvala I.,
            or Guvala.
              Kirttirāja.
                Chandrāditya.
                  Guvala II.
                    Gangadeva.
                      Bhoja I.
                       (About Saka 1020.)
                         Ballāla.
                           Gandarāditya.
                            (Saka 1031 and 1007.)
                              Vijuyāditya,
                              or Vijayārka.
                               (Saka 1064 and 1073.)
                                 Bhoja II.
                                  (Saka 1100 and 1131.)
The succession was continued by Gandarāditya, also called Ayyana-Singa I, the youngest son of Mārasimha. His inscriptions range from Saka 1032 for 1031 (A.D. 1109-10), the Virodhi samvatāra, to Saka 1058 for 1057 (A.D. 1135-6), the Rākhaḷa saṃvatāra, and are found at Kolhāpur itself and at Tālālem in the neighbourhood. In Saka 1031, he was governing the Mirinja country, together with Saptakollha and a part of the Konkana, and his capital was Tiravāda in the Edenād district. In Saka 1057, his capital was Valavāda, which, as suggested by Sir Walter Elliot, is probably the modern Valvā, about sixteen miles to the south of Kolhāpur.

Gandarāditya was succeeded by his son Vijayāditya or Vijayārka, also called Ayyana-Singa II, whose inscriptions range from Saka 1055 for 1054 (A.D. 1143-4), the Dundubhi samvatāra, to Saka 1078 for 1075 (A.D. 1163-4), the Śrimukha samvatāra, and are found at Kolhāpur, Miraj, Bānmī near Kārgal, and Suddhā in the Belgaum District. His capital continued to be at Valavāda. In the copper-plate grant of his son and successor Bhoja II, Vijayāditya is said to have reinstated the rulers of the province of Sthānaka or Thānā and the kings of Govā or Goa. The first statement must refer to some assistance rendered by him to his relatives of the Konkana branch, after the reign of Anantapāla or Anantadeva and before the reign of Aparāditya; and it was probably through this assistance that Aparāditya came to reign at all. The date that is usually allotted to Aparāditya is Saka 1169 (A.D. 1237-8), but, that this must have been towards the end of his reign, and that he was reigning between Saka 1068 and 1069 (A.D. 1135-6), has been shown by Dr. Bühler; and this proves almost conclusively that it was Aparāditya whom Vijayāditya reinstated at Sthānaka. The statement regarding the kings of Govā,—if it refers to any events affecting Goa itself, and unless it simply means that the Konkana Silhāras continued to bear the title of kings of Govā, though the place itself was lost to them,—must allude to some occurrences between the time of Jayakōat II. and Pramādī or Sivachita, of the Kādambas of Goa, to which no reference is made in the Kādamba inscriptions or in any others that have as yet come to notice.

Vijayāditya was succeeded by his son Bhoja II, also called Vijayādityadevana-Singa, whose inscriptions range from Saka 1101 for 1100 (A.D. 1178-9), the Vilambi samvatāra, to Saka 1115 (A.D. 1193-4), the Pramādī or Pramādichā samvatāra. His
stone-tablets are found at Kolhapur; and a copper-plate grant of his reign has been produced from somewhere in the Satara District. In Saka 1109, Valavada was his capital; but in Saka 1109, his capital was Kolhapur, the modern Kolhapur itself, and in Saka 1113, it was Punnaladurga, or, as the Sanskrit version of the name is, Padmanaladurga, the hill-fort about ten miles to the north-west of Kolhapur. That he was still reigning in Saka 1127 (A.D. 1205-6), the Krodhara samataara, is shown by a note at the end of the Sakalavartavamsa of Somadeva, according to which the work was composed in that year, in the reign of Bhoja II., at a Jain temple founded by Gandharáditya at A'juriká, the modern Ajrak, in the country of Kolhapur.

With the exception of what has been noted above in connection with Vijaya-ditya, the inscriptions of Gandharáditya and his successors give no historical details. But, as regards the termination of their power, we have not got the name of any member of the family after Bhoja II. And—as in Saka 1135 (A.D. 1313-4), the Srimukha samataara, the Devagiri-Yadava king Singhana II. was in possession of the country round Miraj, as is proved by his Khedrāpur inscription, which records the grant by him of the village of Kudaladāmavada, the modern Kurandwāl, in the Miraj country; and as we find inscriptions of Singhana II., shortly after that date, at Kolhapur itself,—it would seem that Bhoja II. was the last of his family, and that he was overthrown and dispossessed by Singhana II., in or soon after Saka 1131 (A.D. 1213-20), the Sukla samataara, which was the commencement of Singhana's reign. This is borne out by one of Singhaná's inscriptions, dated Saka 1160, which speaks of him as having been "a very Garuda in putting to flight the serpent which was the mighty king Bhoja, whose habitation was Punnaša."
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