CHAPTER VII

The Śilahāras of Bijapur Region

In the history of Deccan and south India between 10th to 13th centuries A.D. the feudatory dynasty known as Śilahāra played a dominant role. Three families of this stock have attracted the attention of scholars since long. They are identified on the basis of the region in which they were prominent vis-à-vis, the Śilahāras of South Konkan, the Śilahāras of North Konkan and the Śilahāras of Kolhapur.

Śilahāra is a very broad term and we find many other families in different regions claiming to belong to this stock. It is however difficult to connect genealogically these different families with one another. A brief history of these families was first given by John F. Fleet and R.G. Bhandarkar in the Bombay Gazetteers (1896). The next author to present a detailed study of these was by Dr. A.S. Altekar. In the recent years Dr. V.V. Mirashi has brought out a corpus of Śilahāra inscriptions and has made a fresh study of these families. But there are some minor families spread out in the Bijapur-Akalkot regions in the Karnataka and the adjoining Maharashtra State areas which have figured in inscriptions of these regions. They have attracted the attention of
the scholars who have discussed about them to some extent, while editing the concerned inscriptions. Recently Dr. B.R. Gopal has tried in his work "Minor Dynasties of Karnataka" to present some details about these families. In the processes he has mentioned as many families as there are inscriptions referring to them. We have tried here to bring about a coordination as far as possible among these different families. Our study indicates that they can be brought under one stock such as the Śilāhāra chiefs of Bijapur region. Our contention finds support in an inscription from Akkalkot which mentions a Śilāhāra family. Here these chiefs are described as Viṣṇuvarādhīśvara indicating their association with Bijapur. Of course in a conventional way they are also described as Teṣāpurādhīśvara to indicate their connection with the main stock.

Before dealing with the genealogy and chronology of these chiefs it is worth while probing into the significance of the name Śilāhāra and try to know how it came to be acquired by these families. Normally, the name of the family occurs in Sanskrit as well as in Kannada epigraphs as Śilāhāra and the members of the family claim to belong to the lineage of Jīmūtavāhane. On the basis of this, an explanation of the family name is tried to be traced to the story of
Jímútavāhāna and this story is well known. It so happened that the race of serpents headed by the king Vasuki was becoming a victim of the attack of Garuḍa, the enemy of the serpents. Ultimately, Vasuki agreed to send one serpent everyday for Garuḍa. It was the turn of the serpent called Śankhachūḍa and it was sitting on the appointed stone waiting for the attack of Garuḍa. The Vidyādhara prince Jímútavāhana saw that and felt sorry at the plight of Sankhachuda and he managed to send Śankhachūḍa to the temple of Śiva and himself sat on the stone so as to save Śankhachūḍa and became himself the prey for Garuḍa. Garuḍa went there and attacked Jímútavāhana and after having wounded him realised its mistake as it was discovered that he was attacking Jímútavāhana. Jímútavāhana's wife came to know the fate of her husband and started praying the Goddess Pārvati for the life of her husband. The Goddess was pleased to bring back Jímútavāhana to life. In repentance to his action Garuḍa decided not to eat serpents any more and also he brought back to life all the serpents which were killed earlier. Now, according to this story Jímútavāhana became the prey or āhāra to Garuḍa by sitting on the stone or Śilā. Thus the name of the family of those who belonged to lineage of Jímútavāhana came to be known as Śilāhēra i.e. those belonging to the family of one who became the food (Āhāra) for Garuḍa on stone (Śilā).
Obviously, not much credence be given to this story which appears to have been imagined by the writers of records at a later date. Interestingly one of the very early inscriptions of the Śilāhāras of Northern Konkan belonging to Chhadavaidēva and dated circa 10th century A.D. gives a different story in explanation of the term Śilāhāra. It says that a hero named Śilāhāra protected the western ocean which was pushed back by the arrow of Paraśurama. His descendants were thus named Śilāhāra. A number of Kannada inscriptions also give the name of the family variously as Solāra, Silāra and Śilāra though they do not offer any explanation regarding the origin of the name. May be, these terms also indicate a personal name like Śilāra given in the inscriptions of Chhadavaidēva. It is therefore possible that originally the name of the family was Solāra or Silāra and later on in the hands of the ingenious poets it was Sanskritised as Śilāhāra and ingeniously again it was connected with the story of Jīmūtavāhana by playing upon the words Śilā and ahāra. Such instances of Sanskritisation of the local terms and imagining a mythical genealogy are not rare in the Indian historical tradition.

As mentioned above, the three main branches of the Śilāhāras have been studied in details on the basis of many
copper-plates and stone inscriptions discovered through the decades. All these inscriptions have been collected and ably edited by Dr. V. V. Mirashi in *Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum* series Vol. V for the Archaeological Survey of India. But as pointed out earlier, many inscriptions have been discovered, especially in Bijapur district and adjoining areas of Sholapur and Gulbarga districts which bring to light the existence of some more Śilāhāra families. Indeed it is difficult to connect the members of these families with those of the well known three families mentioned above. Nevertheless, it is clear that they belonged to the same stock and dispersed in different areas and held offices of importance under the ruling kings especially from the days of the Chālukyas of Kalyāṇa. Further, these inscriptions give different genealogies, so much so, it is difficult to co-ordinate them and to conclude thereby that all of them belonged to the same stock. It appears that they branched off and settled in different regions maintaining their own identity, yet claiming to belong to the parents' body. Taking into consideration broadly the region over which they held sway we group them all under one title, the Śilāhāras of Bijapur region.

There are about twenty-seven inscriptions in the Bijapur region covering the adjoining Akkalkot in Sholapur.
district of Maharashtra and the Afzalpur taluk of Gulbarga
district. These inscriptions give a large number of names
of the chiefs who claim to belong to the Silahara dynasty.
Some of them give the genealogies of the members for many
generations. A comparative study of such genealogies indicates
that these chiefs in different places claim their descent
from the main Silahara stock, but branched off in different
areas. May be, due to lapse of time they lost touch with
the parent family and formulated their own genealogies. As
such there is considerable variations in the genealogical
accounts, but the fact remains that the original stock was
the same. We try to study the genealogies here with an
attempt to find out a possible relationship between the
different branches.

Among the inscriptions giving the genealogies, the
one from Akkalkot is important. It belongs to Chalukya king
Vikramaditya VI and it is dated in 1114 A.D. The inscrip-
tion refers to the chief Indarasa of the Silalara or the
Silahara family and it traces his genealogy to as many as
fifteen generations earlier to him. The genealogy as we
find in the text is as follows:
Yet another record from the same place and dated 1122 A.D. carries forward the genealogy by two more generations. According to this inscription Indarasa had a brother and four sons:

```
   Indarasa III   Rajarasa
     |               |
     |               |
----|----|---|---|

Kavilasa  Mallideva  Ajjarasa III
```

Dakarasa

Many other inscriptions found mostly in Bijapur district mention various chiefs belonging to the Silahara family and some of them also give the genealogy which agree to some extent. Some names in the above genealogy from Akalkot, are found in the inscriptions from Afzalpur taluk in Gulbarga district adjoining the Bijapur district. A careful study of these genealogies and names reveals that there were two branches of this family in this area. One of them appears to have been fairly predominant and spread over in considerable parts of Bijapur district, while the
other branch was restricted to a small region around Dlamola, a village in Sindgi taluk of Bijapur district. At the present state of our knowledge it is difficult to trace genealogical ties between these two branches. So they are also dealt with here separately.

We have noticed the above genealogy given in the Akkalkot inscription. A similar genealogy is given in an inscription from Agarkhed, in Bijapur district adding a few more generations of chiefs and with some variations. This similarity establishes that the Silaharas of Akkalkot and those mentioned in Agarkhed inscription belong to one and the same family. The genealogy of the Agarkhed inscription is as below:
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An inscription from Hiribevinur\(^3\), also from Bijapur district mentions some more members of the family. It starts with Piriya Govanarasa and mentions Dakarasa, Kiriya.
Govanaresa and Indarasa in that order without specifying their relationship. Indarasa had a son Āhumalla and his elder brother was Dēkarasa.

\[
\begin{align*}
& \text{Piriya Govanarasa} \\
& \quad \text{Dēkarasa} \\
& \quad \text{Kiriya Govanarasa} \\
& \quad \text{Indarasa} \\
\end{align*}
\]

Dēkarasa Āhumalla

Though there is some difficulty in coordinating these names with those in the Agarkhēd inscription some of these can be identified. Obviously Piriya Govanarasa of both the inscriptions referred to is one and the same person. Dēkarasa mentioned as grandson of Piriya Govanarasa in Agarkhēd inscription may be identified with Dēkarasa occurring next to Piriya Govanarasa without specifying the relationship. Dakarasa's son Govanarasa of Agarkhēd inscription is obviously the same as Kiriya Govanarasa mentioned after Dēkarasa in the
Hirebêvinur inscription. This Gōvaiprasa's son was Indarasa and the latter's sons were Dēkarasa and Aḥumallarasa, as mentioned in the Hirebêvinur inscription.

From other inscriptions it appears that an offshoot of this family held position in different regions even later. An inscription from Sālotgi\(^9\) belonging to Seuna king Billama V says that Bandabhūpāla belonging to the family of Dhenaśaṅgraha, was an officer under this king. In this inscription the genealogy is given as follows:

\[
\text{Dhanaśaṅgraha} \\
\text{Chāvunda = Sōvaladēvi} \\
\text{Banda} \\
\text{Govana = Kamaladēvi} \\
\text{Chāvunda} \\
\text{Bandarasa}
\]

The name Dhanaśaṅgraha here clearly indicates that Bandarasa belonged to the family of Pittama of the Akkalkot and Agarkhēd records. An inscription from Chinmalli\(^10\) in
Gulbarga dated 1283 A.D. also speaks of a Dhanesangraha of the Silēhāra family. This only means that the members of this family continued in power till as late as 1283 A.D. These names are found in the above inscription of Akkalkot and Agarkhed. Hence they can also be considered as belonging to this family. A study of all these genealogies makes it clear that this Silēhāra family of Bijapur region was in power in this area from the middle of the 8th century A.D. and depending on the political condition the members were scattered and they held office in different parts of this region till almost the end of the 13th Century A.D. It is indeed difficult to give a connected account of the genealogy and chronology of all these members, yet a coordination is attempted here as far as possible.

The Akkalkot inscription dated 1114 A.D. and the Agarkhed inscription dated 1109 A.D. fairly agree up to a point in their accounts. According to both, the first member of the family was Piṭṭama. On the basis of the date of the last member of the Akkalkot inscription and assigning an approximate period of 25 years which of his predecessors, this Piṭṭama can be placed between Circa 715-740 A.D.

The next member of the family was Piṭṭama's son Ajja or Ajja and his son was Ṛagārjuna, according to Akkalkot
Inscription. The Agarkhed inscription drops out Ajja and states that Nāgarjuna was born in the family of Pittama without specifying their relationship. This means that the Agarkhed inscription does not consider Nāgarjuna as the son of Pittama. Ajja's name might have been dropped out for the sake of brevity.

Indara I was the son of Nāgarjuna according to both the inscriptions. The Akkalkot inscription says that Indara had two sons, Kavilāsa and Kancha, and the elder one, obviously Kavilāsa had a son called Dabbasa. The Agarkhed inscription however combines both the names and calls the son of Indara as Kanchiga Kavilāsa. This phenomena is really not understandable. Dabbasa was his son according to this inscription also. Dabbasa had a son Rakkasā tī Rakkasamati according to both the inscriptions. The Akkalkot inscription mentions two more generations, Indarasā II (son of Rakkasamati) and Gōvanā (son of Indara II). Gōvanā's sons were Pittama and Kavilāsa.

There appears to be a major departure in the Agarkhēd inscription. The text clearly indicates that Dabbasa had a son Rakkasamati. He had two brothers. Indarasā II and Gōvanarasā. This Gōvanarasā had two sons, Narulavitta and Kavilāsa. Noticing the similarity in the names we can identify Narulavitta and Kavilāsa of Agarkhēd inscription with Pittama and Kavilāsa of Akkalkot inscription. We may presume
that Sovana of the Akkalkot inscription is a mistake for Govana of the Agarkhēd inscription. It looks as though the family branched off here into two and Marulavitta of the Piṭāma's branch moved towards Agarkhēd and Kavilāsa II continued in Akkalkot area. In the Agarkhēd branch the genealogy is given as below.

Marulavitta

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Piriya Govanarasa I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dhanaasangraha I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Govanarasa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhanasangraha II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Govanarasa II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kavilāsa II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dākarasa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Govanarasa III</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It looks as though the family branched off once again after Dhanasangraha II of Marulavitta family. The inscription of Sālotgi dated 1109 A.D. gives the following genealogy in the family of Dhanasangraha, thus:
A record from Chinmalla traces the history of the family up to almost the end of the 13th Century A.D. It mentions a Dhanasangraha as belonging to Tardavadi. That he had connections with the main family is clear, but there is no information regarding his predecessors so as to connect him with the same line.

We may notice at this stage few more members claiming to be the Silhāras and ruling in the Bijapur region who, however, did not have direct connection with the family of Piṭṭema. They figure in the inscriptions of Bijapur district only, such as Ālma, Kulokumatgi, Malgha, Devaranāvadgi and Kadleva, all in Sindgi taluk.
The Almāl inscription from Sindgi mentions a Nāyiga as ruling from Almāla. Two records from Kulākumārī which have an identical text mention Singarasa and Udayaditya of this family as favourites of Nāyiga (Nāyiga Ushakra). These inscriptions are dated in 1077 A.D. and 1082 A.D. respectively. They are taken as two sons of Nāyiga. An inscription now kept in the Bijapur museum mentions a Singarasa as Udegan-ankakāra i.e. a favourite of Udaya. He is further described in the epigraph as the son of Udayaditya, who was the son of Nāyiga. This inscription is dated in 1120 A.D. This Singarasa can be designated as Singarasa II. Next comes an inscription from Malghān dated 1133 A.D. It mentions a Kumāra Sōvadvara as the son of Singarasa of the Śilāharā family. On chronological grounds he can be taken as the son of Singarasa II. According to an inscription from Devarnēvedi, the name of the wife of Singarasa II or the mother of Sōvidēvarasa was Bēchadalēvi. This inscription is dated in 1140 A.D. The Yarakal inscription gives another date i.e. 1146 A.D. to Sōvidēvarasa. The genealogy is extended by one more generation by three inscriptions of Kadlevād dated 1163 A.D., 1172 A.D. and 1176 A.D. They mention a Singadēvarasa as Sōmeṣenakara i.e. a favourite of Sōma. He is rightly taken as the son of Sōvidēva. An inscription from Kadlevād dated 1186 A.D. mentions an Anemarasa of the Śilāharā
family as the governor of Elamela. He is described as Singanankkara i.e., the favourite of Singa. On chronological grounds and on the basis of this description he can be placed next to Singarasa as his son. Putting all these details together the genealogy of the family may be shown as below:

```
  Hayiga
    |
    |
Singarasa       Udayäditya
    |
Singarasa II = Bāhaladēvi
    |
    Sovarasa
    |
Singarasa III
    |
   Ānemarasa
```

We shall now consider some stray names of the chiefs belonging to the same family, but who cannot be fitted in the known genealogies. An inscription from Halsangi in Indi taluk which mentions a Chāvundarasa as belonging to the Silāhāra family. The inscription is damaged but it can be ascribed to the rule of Kalachurī king Bījala II.
Chāmunḍarasa claiming to belong to Jīmūtavāhana family and figuring in an inscription from Rūgi in Indi taluk as a subordinate of the Kalachuri king Mallugi appears to be the same as Chāmunḍa mentioned above. He is described as the chief of Tardavādi-1000. A broken inscription from Tadavalga in Indi taluk assigned to the 12th C.E./A.D. gives three generations of the chiefs as below:

Kailāsa - nṛipa

| Dhanasangraha |

The name of the last person is lost. There is no indication whatsoever as to which family they belonged. But the names are peculiar to the family of Śilāhāra being discussed here. But it is difficult to fit them in the known genealogies though both the names figure in the Akkalkot and Agarkhēd genealogies given above. It can at best be suggested that Kailāsa figuring here was identical with Kavilāsa IV figuring in the inscriptions of 1122 A.D. But, of course, there is no evidence for their identification. Alternatively, this Kailāsa may be also identified with Kavilāsa III of the Agarkhēd genealogy in which case his son Dhanasangraha will be the second son of Kavilāsa III. His second son Dākarasa is known from the Agarkhēd genealogy.
Two other chiefs who may be mentioned are ŠoṆanarasë and Ğōnarasa. The former figures in an inscription of Vikramāditya VI from Chattürkī in Sindgi taluk. The latter is mentioned in Hippargi inscription also from Sindgi taluk and dated 1192 A.D. both of them appear to belong to the same family, as the names of these two chiefs occur in the inscription from the same place. Yet another inscription from Sindgi taluk dated 1208-09 A.D. mentions a Bommideva-rama as belonging to the Śilāhāra family.

As mentioned above, it is indeed impossible to establish exact relationship between the different chiefs. It can only be said that all of them belonged to one family and were scattered here and there holding sway over some areas in the Bijapur region itself till the end of the rule of Šeũnas namely the end of the 13th C. A.D. As it is well known, this period witnessed the invasion of Alauddin Khilji and his general Malik Kafur which eclipsed the Šeũna power. Consequently in the confused and uncertain stages of conditions these chiefs also disappeared from the stage of history.

History of the Family

The genealogy and chronology discussed above indicate that the history of the family goes back to the middle of
the 8th Century A.D. with Pittama as the first member of the family. But of course, the first member to be mentioned independently is Dhenasangraha II of the Agarkhed genealogy. He figures as Dhenasangrahasayya in an inscription from Rugi in Indi taluk, as a subordinate of Chalukya Jagadekamalla Jayasimha II in 1019 A.D. Herein he is referred to as the governor of Tardavadi division. He approved of a grant of land made by an officer Desarasa to the God Nagesvara of Anaya-Ruviga i.e., Rugi, the findspot of the inscription.

The next chief we come across is Govanarasa, the son of Dhenasangraha and the grandson of Kavilasa III who was a brother of Dhenasangraha II mentioned above.

This Government made a grant of land to God Svayambhudeva of Kheda the chief town in a division of 12 villages in 1109 A.D. He was also the governor of Tardavadi. He also figures in an inscription from Chhatarki as a subordinate of Vikramaditya VI. He is stated to have been governing obviously the Tardavadi division from the head quarters, Kannavalli. This inscription mentions an incident that Govanarasa had a fight with his relatives (Dayadas) at Chhatarki. He entered Chetturage with force and defeated the relatives. It appears that the Mahajanasa of the place helped him in this encounter as a recognition of his service.
He granted them the income accruing from various taxes in the village. He also created a śīla śēsana, or an inscription mentioning the fact which is obviously the same as the one available now. The inscription is not dated but since it belongs to the reign of Vikramāditya VI it can also be placed near about 1109 A.D. which is a known date for the chief. It is also difficult to ascertain who the Dāvādas of the chief were and what was the cause for the conflict.

The next chief to be mentioned was Indarasa III of the Akkalkot genealogy. He is mentioned here as a subordinate of Chālukya Vikramāditya VI. The same Indarasa figures in another inscription from Akkalkot dated 1122 A.D. as the subordinate of Chālukya Vikramāditya VI. He is described as the mannavas of Ankulage-mēdu in Āṇandūr-300. The record states that he, along with his sons and grandsons made a grant of land to the temple of Kandarpēśvara and Kēśava.

The Hirebōvinūr inscription continues the genealogy for two more generations. Piriya Gōvaprāsa's son was Subedarasa and Indarasa's sons were Pākara and Ānumallarasa. He also appears to be the governor of Tardavēdi. He was a subordinate of Vikramāditya VI. He made a grant of land to God Bhogēśvara at Hirebōvinūr in 1124 A.D.
Another Đäkarasa figures in an inscription from Muttagi in Bagevdi taluk of Bijapur district as a subordinate of Chälukya Jagadékamalla II in 1147 A.D. This Đäkarasa however, cannot be identified with Đäkarasa mentioned above, though he had a very long period of rule.

The next chief was Chavundarasa whose name occurs in an inscription from Halsangi in Indi taluk dated 1168 A.D. The inscription is badly damaged and no details about him can be got except that he made a grant of land to god Swayambhudeva. This Chavundarasa can be identified with Chavundarasa figuring in the Sälotgi inscription as belonging to the family of Dhanasagraha. This Chavundarasa had a son Govañarasa according to the same inscription. He may perhaps be identified with Gopañarasa, said to be belonging to Silahāra family and described as mahéśāmabōdeva under Seunā Bhillama V, in an inscription from Hippargi in Sindgi taluk of Bijapur district dated 1192 A.D. This Gopañarasa's son and successor was Bandarasa, who was the second of that name, because according to the genealogy given in the Sälotgi inscription dated 1190 A.D. of Bhillama V his father had an elder brother named Bandarasa. This Bandarasa has been highly praised in the inscription as a hero of many battles, though no specific battle he fought has been mentioned.
The last member of the family of Pitama as known till now, was Dhanasengraha figuring in the Chinmalla inscription with dates, March 1288 A.D. and April 1289 A.D. This Dhanasengraha is also described as belonging to Tardavadi, i.e. the governor of that region. He is also stated to have been ruling from the fort of Attinur. It is further stated that he went to Chinmalla on the bank of the river Dhimsa and made a grant of land to the deity Mallikarjuna of that place. A year later he made another grant to the same deity.

As noted earlier some members of the family appear to have branched off and settled in another part of the Bijapur as feudatory chiefs. The area under their jurisdiction appears to be in the northern part of Sindgi taluk with Almel as the headquarters. The earliest known member of this branch was Niyiga who was a subordinate of Chalukya Somesvara I in 1044 A.D. The inscription mentioning this fact comes from Almel itself which is here called Elemola. The inscription is fragmentary and as such no details about the chief are available. The next chief was his son Singarasa. He figures in an inscription from Kulekumajgi in Sindgi taluk dated 1077 A.D. as the subordinate of Vikramaditya VI. However, no other details about him are available. His brother Udayaditya figures here as well as in an other inscription.
from the same place dated 1082 A.D. $^5$ Considering the fact
that they were mentioned together in both the inscriptions
it looks as though they were exercising their authority jointly.
The next known chief was Singarasa II, the son of Udayaditya.
He figures in an inscription kept in the Bijapur Museum which
probably came from Sindgi taluk and it is dated in 1120 A.D. $^5^1$
He is described as the subordinate of Chalukya Vikramaditya
VI. He is credited in a conventional way as having routed the
Cholas and Malava kings. It may be stated that he participated
in both the northern and southern expeditions of King Vikramaditya VI. He is stated to have been a party to a grant of
land made to the temple of Malasthānadeva.

From an inscription of Malghān in Sindgi taluk dated
in 1133 A.D. $^5^2$ we learn that Singarasa II had died by that
time and his son Sōvarasa was in power. This inscription
describes Singarasa as a favourite servant of Ketaladevi,
probably the queen of Vikramaditya VI. Sōvarasa is here stated
to be making a grant of money to the temple of 2wayambhudeva
at Malghān for the beatitude of his father Singarasa.

An inscription from Devarnāvedgi also in Sindgi taluk
and dated 1140 A.D. $^5^3$ in the reign of Jagadēkamalla II gives
some more details of Sōvarasa and he is described as born of
Bachaladevi, the wife of Simhabhūpa i.e. Singarasa II. It is
no wonder, says the inscription, that born as he was in the Khöchara family he was highly generous. Naturally he surpassed in his generosity, Khöchara, Sibi, Bali and Karna of the Puranic fame. And again, the record states that the subordinate officer of Sövidöva constructed a temple of Mallikärjuna which looked as though the god Brahma created this temple, pouring in it all the beauty found in the world, at Nāvadgi. This chief called Dēverāja, invited Sovideva to this place to see the temple. The chief pleaded that this construction must be protected by the ruler and requested him to make a grant whereby Sövarasa made a grant of land for the maintenance of the temple, the details of which are elaborated in the inscriptions.54

An inscription from Yärgal, also from Sindgi taluk, gives Sövidöva another date in 1146 A.D.55 He continued to be the subordinate of Jagadekamalla II during this period. Here he is stated to have made a grant of land to the temple of Svayambhu Ramōvaradēva at Yarengal i.e. Yärgal constructed by a person called Vittarasa.

The next Silēhāra chief known to us is Singarasa. We have a clear date for him in 1168 A.D.56 but he appears to have come to power even earlier. We have an inscription from Kāllevä in Sindgi taluk dated 1158 A.D.57 A Silēhāra chief
is mentioned here but unfortunately his name is lost, but in view of the fact that Singarasa's inscription of 1168 A.D. is found in Kadlevāḍ, we may suggest that this inscription also belonged to him. He might have come to power sometimes before 1158 A.D. which is the date of this inscription.

When this chief came to power, the political situation in Karnataka was undergoing a change. The mighty rule of the Chālukyas was now on the decline and their feudatory, Kalachuri Bījjala rose in revolt against the ruling Chālukya king Tāla III and finally claimed himself to be the imperial ruler. This event took place in about 1156 A.D. With this change, the Śilāhāra chief also obviously changed his loyalty to the Kalachuri ruler. The Kadlevāḍ inscription of 1158 A.D. which belongs to Kalachuri Bījjala mentions a Śilāhāra chief presumably, Singarasa III and that he continued in power later as well, is clear from yet another inscription from Kadlevāḍ dated 1168 A.D. and belonging to Kalachuri Sōvidēva. Here Singarasa is stated to be governing from Eḷamēla. He is associated with a grant made to the temple of Svayambhu Sōmanātha of Kaṭlevāḍ. He had a fairly long rule. We have for him two more dates in 1172 and 1176 A.D., during the rule of Kalachuri Rayamurāri Sōvidēva. In A.D. 1172 he is stated to have visited Kaṭlevāḍ which was a Gaṭikāsthāna, to have a dārsana of God Svayambhu Sōmanātha. On this
occasion he made a grant of land to the beautiful Trikūṭa temple constructed here on the bank of the river Bhīma. In the inscription of 1176 A.D., also from Kaḍlavāḍ, he is associated with yet another grant made along with Kasapayya-nāyaka and Mahāvṛsadhana Kumāra Dhanudēgarasa and others.

Singarasa's son was Ānemarasa. We have a date in 1186 A.D. by which time the political scene had again undergone a change, as Sōmāśvara IV of the Chālukya family had succeeded in wresting the power from the Kālacūria and establishing the Chālukya hegemony once again. Naturally, therefore, the Śilāhāras changed their loyalty to the Chālukyas once again.

In the inscription mentioned above, like his predecessors he is also stated to have made a grant to the temple of Svayambhu Sōmanātha at Kaḍlavāḍ which had acquired considerable fame.

As mentioned earlier, a Gōnarasa of the Śilāhāra family figures in an inscription from Hippirgi dated in 1192 A.D. Since the inscription is from Sindgi taluk, it is tempting to connect him with the family of Ānemarasa, but there is no sufficient ground to do so. If he really belonged to the same family, the genealogy can be extended by another generation.
But by this time there was yet another change in the political conditions of Karnataka. Chalukya Somesvara IV was successful in getting back the kingdom from the Kalachuris; but he could not retain it for long. Within a few years he lost it to Seuna Bhillama V whose family had served the Chalukyas earlier. By 1192 A.D., which is the date of the record in question, the northern part of the erstwhile Chalukya kingdom had been occupied by Bhillama V. Naturally, therefore we see this Goparasa as a subordinate of the new king Bhillama.

Thus, no details about their political activities such as participating in the battles of their overlords or the details of their administration are forthcoming. The records indicate that the local political conditions were comparatively quieter and that they were successful in maintaining peace in the area within their jurisdiction.

As for their religious affiliations the above references indicate that they were the followers of the Saiva faith of the Kalasamukha sect and contributed to the temple building activities, common in the period concerned.
REFERENCES AND NOTES

1. Indian Culture, II, p. 393 ff.


3. Descriptive lists of Inscriptions, 1940-41, No. 16, p. 3


5. Ibid, No. 16.


7. In the Akkalkot inscription, in between Piṭṭama and Nāgarjuna a chief named Ajja figures, whereas there is no mention of him here. But Dr. G. S. Gai (SII XX p. XX intro.) includes this chief in the genealogy next to Piṭṭama.

8. SII, XX, No. 85.


10. ARGAS, No. 9


12. SI, XX, No. 71

13. Dr. G. S. Gai (SII, XX intro. p. XXI) and Dr. B. R. Gopal (Minor Dynasties of South India, (Karnataka), I, p. 154) have also taken Indara and Gōvana as the sons and grandson of Rakkasamati, but the word goraṛa used with reference to Indara and the word Kiriva used with reference to Gōvana (SII, XX, No. 71, p. 86, line 31)
clearly indicates their relationship as elder brother and junior to him respectively.

14. In this part of the genealogy, Dr. Gopal puts the names occurring in the Agarkhēd inscription one below the other, while Dr. G. S. Gai (SII, XX intro p. XXI) creates an avya or aliya. But though the text is rather vague it can be interpreted correctly. It is stated that the text indicates that Dhanasangraha was the brother (govara) of Piriya Gōvana of the family of Maraḷavitta. That his son was Gōvana is clear. But the next king Gōshṭada Kavilēsa is described as Gōvana rasaninavara Kirtiyayyah (SII XX No. 71). Here Kirtiyayyah does not make any sense. It may be corrected as Kiriyayya, which means the younger brother, (i.e. father's younger brother) of Gōvanarasā as shown above. This Kavilēsa becomes the younger brother of Dhanasangraha.

15. SII, XX, No. 179.
16. AEGAS, No. 9, p. 43
17. Actually only the letters Śriman-Nāvi appears in the text of the inscription. The name is rightly taken to be Nāviga (SII, XX, No. 30).
18. SII, XX, No. 51
19. Ibid., No. 56
20. Ibid., No. 30.
21. Ibid, No. 80
22. Ibid, No.
23. Ibid, No. 104
24. Ibid, No. 111
25. Ibid, No. 115
26. Ibid, Nos. 151, 154 and 158
27. Gopal, B.R. *Minor Dynasties of South India*
   (Karnataka) I, Madras, p. 158
28. SII, XX, No. 127
29. Ibid, No. 292
30. Ibid, No. 166
31. Ibid, No. 309
32. SII, II, No. 11
33. SII, XX, No. 91
34. Ibid, No. 178
35. Ibid, No. 189
36. Ibid, No. 71
37. Ibid, No. 21
38. Ibid, No. 71
39. Ibid, No. 91
40. *Descriptive List of Inscriptions 1940-41* No. 16 p. 3
41. SII, XX, No. 85
42. Ibid, XV, No. 35
43. Ibid, XI, No. 292
44. Ibid., No. 179
45. Ibid., No. 178
46. Ibid., No. 179
47. ARAAS, No. 9, Nos. 13-14, p. 43
48. SI, XX, No. 30
49. Ibid., No. 51
50. Ibid., No. 56
51. Ibid., No. 80
52. Ibid., No. 104
53. Ibid., No. 111
54. Ibid., Nos. 111, 115 and 116 respectively
55. Ibid., No. 115
56. Ibid., No. 151
57. Ibid., No. 136
58. Ibid., XV, No. 116
59. Ibid., XX, No. 154
60. Ibid., No. 127