CHAPTER VII

MARATHEWADA UNDER THE SEUNAS

[THE YADAVAS OF DEVAGIRI]
The Sēṅgas or the Yadavas of Devagiri came to power as early as the beginning of the 9th century itself. Obviously they were the subordinates of the then ruling kings, the Rāṣṭrakūṭas. They held their sway over the area around Sinnar in Nasik district. In course of time, with the change of the ruling dynasty when the Chālukyas of Kalyāṇa came to power, the Sēṅgas had to submit to the latter though they tried to rise against them in the beginning. Later on, continuing in their subordinate position and helping their overlords in their wars, the Sēṅgas became an important power in the Northern part of the Chālukya empire. About the close of the 12th century taking advantage of the waning power of the Chālukyas, Bhillama V of this family succeeded in establishing an independent kingdom with Kalyana as his capital. So far as Marathwada is concerned, it was practically with him that the Sēṅga rule commence in this region.
Yet, it is worthwhile here to take into consideration an inscription which is ascribed by scholars to an early member of the Sēlγa family i.e. Singhaṇa I. This inscription comes from Ghanai in Ambejogai taluk of Bid district. It is written in Nāgari characters and Marāṭhi language. The date is read as Ś.1002 Raudra Ashadha 8, Saturday. But on the estampage of the inscription Śaka Year looks like Ś.1062 rather than Ś.1002 in which case it can be equated with 1140 A.D., 24th June. The main difficulty is that the writing is not clear. The name of the chief can be read as Singhaṇadēva but the appellation Mahākumāra is enigmatic. Under these circumstances, it is difficult to identify this chief with Sēlγa Singhaṇa I, though the date falls during this period. Further, the reading of names of territories read as Ambedēsi and Selavēṇa is extremely doubtful. It is therefore, proper, at the present state of our knowledge to take this Singhaṇa as a local chief.

We shall consider here yet another inscription which also has been ascribed to Singhaṇa I by Brahmanand Deshpande. It has been ascribed to Kalachuri Singhaṇa by S.G.Tulpule. This inscription is found in Sangeen Masjeed in Ambejogai. It is written in Nāgari script but the writing is not well preserved. The inscription is not dated and it refers to Mahāmandaḷēśvara Singhaṇadēva and his subordinate officer Pattasēhāni Dēvarasa. Mention is also made of another
subordinate Mahāmandaśeśvara Dōcharasa who seems to have been the father of Devarasa.

On the basis of the mention of the two officers and on the analogy that the names ending in Reasa (it is actually Arasa) Dr. Tulpule suggests that Singhanadeva of the record belonged to the Kalachuri family but Brahmanand Deshpande prefers to identify this Singhana with Singhana I of the Sēūna family. In the absence of clear evidence it is indeed difficult to accept either of the identifications. The argument based on Reasa has not much sense. Indeed, Kalachuri influence had extended to Marathwada and Kalachuri inscriptions have been discovered in the Marathwada region but by the time Kalachuri Singhana came to power the family had sunk into insignificance and his rule was very short. It is therefore, doubtful if his inscriptions could be found thus far in the Marathwada region. Palaeography comes in the way of identifying this Singhana with Sēūna Singhana. Further, there is no indication whatever regarding the family of the chief. Under these circumstances, it is better to surmise that Singhana of the record was some local chief.
As pointed above, it was BhillaSk V who directly established his authority over the Marathwada region. He commenced his expansionist activities right from 1173 A.D. itself. Far from accepting the authority of the Kalachuris he fought with them though he did not succeed in becoming independent at that time and Sōmeśvara IV re-established the Chālukya power. Bhillama started his regular campaigns. He captured the fort Shrivardhana near Poona proceeded to Pratyandaka i.e. Parenda in Osmanabad district and captured that also. He then proceeded further down towards Kalyana which he ultimately captured and established himself as the sovereign ruler in about 1186 A.D.

A dated inscription of this Bhillama (i.e. 1192 A.D.) is found in Nilegaon in Tuljapur taluk of Osmanabad district. It contains the famous Vachana of Shri Śidhārāmēśgvara of Soṇālīge i.e. Sholapur (Maharashtra State). It introduces to us a feudatory chief Dānkaraśa Mallidēva claiming to belong to a Śilhāra family of Vijayapura (i.e. modern Bijapur in Karnataka State.). This inscription clearly shows that by the date of the record, the Śūra rule was firmly established in the Marathwada region. Another inscription of the same date found at Ardhapur in Nanded district, ascribable to the rule of Bhillama is further
interesting from this point of view. It introduces to us a hitherto unknown feudatory family called Raṭṭa. Ballāla, the contemporary chief of this family is credited with bringing stability to Yādava i.e. Seūpa family by helping Mailugi.

This Mailugi can be identified with Mailugi II the father of Bhallama V. It is possible that Ballāla helped Mailugi in the early days of the struggle of the Seūnas for power. The absence of reference to the ruling king in the record may be due to the special position Ballāla enjoyed as a senior ally with the Seūna ruler. On the basis of the record, the genealogy of the family can be shown as below.

```
Devapāla
```

```
Vikramārka
```

```
Ballāla = Ponmaladevi
```

This Ballāla is called the lord of Amardakapura. The name of the family is also interesting. Raṭṭa is a variant of the name Rāshṭrakūṭa and it indicates that these Raṭṭas were connected with the Rāshṭrakūṭa family. Another famous family was that of the Raṭṭas of Saundatti who
claim a direct connection with the Rāṣṭrakūṭas of Malkhed. It is not unlikely that this newly discovered Rattā family from Aśdhapur also descended from the Rāṣṭrakūṭa family of Malkhed which also hailed from Marathwada region itself.

Ballala is described as the lord of Aśardakapura. It is indeed difficult to identify this place. Sri Thosar and Pohanerker identify it with Aundha in Parbhani district but there are no good grounds for this identification. The inscription refers to the minister of Ballāla as Bhūma of Śrīvatsa family. It further records numerous charitable deeds done by Ballāla and his ministers.

An inscription from Aṇḍur in the Tjaljapur taluk of Osmanabad district written indifferently on the lower portion of a slab containing two Chālukya inscriptions, refers to Bhillama and gives the date as year 26 Krōḍha Aśadhā, Thursday, Viśu-Sahkramgeṇa. The date roughly corresponds to 1199 A.D. though the details do not correspond regularly. It is known from other sources that Bhillama ruled for about six years as an independent ruler but the year 26 mentioned in the record presents chronological difficulties. Obviously the date recorded is inaccurate.
Two inscriptions of the next ruler Jaitugi I, son of Bhillama, testify to the activities of his feudatory chiefs and officers in the Marathwada and adjoining regions. One of them from Kisegaon in Tuljapur taluk of Osmanabad district contains the famous Vachana of Siddharāmāvara known from other sources also and records a grant of land to God Kāpilaśiddhā Mallākārjuna of Sonalige i.e. Sholapur by Mahāmendalesvarā Chāmarasa - Kapparasa who held many offices under Jaitugi.

Another inscription coming from Balsur in Osmanabad district is dated 7th year of this king Pīṅgala i.e. = 1197 A.D. It is indeed a lengthy inscription. It is in bad state of preservation. As such it is difficult to get the details. The next Seuna ruler was Singhana II. It is generally believed that he came to the throne in 1210 A.D. but it is shown that his rule commenced from as early as 1200 A.D. itself. He was the most prominent member of the family and his was the longest rule also. Among the inscriptions of the members of this family the largest number belongs to this ruler testifying to the multifarious activities during this period. In the Marathwada region also we have inscriptions of this king which reveal new facts about the political and religious
activities of this king as well as his feudatory chiefs and officers.

It is known that this Singhaṇa II had a son named Jaitugi II but an inscription from Itkal in Tuljapur taluk of Osmanabad district seems to indicate that he had more sons than one. It records certain grants made on the 11th day of Puṣya Bahula of Iṣvara Sayatsara, in view of the approaching Solar eclipse on the coming Amavāṣya. It mentions Kumāra Jaitugi who is obviously the same as his son Jaitugi II but it also refers to five other persons along with Kumāra Jaitugi who also are described as Kumāras i.e. princes. They are Liṅgadeva, Gaṇeśvaradeva, Parigideva, and Śambhudeva. One does not know if all these five were the sons of Singhaṇa II. Though it is not altogether impossible the fact is that there is no reference whatever to any or all of them in any of the inscription found so far, or in the account of Hēmādri; but there is no reason to disbelieve the Itkal Inscription.

An inscription from Ranjana in Basmat Taluk of Farbhānī district furnishes new information regarding a chief of Singhaṇa. It is dated in 1217 A.D. It mentions a chief named Āmaṇadeva. The names of his father and grand
The inscription refers to the construction of a temple at Amardaka. It is interesting to note that the names Devapala and Vikrama occur in the Ardhapur inscription discussed above. That inscription mentions the feudatory chief of the Ratta family named Ballala. Vikrama and Devapala were his father and grand-father respectively. It is also worthy of note that Ballala is called Amardakapuravardhīśvara which means that the family belonged to Amardaka. Noticing the identity in place and proper names of the two inscriptions it is possible to surmise that persons mentioned in both the records belonged to the same family. In the Ardhapur inscription Vikrama is mentioned as the son of Devapala and the inscription is dated 1190 A.D. and this Ranjna inscription is dated 1217 A.D. Putting these two things together it has been suggested by Brahmanand Deshpande that Vikrama of Ardhapur and Ranjna inscriptions is one and the same and that he had a son named Devapala in addition to Ballala of the Ardhapur inscription. He has thus given the geneology as below:
An inscription from Sillod introduces yet another hitherto unknown officer Ellana Pandita who was holding the office of Śrīkarnika under the king. His father Dēmodara is described as Mahāpandita and they belonged to Gouḍa family (Gouḍānaya). The inscription states that Ellana Pandita constructed a Śiva Temple and a well to commemorate the death of his wife Vāmādevi. The inscription is dated 1230 A.D. Two Sarvādhikāris of Śīnghaṇa namely Sānkama and Laksāṇa Pandita are introduced in an inscription of Śīnghaṇa from Ardhapur dated 1236 A.D. They are connected with making grants to a number of temples in Ardhapur. It is interesting to note that the office of Sarvādhikāri became very popular in the Sāṇa period whereas it does not figure prominently in the earlier period.

A broken inscription from Pāli mentions his officer Mahidhara.
By far the most important inscriptions of Śiṅghana in the Marathwada region come from Ambejogai. They introduce one of his most prominent generals Khõesēvara who was responsible for the expansion of the Seūṇa Kingdom in the northern region. From these inscriptions we gather that he was even credited with firmly establishing the king in power (rāvasthāpāna-kāryakeusālavidevā-āchārya ēva svayam). The inscriptions also extole the role played by him in the northern expeditions of Śiṅghana. We can get the following details from these inscriptions about him. From the father's side he belonged to Mudgala gotra and the gotra of his mother's family was Kaśyapa. His parents were Trivikrama and Chandra. His grandfather and great grandfather on father's side were Sevāmidēva and Bhāyidēva respectively. On the mother's side they were Nimbadēva and Vāsudēva respectively. This famous general, a hero of many battles was deeply religious also. The Ambe inscriptions credit him with a number of charitable deeds such as construction of temples and institution of Aghrāras in various places.

Among the important exploits of Khõesēvara was his fight with the Gūrjara king. The Gūrjara contemporary was Bhīma II but more prominent were his generals Vāghēla chief Lavaṇa prásaśāda and his son Viśrādhavala who were actually
spear-headings the kingdom. One of the Ambe inscriptions\textsuperscript{22} says that Khōlēśvara pushed the Gurjara army up to the northern bank of Narmadā while another one\textsuperscript{23} in the same place speaks of his subduing the chief of Bhṛigukachchha (i.e. Bhadoch) and planting a pillar of victory there. It appears that Khōlēśvara proceeded further north and attacked Dēvapāla, the Paramāra adversary of Sīṅghana.

Khōlēśvara also participated in Sīṅghana's expedition against the Śilāhāra chief Bhōja II. He is the last known chief of the family and the Śilāhāra territory became a part of the Sēǔga kingdom after this conquest.

One of the Ambe inscriptions\textsuperscript{24} also speaks of a defeat of a chief Kēśi at the hands of Khōlēśvara. This Kēśi was obviously Jayakēśi III of the Kadaṁba family of Goa. Among other exploits of Khōlēśvara may be mentioned the defeat of Abhirā Lakshmīdeva\textsuperscript{25} who was opposed to Sīṅghana. This Lakshmīdeva is described in the inscription as the lord of Bhambhāgiri. This place is identified with Bhemar in Dhulia district of Maharashtra State\textsuperscript{26}. Bhōja of Chahändē, Hēmādri and Nāgaṇa were other chiefs subdued by Khōlēśvara. Bhōja is described as belonging to the Paramāra family which was in power in Chahanda, the area around Chanda in the Maharashtra State. The chief Hēmādri is stated to have
belonged to Banakheta. This Banakheta seems to be the same as modern Vānakhežī in Dharva taluk of Yeotmal district. It has not been possible to identify Nāgāna. His name indicates that he was in power in the southern region.

Khōlēśvara is stated to have captured the fort Toragale. This Toragale is at present a small village named Torgal in Belgaum district. The inscription also ascribes to Khōlēśvara victory over Hoyaśaḷa, Chōḷa and Telaigana kings, but these appear to be only conventional descriptions.

It can be concluded that this Khōlēśvara belonged to Amrāḍēṣa i.e. the region around Ambejogai, the find spot of these records and that he was the guardian of the northern frontiers of the Sēṇa kingdom. His son Rāma was also a famous general during his time. One of the Ambe inscriptions tells us that he led the Sēṇa army against the Gūrjaras. This was sometime before the date of the Ambe inscription which mentions this event. The inscription praises him highly as equal in valour to Bhīṣma, Kārṇa and Drōṇa. Khōlēśvara's daughter Lakṣmī also figures prominently in one of the Ambe inscriptions. She is said to have held change of the territory when Rāma fell in the battle field.
The reign periods of the next rulers Krishna and Mahadeva were not very eventful speaking from the political point of view. The northern borders were almost quiet and in the south skirmishes with the Hoyasalas were going on. There are two inscriptions found till now which mention Krishna or Kannara. Both of them are in Marathi mixed Sanskrit language. One is from Manur (district Bid) dated in 1248 A.D. and the other from Kanegaon (district Osmanabad) dated in 1258 A.D. Both of them mention hitherto unknown chiefs of the king. As pointed out earlier in Chapter II, the Manur inscription presents difficulty in the reading and thereby there is some controversy in the inscription. According to Brahmanand Deshpande the inscription mentions an officer Matrauta and states that he erected a memorial to fulfil the matririna but Thosar tries to read the name of the queen of Kannara as Irau. Since the text is indistinct it is difficult to decide the issue. The inscription from Kanegaon is more interesting. It gives the usual titles to the king and introduces a Gopaldeva who is described as Maharajaputra who seems to have been described as Lattanapurapuraadhisvara. Obviously he was associated with Lattanugra i.e. Latur, but Maharajaputra is enigmatic. It is difficult to take the expression to
mean the prince or the son of the king but it is also
difficult to accept the meaning given by S.G.Tulpule that
it means the son of a person known as Mahārāja. Another
point to be noted here is that the person is described as
belonging to Rāṣṭrakūṭa Vamsa i.e. originally Rāṣṭrakūṭa.
It is worthy of recalling here that the imperial
Rāṣṭrakūṭas of Mālkhed also called themselves Lattalūpa-
puravarādhīśvara. It is not unlikely that this family of
Gopāldeva claimed its ancestry from the Rāṣṭrakūṭas. The
inscription was written to record certain grants made on
the occasion of completion of Lakṣahāma performed for
Gopāldeva's benefaction. The mention of places like Kandhar,
Turai (Tarur) and Udayagiri (Udgir) all situated in the
Marathwada region, indicate that Gopāldeva was the governor
of some part of this region.

As regards the conquest of Kannara these inscriptions
are silent. They are after all small inscriptions record-
ing some local events but the copper plate inscriptions
found at Purushottampuri in Bhir district of the Marathwada
region ascribe some conquests to him. For example, it
states that he defeated Kāmapāla. He seems to be an
Ābhira chief whose predecessor Lakshmīdēva was defeated
by Singhaṇa's officer Kholēśvara, according to one of the
Ambe inscriptions. Another chief mentioned in the Purushottampuri plates as having been defeated by Kannara is Gōpakapālaka. M.m.V.V.Mirashi who edited this record suggested that this chief was an Abhira king but G.H. Khare thought that Gōpakapālaka meant a king of Goa and identified him with Kadamba king Jayakesi III, but as suggested by S.H.Ritti, Jayakesi's reign period is too early to be contemporaneous with Kannara. As he has further suggested, that this Gōpakapālaka was the Kesirāja II of Śilāhāra family of northern Konkan. It may also be noted here that the Mahānubhāva work Līlācharitra speaks of the respect that he entertained high regard for the saints of the Mahānubhāva sect. It says that he went with his brother Mahādeva to Lonar to pay respect to Chakradhara.

As regards the next king Mahādeva the brother of Kannara, no stone inscription has yet been found in the Marathawada region. Some information about him however is found in the Paithan and Purushottampuri plates of Rāmachandra discovered in the region. The Paithan plates for example state that he defeated Viśalādeva. This Viśalādeva seem to be the same as the Vāghēla chief Viśalādeva. It looks as though at sometime friendly relationship was established between Viśalādeva and Mahādeva,
This is suggested by record of Viśaladeva which states that he married the daughter of the king of Karnāṭa. This Karnāṭa king could be Viśaladeva's southern neighbour Sūña Mahādeva. The possibility of Viśaladeva contracting marriage alliance with the Hoyasala king of the lower Deccan, who was also known as Karnāṭa king, is too remote.

Another conquest highlighted by the Purushottampuri plates is that Mahādeva drowned Sōma into the ocean. This point is further elaborated by Hemādri who states that Sōmeśvara the lord of Konkāna was drowned together with his army, in the ocean of the rut of elephants of Mahādeva, though he was an expert in swimming. This Sōmeśvara was obviously the Śilāhāra chief of that name and he seems to have lost his life in the naval fight with Mahādeva.

The next important ruler in the Sūña family and in fact the last of the Sūña rulers was Rāmachandrāya but, in between was interposed Amaṇa. It is well known that Amaṇa was the son of Mahādeva and the latter tried to place him on the Sūña throne as against Rāmachandrāya, the son of Kannara.

Amaṇa's was a very short rule, may be of a few days only. Rāmachandra contrived against him and deceitfully
difficult for him to capture power through a straight fight. The Purushottampuri plates categorically state that Rāmašandra entered the fort of Devagiri in the guise of the dancer and killed Āmaṇa. Lilācharitra describes the confusion caused on account of this event and states the terrified people started running away from the capital.

The famous inscriptions of Rāmašandra in the Marathwada are from Purushottampuri and Paithan. These inscriptions have been discussed and published since long. There are some more inscriptions which do not add much new information so far as the political activities are concerned. They are however useful for understanding the religious conditions of the period and also from the point of view of the development of the language. This information is utilized and discussed in the subsequent chapters.

The Paithan plates dated in 1272 A.D. i.e. almost in the beginning of his career ascribe him conquest over Mālava. This fact cannot be verified. If at all he led an expedition to Mālava, it must have been during the time of his predecessor. The Purushottampuri plates give a long list of the achievements of Rāmašandra. They are the
conquests over the kings of Dahala, Bhāndāgāra, Vijṛakara, Palli, Kānyākubja, Māhima, Saṅgama and Khēta. Mm V. V. Mirashi who had edited this record has suggested the identification of some of the chiefs. We may note them here. Bhāndāgāra has been identified with Bhāpḍārā the headquarters of the district of that name in Maharashtra State. Vajrākara is identified with Vairagarh in Chanda district. Palli is also placed in the Vindhyā region. Māhima is obviously Mahim, now a part of Bombay. The Mahākavati Bakhsh mentions a Nāgarasa who was fighting with his brother-in-law for getting hold of the Thana region. Rāmachandra is said to have sided with the latter. It is also stated that Hēmādīpant (i.e. Hēmādri), the minister of Rāmachandra was defeated in this battle. Saṅgama and Khēta are identified with Saṅgamaśevara and Khed in Ratnagiri district. The conquest of Kānyākubja and also Vāraṇāsi seems to be a tall claim. Both these areas were under the occupation of Muslim rulers.

The Unkesvar inscription refers to Praṭhāṇa Hēmādī-
panḍita who is obviously the same as the famous Hēmādri, the minister of Rāmachandra and the well-known author of Chaturvargachintāmāni. The inscription also refers to other officers Hāthiśeṣhaṇi Bhāvakadēva and Śaṃśānāyaka.
Similarly, the Hatnur inscription dated 1301 A.D. mentions Purushadévapandita who seems to be the same as Purushöttama, the minister of Rámachandra who issued the Purushöttampuri plates.

Rámachandra was practically the last ruler of the family. As is well-known, the last decades of his rule witnessed repeated invasions of Ala-ud-din and his general Malik Kafur which ultimately resulted in the extinction of the Sêuna kingdom itself. Rámachandra's son Singhana III did try to protest against the onslaughts but he met a miserable end. This story is too well-known to be repeated here. There is a record of Singhana's III's son Mallugi III dated in 1333-34 A.D. but by that time the Sêuna kingdom had become a part of Tughluk rule. Thus the beginning of the 14th century saw the extinction of the Sêuna kingdom and a new chapter in the Marathwada region began under the Muslim occupation. The famous Dëvagiri, the hill of Gods, came to be renamed as Daulatabad and Muhammad-Tughluk made a vein attempt of making it the capital of the vast empire. The subsequent story is beyond the perview of this work.
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