CHAPTER IX

ADVENT OF NEW POWER

Earlier it has been said that within a generation since the date of the Polamuru set I, the Vengi country, the heart of the Vishṇukūḍi dominions, was completely under the effective rule of the Chālukyas. Therefore, for all practical purposes the Chālukyas may be looked upon as successors of the Vishṇukūḍis in the Vengi country. How the former succeeded in subjugating the country and in establishing their own rule there may be studied in this chapter.

(1) Sources

We have got the following three records that have bearings on the history of the period.

1) The Marutara Grant: This recently published copper plate charter is of the Chālukya king Satyārṣaya Prithivīvallabha, to be identified with Pulakeśi II of Bādami as we shall see subsequently. In the introductory part of the record the king is described only in a general way and here no particular achievement, either political or otherwise, is attributed to him. Many of the epithets of the monarch have been met with in the descriptions of his father Kīrttivarman and his paternal uncle Maṅgalēśa in the latter's epigraphs. Dated in the eighth regnal year, Jyēṣṭha ba. 15, solar eclipse, the present charter records the king's gift
of the village Māruttara together with Natāvaṭa and Vattipagu in favour of some eleven Brāhmaṇas and to one person belonging to the fourth caste (varpa-traya-nivṛtta). The names, gātrās and the educational achievements of all the twelve are given. Some of the Brāhmaṇa donees were well versed in the four Vedas, some had mastered eighty tarkas (logics) and some others thousand tarkas.

It is said that at the time of issue of the charter the monarch was camping at Kalūrapura immediately after capturing Pīṣṭapura, which seems to have been surrendered to him, or more probably which he had destroyed before capturing. Further we are told here that the king made this grant with a view to help the seniormost queen, evidently of his, by name Kadambā, in fulfilling her desire to gratify her guru (father?). At the same time the king is also stated to have made the same gift for the akshayya-phala or imperishable result (i.e. moksha) for a certain Ālukamahārāja, who had come all the way from Mangalapura for the sake of the donor i.e. Pulakesi, paying no heed to the troubles of the stay in the dangerous (vishama), plundered (vikrishta) and desolated (adhyāna) foreign country and to the difficulties of returning back; and who had attained godhood (i.e. died) at Kalūra.

Of all the Chālukyan kings who styled themselves as Satyāśraya Prithivīvallabha, Pulakeśi II alone is known to have subdued Pīṣṭapura and to have invaded the Veṇgi country. Therefore the issuer of the charter is to be
identified with that king. His chief queen Kadambā is not known from any other source. The Ālukamahārāja, who came from Maṅgalapura to Kalūra and died there was certainly a member of the Ālupa dynasty of the Tuḷuva country (South Kanara). One Sakalasrimat Āluvarasa of the dynasty has been referred to c. 600 A.D. If that is correct, then the Ālukamahārāja of the present record may be identified tentatively with that king. From the tenor of charter under study it appears almost certain that the above Āluka king was the guru (i.e. father or an elderly member of the family) of the queen Kadambā. The tone of the record seems also to indicate that he came to Kalūra to assist his overlord, i.e. Pulakēśi II, in his campaigns in the Eastern Deccan, and died in Kalūra, perhaps in a battle.

Pishtapura of the record is the modern Pīṭhāpuram in East Godavari District. Its capture by Pulakēśi II, is already known to us from his Aihole Prasasti. Some writers have identified the place of camp of Pulakēśi II viz. Kalūra or Kalūrapura, and the grant village Māruṭūra respectively with the modern Kīlūr and Māruṭūru both in the Guntur district. However, in the Aihole Prasasti we are told that after the capture of Pishtapura, Pulakēśi II had to fight and win a fierce battle near the Koleru lake - a thing not referred to in the present record. So it is reasonable to think that at the time of the issue of the present charter the Chāluksya was yet to fight and win that battle. Besides,
as will be shown later, Pulakeśi II had to come personally once again, in about 631 A.D., on a separate campaign to conquer the Guntur region in the South of the Krishna. Therefore it is very likely that the name Kalūra in our record, where Pulakeśi II was camping at the time of the issue of the charter immediately after reducing Pishṭapura, has some connection with the Koleru lake. May be, it was a place somewhere on the bank of that lake in the West Godavari district. Perhaps it was this place, wherefrom the Eastern Chālukya Jayasimha issued his Gudivada plates (set I) in his 18th year.

Coming to the gift village Māruṭuṇa it may be identified with the present Māruṭuṇa in the Tanuku taluk in the same district. Again the two other geographical units viz. Natāvaṭa and Vattipuṇa, gifted along with Māruṭuṇa may be identical respectively with the modern Nāḍupuṇi, about 6 or 7 miles to the east of Māruṭuṇa, and with Vadura, just adjacent to the said Māruṭuṇa. Some are inclined to identify Mangalapura of the record with Mangalagiri again in the Guntur district. But the tenor of the record indicates, beyond any possible doubt, that the place under question was the home of the Āḷupa king and it was far removed from Kalūra. Therefore it may better be identified with the present Mangalore, in the Āḷupa country in the South Kanara district.

The details of the date of the record pose a problem. This is one of the few records of Pulakeśi II, known so far,
giving verifiable details of dates in the regnal years of
the king. The two other known records of this type are the
Hyderabad and the Kopparan plates.

The details of the date of the Hyderabad plates, are
_raiyabhisheka-samvatsara_ (the year of coronation) 3, Ṣaka 534
expired, Bhadrapada ba. 15, and solar eclipse. Dr. Fleet
first equated these details with the 23rd July, 613 A.D.
when there was a solar eclipse visible in Badami. But,
as this equivalent would be correct only if the Ṣaka year
quoted was 535 (not 534) expired, the above scholar subse­
quently changed the above view and equated the details with
the 2nd August, 612 A.D., when there was a solar eclipse,
but not visible in India. Yet, as in epigraphs there are
instances of quoting eclipses that did not occur at all or
were not visible in India, and as one is not justified in
assuming that the Ṣaka year 534 quoted in the record is
wrong for 535 the second equivalent has been taken to be the
intended date of the record. Consequently the accession of
Pulakēśi II has been assigned to a period between July-August
of 609 A.D. and July-August of 610 A.D.

On the other hand, the details of the date of the
Kopparam plates viz. regnal year 21, Karttika Mahānāvami (i.e.
Śu. 9), and Thursday are, as calculated out by R. Sewell,
to be equated with the 10th October, 631 A.D., and it would
assign Pulakēśi’s accession sometimes between October, 610
A.D. and October, 611 A.D., i.e. about a year later than
Fleet’s date.
Coming to the details of the date of the Marutura grant, viz. regnal year 8, Jyēṣṭha ba. 15, and solar eclipse, it may be stated that according to Swamikkānun Pillai's Ephemeris there was no solar eclipse in the month of Jyēṣṭha during the period between 610 A.D. and 624 A.D. excepting the one that fell on Friday, the 21st May, 616 A.D. Therefore it is certain that this was the intended date of the record. But it would drive one to assign Pulakesi's accession to a period between May 22nd, 608 A.D. and May 21st, 609 A.D. i.e. about a year earlier than Fleet's date.

Thus the above three charters furnish three conflicting dates for the accession of Pulakēśi II, viz. (1) 609-10 A.D. (Hyderabad plates); (2) 610-11 A.D. (Kopparam plates) and 608-09 A.D. (Marutura grant). Though one may not be quite sure on this point, a probable solution to solve the above problem of discrepancy may be suggested as follows:

True, one should not, without sufficient reason, assume that the Śaka year 534 quoted in the Hyderabad plates is wrong. Yet, on the evidence of the subsequently discovered Kopparam plates one may be fairly justified in assuming that the intended year of the record was perhaps only Śaka 535 expired in which year there was a solar eclipse in the month of Bhādrapada and it was visible in India. If so, even according to the Hyderabad plates, the year of accession of Pulakēśi II would be only 610-11 A.D.

Coming to the Marutura grant it may be worthwhile to
bear in mind this: Studying various aspects of the Chalukyan history of the period, Dr. Fleet placed Maṅgaleśa's death in 608 A.D. and allowed a year or so for all that was done by Pulakēśi II, before his coronation, in quietening the general confusion that ensued on the death of Maṅgaleśa. If this is accepted, then it may not be unreasonable to assume that the eighth year quoted in the Marutura grant is to be counted from Pulakēśi's accession on the death of Maṅgaleśa in 608 or 609 A.D., while the third year of the Hyderabad plates is to be counted from the date of his coronation in 610-11 A.D. That is why, of the two early charters of the monarch viz. the Hyderabad plates and the Marutura grant, the former quotes the year of coronation (rājaviśvēka-
samvatsara) while the latter mentions the year of rule (rājaviśvēka-
śrī-vara). 

(2) The Polamuru Plates Set II: The second important landmark in the history of the Chalukyan occupation of the Veṅgi country is furnished by the Polamuru plates set II. The language of this record closely follows that of the Polamura plates set I. It was issued by the Eastern Chalukya king Prithivi-Jayaśimha i.e. Jayasimha I the son and successor of Kubja Vishnuvardhana who was the first king of the Eastern Chalukya dynasty. This charter records that king's gift, as the Servasiddhi-datti, of the village Pulomburu in the Guddavādi viśaya in favour of the Brāhmaṇa Rudrasarman of the Taittirīya school and of the Gautama gotra. The donee is
further described as a grandson of Dāmasārman, as a son of Sivaśārman, as a resident of the śāhā (i.e. ghaṭikāsthāna) in 'Asanapurā, and as the former owner of the agrahāra (pūrvāgrahārīka) evidently of Pulōmūru. As in the case of the Polamurū set I so in the case of this charter also the officials hastikōsa and vīrakōsa figure as the executors of the grant. The charter is dated in the third day of the eighth fortnight of the Summer season in the fifth regnal year of the monarch.

There cannot be any doubt that this charter, studied together with the Polamurū set I, reveals the following facts: The grant villages of both the records are identical; the donee Rudraśārman's father Śivaśārman of the present charter was identical with the donee of the same name of the other; and in fact, the present charter only restored — as indicated by the epithet pūrvāgrahārīka of the donee — the original grant conferred by the other one, which must have fallen in disuse in the meantime evidently due to the political upheaval in the area during the period.

From the above, this is also fairly clear that the interval between these two charters could not have been much more than a generation. Yet to fix up the actual year of issue of the present charter is a little problematic. For, though the Eastern Chālukyan records are unanimous in assigning 18 years of rule to Jayāsimha's father Kubja Vishnuvardhana, scholars widely differ from each other regarding the year of
commencement of Vishnuvardhana's regnal period. Accordingly the 18 years of rule of that monarch has been differently assigned by scholars to 615-33 A.D., 624-41 A.D., and 633-50 A.D. However, as the Polamuru set I is to be placed in 612 A.D., and as the gap between the dates of these two sets of Polamuru plates could not have been much more than a generation it would be much better if the reign of Vishnuvardhana is assigned to a period c. 616-33 A.D. In that case it would mean that his reign period was counted from the date of his yuvarājyabhīshēka or assumption of the viceregal position. The Satara Plates issued by Vishnuvardhana as a yuvraja in the eighth regnal year of Pulakēśa II (i.e. the same year of the Marutura grant) signifies that in that year viz. 616 A.D., Vishnuvardhana was already enjoying a status, independent enough to enable him to issue charters in his own name, if not in his own regnal years. Moreover, as we shall see subsequently soon after his victory in the battle of Koleru in 616 A.D. Pulakēśa II entrusted the administration of Vengi to his brother Vishnuvardhana. Therefore it is not unreasonable to equate the 5th year of his son Jayasimha with c. 637 or 638 A.D. (616 + 18 + 5), a year which is removed from the year of the Polamuru set I only by about 26 or 27 years. It may also be seen that even if the reign period of Vishnuvardhana is assigned to 624-41 A.D. the fifth year of Jayasimha would correspond to 645-46 A.D. i.e. just 33 or 34 years from the date of the Polamuru set I.
(3) The Aihole Prāṣasti: One more inscription of Pulakēśi II, though not coming from the Vēṇgi country is directly connected with its history of the period. It is the well known Aihole Prāṣasti, dated in Śaka 556 expired (=634-35 A.D.), corresponding to the year 3735 since the Bhārata war (i.e. Kali era). The 27th and 28th verses of the Prāṣasti give a vivid picture of how Pulakēśi II pounded and captured Pishaṭapura and how he fought a fierce battle of elephants and infantry somewhere on the bank of the Kunāla i.e. Koleru lake. The relevant portion reads:

\[
\text{Pishaṭapuram vēna jātai ātṛagām-adṛṛgamam} \\
\text{chirād yasya Kapāl-vṛttam jātai ātṛagām-adṛṛgamam} \\
\text{Sannaddha-vāraṇaśatā-sthaatit-antarālam} \\
\text{mān-avudha-kṣata-nara-kṣatai-āṅga-rāgam} \\
\text{āśi-liṣaṁ yad-savamardditam-abhra-garbham} \\
\text{Kaunālaṁ=ambaham=iv-śūtita-sāndhya-rāgam} \\
\]

(ii) Chālukyan Occupation of Vēṇgi

Having thus examined in detail the contents of the Chālukyan records of the area and period concerned, we may study the history of the Chālukyan occupation of the Vēṇgi country. We have already referred to the rise of the Chālukyan power under Pulakēśi I (c. 535-66 A.D.) a junior contemporary of Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman. He was succeeded by his son Kīrtti-varman in 566 A.D. i.e. the year in which Vikramēṇāravaran II issued his Tuṭmalagudem plates (set II). Kīrtti-varman was
succeeded by his younger brother Maṅgalēśa in 597-98 A.D. who, as we already saw, ruled till 608 A.D., i.e. more or less contemporaneously with Maḍhavavārman IV.

The Chālukyan inscriptions credit both Kīrttivarman and Maṅgalēśa with extensive conquests. Thus the former is said to have won victories over the rulers of Vaṅga, Aṅga, Kaliṅga, Vaṭṭāra, Magdha, Madreka, Kāraḷa, Gaṅga, Mūshaka, Paṇḍya, Dvārakā, Chōliya, Alūka and Vaijayantī and to have destroyed the Nālas, the Mauryas and the Kādambas. Similarly, Maṅgalēśa is also credited with the victory over the Kaṭachchuris and the conquest of the Rēvatiyāpa. It is significant that even these tall claims and exaggerated lists of countries and rulers over whom the Chālukyan kings claim to have won victory do not refer even once to the name of Andhra or Veṅgi or Vishpukṛṣṇi. It may not be wrong if this phenomenon is taken to be a proof in the negative indicating a probability of some sort of friendly relationship between the Chālukyas and the Vishpukṛṣṇis of the period. A possibility of Pulakēśi I (or his son Kīrtivarman) joining the Vishpukṛṣṇi Indrabhaṭṭārakavārman against the Maukhari, sometime earlier than 554 A.D. has already been referred to. Moreover the last mentioned Vishpukṛṣṇi, as we saw earlier, was perhaps the earliest of the known kings to bear the title Satyāgāraṇa, which many Chālukya rulers, since the days of Pulakēśi I himself, were very particular to assume. Again
the bhūravi and the name Satyaśrava Dhruvaraja Indravarman of
the Goa plates (610 or 611 A.D.), whose place in the Chālukya
genealogy is yet to be finalised satisfactorily, recall
those of Satyaśrava Indravarman, the Vishnuṇgūḍi. All these
may point to a probability of some friendly relationship be­tween these two families.

Mangalāśa died in c. 608. The Aihole Prāṣasti furnishes
a picturesque description of the anarchy and confusion that
ensued his death. At that time, the prāṣasti says, taking
advantage of the general confusion of the time, one Appāyika
and a certain Gōvinda - the latter with a sizable army of
elephants - jointly ventured to capture the Chālukya terri-
tory to the north of the river Bhīmā. The prāṣasti goes on
to say that Pulakesi, evidently following bhadrapāya, defeated
and drove away Appāyika but made friendship with Gōvinda and
amply rewarded him for the help he had rendered to the Chālukya.

The verse under question runs:

Labdhyā kēlam bhayam=upagataḥ jātum=Appāvik-ākhyā
Gōvinda cha dvirada-nikaraṁ-uttaram Bhīmarathvāḥ
yasyāṁikair-yudhi bhaya-rasajñatvam=ēkāḥ pravātah
tatāṁ avāxātm phalam=upakritasya=āparāḥ āpi sadvah
(Verse 17)

No attempt is possible to identify Appāyika at this
stage of our present knowledge. But scholars entertain
conflicting theories regarding the identification of Gōvinda
of the above verse. Some have proposed to identify this
Govinda with his namesake, the great grandfather of the Rasatrakūṭa Dantidurga (742-57 A.D.). However, as Dr. Fleet had rightly pointed out, that Rasatrakūṭa did not enjoy any regal position and is hardly referable to a period as early as c. 608 A.D. To the period under question some writers assign the Rasatrakūṭa chief named Govinda who figures as the grandfather of the Rasatrakūṭa Nannarāja in the latter's Tiwarkhed (Betul district C.P.) plates, believed to be dated in Śaka 553, but that record is taken to be spurious. Even otherwise, the text of the unsatisfactorily worded date-portion of the said record probably indicates Śaka 663 (731-32 A.D.) and not Śaka 553 as the date of the record. Therefore that Govinda too cannot be assigned to the beginning of the 7th century. Another school of scholars is of the opinion that Govinda of the Aihole Praśasti was a mere military adventurer with no claim of royalty. However, the fact that he had a strong army of elephants and that during Pulakesi’s ever successful military career the latter had to come to a compromise with this Govinda alone and rewarded him in recognition of his help does not seem to support that contention. Thus the identity of Govinda of the praśasti still remains to be a burning question.

However, without giving any reason Dr. Fleet suggested that this Govinda must have been a Rasatrakūṭa. It may be probably because Fleet was not aware of any other dynasty of the period that had kings of that name. But now it is known well that the name Govinda was popular in the family.
of the Vishṇukupūḍis. We have also already seen that the
Vishṇukupūḍis and their dominions were just on the eastern
side of the Bhīma river, and that they had organised a
strong army of elephants. Therefore one may suggest
tentatively at least, that that Govinda who invaded the
Chālukyan territory on the northern side of the Bhīma with a
big army of elephants and with whom Pulakesi II found it
expedient to be friendly, might have been a Vishṇukupūḍi
prince, perhaps, as the period indicates, a son of Mādhava-varman IV. The prince was probably named after his own grandfather i.e. Govindevarman II. May be, this Vishṇukupūḍi prince, being tempted by the troubled conditions of the Chālukyan kingdom, set aside the traditional friendly policy towards
the Chālukyas and tried to garb some territory of the latter,
but in vain. As the prāśasti tells us, he had to bow before
the diplomacy of Pulakesi. Obviously the policy of friend-
ship was revived. Therefore here in the Aihole Prāśasti
there may be a reference to a son of Mādhava-varman IV not
known so far from any other source. Similarly if the above
friendly relationship between the Chālukya and the Vishṇukupūḍi
were referred to in the Prāśasti, then it may very well explain
how Mādhava-varman IV could embark upon his eastern campaign
as late as 612 A.D., without the least apprehension of the
formidable Chālukya growing stronger and stronger just on
the western neighbourhood.

Crushing down the rebels with iron hand and tact,
Pulakesi II soon brought the civil war to an end, and esta-
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established himself firmly in Badami as evidenced by his own Hyderabad plates. Then he set out on a digvijaya. The Satara plates are clear enough to indicate that while starting on his foreign conquest Pulakesi made his younger brother Vishnupardhana a yuvraj and entrusted to him, with some independence, the administration of the home country. The Aihole prasasti gives a grandiloquent account of the triumphal campaigns of Pulakesi II. It narrates (verses 20-26) how he overthrew the Mauryas of Konka; subdued the Latas, the Malavas and the Gurjaras; won a spectacular victory over the mighty Harshvardhana of the north; acquired the sovereignty over the three Maharashtrakas; and humbled the Kalingas and Kosalas. Our study here is not concerned with any of these achievements of Pulakesi. But it is very much concerned with his achievements described in subsequent verses.

As we already saw, the next two verses tell us how he founded and captured Pishapura, fought, and also perhaps won, a pitched battle on the bank of the Kolera lake. The Marupura grant issued by Pulakesi II himself from his camp near that lake immediately after the capture of Pishapura corroborates the above statement of the Aihole prasasti. As a result of these two-fold victories, a sizable portion of the Eastern Deccan passed under the Chalukyan conqueror.

The chief Prithivimaharaja seems to have been ruling from Pishapura sometime in 612-16 A.D. as we saw earlier. Therefore it is certain that it was that chieftain, from whom Pulakesi snatched away Pishapura before he conquered
There are controversies regarding (1) the date Pulakesi*’s conquest of Vengi and (2) the king who gave a fierce battle to the invader on the banks of the Koleru lake.

(1) Regarding the first point viz. the date of Pulakesi’s conquest of Vengi, scholars entertain contradictory opinions. The dates that had been suggested in this connection are c. 609 A.D., 610 A.D., 611 A.D., 610-15 A.D., 617-20 A.D., 615 A.D. and c. 631 A.D. However the Māruṣūra grant dated in 616 A.D. fully testifies the view of Dr. Fleet who, as early as 1891, with a remarkable historical and chronological insight, has assigned the event to 616 or 617 A.D.

(2) On the second point also scholars differ from one another widely. When Dr. Fleet wrote in 1891, the dynasty of the Vishnukundis was unknown and the Māṅgalūra grant of the Pallava Simhavarma was found to indicate the Pallava occupation of the Vengi country. Naturally therefore the above scholar held that the Vengi country was taken away by the Chālkaya from the Pallavas. This seems to have been also supported by the Aihole prasasti itself speaking of the Pallava-Chālkaya conflict along with the description of the Chālkayan conquest of Vengi.

However, after the discovery of the Vishnukundis, scholars are unanimous in taking the Chālkayas as the political successors of the Vishnukundis in Vengi. But they hold
contrary views regarding the probable Vishnukundi rival of the Chalukya. While studying the genealogy and chronology of the Vishnukundis, we have seen how the upholders of the Theory III (of genealogy) first identified that Vishnukundi rival with Madhavavarman, the Trikuta-Malavadinati or his uncle Vikramendravarman and how they have to abandon that view and have now come to identify the Vishnukundi adversary of Pulakeśi with Vikramendravarman II of the Chikkulla plates. The difficulties that the Theory suffers from has already been pointed out.

On the other hand the authors of the Theory IV viz. those who believe that Madhavavarman of the Polamuru set I was identical with his namesake of the Ipur set I and was the grandson of Vikramendravarman of the Chikkulla plates are of the opinion that that Madhavavarman himself or his son Mañchyanabhatṭāraka must have been the Vengi ruler defeated by Pulakeśi II in the battle of the Koleru lake.

However, as we have already seen, no Vishnukundi is heard of after 612 A.D. It seems, therefore, that in that year or very soon after, Madhavavarman IV must have died without leaving any able successor to shoulder the responsibility of the kingdom and consequently the country was plunged into confusion and chaos. In this connection it is quite significant that in the Mārupura grant of Pulakeśi II characterises the country where he was camping (i.e. Vengi) as “a dangerous desolated land given to plunder
(vishama-vikrishṭ-ādvāna)" - a description that amply vouches for the general chaotic conditions prevalent in the region during the period under question. The cumulative effect of these evidences may indicate that the powerful dynasty of the Vishnuṇuṇḍis had just disappeared from the political arena of the Andhra country and that no king or dynasty worth the name had been successful enough to establish itself firmly in the area. Therefore it may not be wrong to suggest that Pulakesi invaded the Vengi country, taking the fullest advantage of the political confusion and instability that must have ensued the sudden collapse of the powerful Vishnuṇuṇḍi house round about 612 A.D.

(iii) Pulakesi II and Prithivivuvărāja

The battle on the bank of the Koleru lake fought by Pulakesi II in May 616 A.D. immediately after capturing Pishaṭapura perhaps decided the Chālukya's success in subjugating the Krishṇā-Godāvari doab. As the course of events show, Pulakesi won that battle. However, his Marutara grant is clear enough to suggest that he lost Alukamahārāja, perhaps his faithful general and father-in-law. We have already referred to the Chezerla inscription in which certain Prithivivuvărāja, a feudatory of the Pallava Mahāndravarmavum I claims to have destroyed the armies of the enemies near the Koleru lake. Therefore it is very likely that the Chālukyan monarch,
though a powerful expansionist, was clever enough to realise it not expedient to cross the Krishna and to march further south at that time. So, after the battle of Kolhar, Pulakesi seems to have returned back to Badami leaving the work of consolidating the new conquests to his beloved brother Vishnuvardhana. However in 631 A.D. he revisited the east coast and completed his conquest of the region. On this aspect of the history of Vengi the following two inscriptions bear witness:

(1) The Chezerla Inscription: This inscription is engraved on two sides of a stone slab set up in the Kapoteshwara temple in the village Chezerla, Narasaraopet Taluk, Guntur district. When the record was first discovered in 1899 and noticed in 1900, both the sides of the slab were believed to bear one and the same inscription. However, perhaps because the epigraph is very much obliterated, particularly in the lower parts of the stone and perhaps also because there was no link found to connect the texts engraved on its two sides, Sri K.V. Subrahmanya Aiyer, the first editor of the record (in 1928) published the two texts separately. However, again he had an opportunity to examine the epigraph in situ. So he maintained that the records on both the sides of the stone, are "materially connected with one another", and "written in the same script", "almost in the same hand". Therefore he may be right in treating them as a single record. Now there are other reasons also to believe that the text
on the second face is in continuation of that on the first. Therefore it is almost certain that the slab contains only a single record engraved on both the sides of it.

The palaeography of the epigraph is very much similar to that of the Aihole Prasasti of Pulakeśi II, and of the Dharmarājāratha inscriptions at Mahābalipuram, resembling palaeographically the inscription of Pallava Mahendra varman I. One notable feature in the Chezerla record is that the vīras are denoted not by two dots, one above the other, but by a vertical line with ends slightly thickened, as in the Dharmarājāratha inscriptions. Similarly the letters dh, ṣ, ṣ, etc., are more of the Pallava than of the Chālukya. On consideration of these features the Chezerla record may be attributed to the age of the above mentioned epigraph i.e., the first half of the 7th century.

The record definitely falls into four parts. The first part (lines 1-33) introduces the chief Prithvīyuvarāja as camping at the lake Kōlissaras i.e., on the bank of it, and as the son of the daughter of Kandarāja. The second part, i.e., the grant portion (lines 33-71), seems to record the chief's grant of a tax-free village and perhaps a temple, and also the restoration by him of some original gift in favour of gods Achalēśvara and Kapōtēśvara, apparently to meet the expenses of their worship. The grant was made for the victory, strength, longevity, health etc., of the lineage of the donor's son (sva-sut-anvava). The third part (lines 72-89) seems to refer to the rule of the Mahārāja Avasīkhājana
Mahendravikrama and probably bears the details of the date of the record in the regnal year of that king, now unfortunately lost almost completely. The fourth or concluding part (lines 90-93) refers to the twelve officers of the temple of Kapotēśvara and a merchant. Probably to them the gift was entrusted. A learned person, name lost, seems to be referred to presumably as the composer of the text of the record.

According to the inscription, the chief Kandararāja was born of the great family of Anandamaharshi and was the lord of the city Kandarapura, of two janapadas or provinces, and of the river Sitotara-Bennā (i.e. the Krishna-Bennā or Krishnā) in which the Andhra ladies took bath. He had the title Trikūṭaparvatapati and his victorious banner had in it (the representation of) the gālāṅgāla or a species of monkey. His beloved daughter was the great queen Āvanitalantavati and of the latter, was born the chief named Prithviyuvarāja (lines 3-12).

The last mentioned chief is endowed with a long chain of epithets, of which a few are noteworthy. From them we learn this: Prithviyuvarāja was residing at, or governing (adbhitishthan) over, the place of the above Kandararāja (lines 12-13). He had an excellent army of elephants (varah-ōttama-bala) (line 18). His charters had, evidently on their seals, the representation of Muraripu (i.e. Viṣṇu) mounted on Garuḍa (lines 22). He was the lord of the highly prosperous villages (pallī) and provinces (janapada) and was bent upon vanquishing the most powerful (line 23).
had in it the figure of a vulture (gridhr-ādhyāsita-ketana, line 24). He was a wrestler, as it were, in the academy of wise men well versed in all the fine and practical arts (sakalā-kalē-vaśarda-sat-sabha-malla, line 29). The chief's last epithet seems to be Śrīraṇamaḥāvikrama (line 33). It is strikingly significant that this list of epithets, though fairly long, does not endow the chief under question with any title like Mahārāja or Rājan showing his regal status.

In the grant portion, which is very much defaced, references are made to the numerous temples (devatāvatana) based on firm footing (line 36); to the gift village with all immunities (lines 37-40); to the goddess Pārvatī and god Paramēśvara (line 41); and to a gift of probably a temple (?) with bells and some other things made of silver (lines 43-46). After a long description (lines 47-67) of the gods Āchalesvara and Kapoṭēśvara, reference is made (lines 67-69) to something (may be, some earlier grants) that had fallen in disuse on account of "some other reasons" (karaṇāntaraier-astamita); and also to its restoration. The god Kapoṭēśvara is described (lines 70-72) to be in the abode i.e. temple (avasthāna) at the time of the issue of the record (iddāīm).

From the third part we learn that the Mahārāja Mahēndra-vikrama had the title Avanibhājana (line 79). He is described perhaps as a worshipper of god Hara (i.e. Śiva) (line 78). He was the meditator on the feet of Bappa-bhaṭṭāraka, and was member of the family of those who belonged to the Bhradvaja-gōtra, had performed probably Āśvamedha (line 73) and were
bowed by their feudatories (line 72). His capital was watered by the river Vēgavatī (line 83) i.e. the modern river that passes by Kāñchipuram.

K.V.S. Aiyer seems to be perfectly right in identifying Prithiviyuvarāja of the inscription with Prithiviḍuvarāja of the Koppāram plates, which we shall examine next. This identification is propped up by the fact that both the records belong to the same age and to the same area. Further more, in both the records he is not endowed with any regal title and in both he is pictured to have done something for the sake of the lineage of his son. By the Chezerla inscription he made a donation for the welfare of his son's lineage while in the Kopparam plates he claims to have secured a kingdom for the same lineage. Thus the circumstances and the identity of the expressions favour the above identification. The difference between the spellings of Prithiviyuvarāja and Prithiviḍuvarāja in the respective records may not matter much. For, one and the same person is called as Brahmayuvarāja and also as Brahmaduvarāja respectively in the Sanskrit and the Tamil portions in one and the same Kasakkudi plates of Nandivarman Pallavamalla. Similarly the Eastern Chālukya Maņgiyuvvarāja is also referred to sometimes as Maņgi-duvarāja in epigraphs.

The Chezerla inscription says that Prithiviyuvarāja's mother was a princess of the Ānanda family. But, from the extant portion of the record nothing is known about the family to which his father belonged. The theory of his Rāṣṭrakāṭa
affinity is based on flimsy grounds. Moreover, no Rāṣṭra-
kūṭa was known in the region as far east as Guptār and in
the age as early as the beginning of the seventh century.
It is said in this connection that the monarch Akālavarsba
Prithivivallabha of the Merkara plates of the Western Gaṅga
Āvinīta, dated in Śaka 388 was a Rāṣṭrakūṭa. But that
grant is written in characters of the 11th or 12th century
and is undoubtedly a spurious one, and it belongs to the west­
ern India. On the ground that the name Kandara may be a
variant of Kṛishṇa, a famous name in the Rāṣṭrakūṭa dynasty,
the Gorantla (Guntur district) plates of Attivarman of the
family of Kandara were once believed, to be the earliest
of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa records. But it is known now that that
Kandara was of the Ānanda family and had nothing to do with
the Rāṣṭrakūṭas. Therefore, as Dr. Fleet said, the earliest
traces of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas come from the Central India and
from the part of the former Bombay Presidency, and nothing
from the Eastern Deccan.

Because of its palaeography and contents, the Chezerla
inscription and its hero Prithivīyuvarāja are to be assigned
to the first quarter of the seventh century. Hence the
hero's maternal grandfather Kandara may be assigned to the
second half of the previous century. Evidently he was a
descendant of the Ānanda kings Kandara, Attivarman and
Damōdaravarman known from the Ānanda records. Even those who
take him to be the predecessor of Attivarman of the
Gorantla plates, are not unmindful of the palaeographical
difficulty that their theory suffers from. The significance of his title Trikūṭaparvatapati has already been discussed.

On the authority of the Mattavilāsaprabhasana, the king Mahendravarma-mahārāja of the inscription is to be identified with the author of that play, viz., the Pallava king 103 Mahendravarman I, the son of Simhavishnu. This identification draws much strength from the fact that the king is said to be a member of the family of those who had performed Śvamēcha and belonged to the Bhāradvāja gōtra. There can possibly be any doubt that the above well-known description is of the Pallava family only. Moreover Mahendravarman I was the only king to bear the title Avanibhājana found in the inscription. It may be noted that the above biruda of Mahendravarman viz., Avanibhājana is found engraved in one of that Pallava's earliest caves at Pallavaram as well as in his last cave at Śiyamangalam. And this biruda as well as the name Mahendravikrama are met with together in the same king's Tiruchirapalli cave.

Of the geographical units mentioned in the record, the Kōliśaras, where Prithivīyuvarāja was camping, is described to be the foremost among the bodies of water (nīra-kētu); and to be a famous one. We are also told that at the time of the issue of the epigraph, the above saras was a camping place, evidently of Prithivīyuvarāja, with his seven crores
of war-troops that had come from Dhānyakaṭa and were imparsable because of the enemy's army of elephants they had destroyed. There is no famous lake in the Coastal Andhra other than the Koleru lake, that can answer to such a description. As we have already seen, the bank of the Koleru lake was also a military camp of Pulakōṣi II and served as a battle field where that Chālukya used his army of elephants. In still earlier times it had also served probably as a battle field when Samudragupta invaded the area. The place continued to be battle field more than once even in subsequent ages. Therefore it is very probable that the Kōlissaras where Prithivīyuvarāja was camping with his seven crores of troops and had destroyed the enemy's army of elephants was identical with the Koleru lake. This lake is hardly 30 to 40 miles from Dhānyakaṭa of Prithivīyuvarāja. As the word ēru is a synonym of Sanskrit saras, 'lake', there may not be any unsurmountable phonetical difficulty in the Kōlissaras = Koleru lake equation.

Dhānyakaṭa whose huge army Prithivīyuvarāja was commanding at the Kōlissaras is same as Dhaṇakaṭa, Dhanakaṭa etc., of the Prakrit records of the earlier age, and it has been identified with the modern Dhārenikōṭa or Amarāvatī on the southern bank of the Krishṇa. From the Mayidavolu plates of the Pallava Śivaskandavarman (c. 350 A.D.) it is known that that place was a provincial capital of the Pallavas. It is likely that even during the time of the
Pallava Mahendra Varman, the place enjoyed the same status. Yuan Chwang who resided several months in Amaravati in 639 A.D., speaks of a country under the name Tena-ka-che-ka, or To-na-kee-tee-kia (Dhanyakataka). It probably corresponds to the region with its capital at Dhanyakataka. It is significant that in the Chezerla inscription an army is said to have come from this place. The lexicons recognise the word kataka in the sense of 'army', 'royal head-quarters' etc., etc. Therefore it is likely that Dhanyakataka was not only a provincial headquarter but also an army-headquarter of the monarch, i.e., Mahendra Varman and his chief Prithivi-viyuvaraja, obviously to guard the northern frontier of the Pallava empire.

The city of Kandarapura must have been a capital of the Ananda rulers wherefrom the earlier Ananda king Damodara-Varman issued his Mattepad plates. It has been located in the vicinity of the modern Chezerla. Some have proposed to identify it with the modern village Kanteru (Guntur district). Of the two janapadas or provinces over which Kandara was ruling, one may have been the region around Kandarapura itself. The other province was perhaps the region around Dhanyakataka referred to by Yuan Chwang as the country Dhanyakataka. The other geographical units viz., the mountain Trikuta-parvata, and the rivers Sitetara-benna and Vegavati all mentioned in the record have been already identified.

Though the date portion of the record is unfortunately lost, there cannot be any doubt that it belongs to the reign
of the Pallava Mahēndravarman I usually assigned to c. 600-630 A.D. Again as that king is described here as a worshipper of Śiva, the record is to be assigned not to the early part of his reign, but to a period after his conversion from Jainism to the Śaivism under the influence of the saint Appar. The reported discontinuance of certain earlier grants due to some reason not given in the record, may perhaps be due to the policy of persecution of non-Jaina religions, the monarch is believed to have followed when he was a Jaina earlier. But the point that clinches the date of the record is the reference to the Kōlissaras or Koleru as a battle-field. As we shall see subsequently, this battle was fought against Pulakōśi II. We have already learnt from the Marutra grant that the Chāluken conqueror was camping on the banks of the Koleru in May, 616 A.D.

Again the battle on the banks of the Koleru seems to have been fought by Pulakōśi with Prithivīyuvarāja. At the same time the Chezerla record issued by the latter from the same Koleru seems to quote some month of the autumnal season (August-October), as the date of the record. Therefore it is probable that the Chezerla record belongs to some date, a few months after the date of the Marutra grant.

(2) The Kopparam Plates: The second record which is also important for our study comes from Koppāram, a village also in the Narasaraopet Taluk, Guntur district. It belongs to the reign of Pulakōśi II, and is dated Thursday, Kērttika
Śu. 9, in his 21st regnal year. As we have already seen, these details are to be equated with the eighth October, 631 A.D. It records an order issued by Prithividuvarāja when Vallabha, i.e., Pulakesi II, was present in person. By that order, the chief granted some village in the Kamarāśṭra to a certain Brāhmaṇa. Prithividuvarāja is described to have won victories over his enemies and to have secured a kingdom in the lineage of his son. The concerned portion of the record reads:

Prulakṣī-Pṛthivīvallabha-mahārājō Kathārāhaṃ saṃmānataḥ
Viditaq-asti Vallabha samakṣaḥ-avasthitā vidhitva sat prapa-
dattā matāṃ Kalikulānāṃ-anēka-saṅgrāma-saḥsa-daśkēpa
nikrisha-mandālaṅga-saṅathēṇa sva-bhūna vīpakāna-
mandalam nīlitva sva-satānava pratiṣṭhāvita-
raivaṛya Pṛthivīduvarājaśvā=ājāntiḥ. (lines 7-10)

The date portion of the record runs:

Pravardhakāna-viśva-raiva-samvatsara ākāvinśa
Karttikāmāṣe mahānavaṃyam Bṛihapatiśvarā prasastā
Muhūrtta-avya detṭēr=ājāntiḥ (lines 13-14).

The Kamarāśṭra included the parts of the modern districts of Guntur and Nellore.

Regarding the identification of Pṛthividuvarāja of the record there is some difference of opinion. Sri Lakshman Rao identified him with Satyāśraya Dhruvarāja
Indravarman of the Goa plates of Šaka 532, or 610 A.D.

But, the details of the date of the present Kopparam record corresponded actually to the eighth October, 631 A.D., and it would be too much to assume that Indravarman who had already completed 21 years of service by 610 A.D. continued to be in service as late as 631 A.D. and was posted in the far off Eastern Deccan.

On the other hand Dr. Hultzsch believed that the expression Prithividurāja, i.e. Čuvavāra, is a title meaning "the heir apparent of the earth" in contrast to the title Prithivivallabha of Pulakesi II, meaning "the husband of the earth". So he identified him with Kubja Vishnuvardhana, the younger brother of Pulakesi II. For, he figures as a Čuvavarāja in the Satara plates dated in the eighth year of that emperor. This theory of identification is not altogether devoid of logic. For, the Kopparam plates being a Chalukya record, one would perhaps take the Čuvavāra in it to be a Chalukyan prince. Hence this view has gained wide support of scholars in general.

But, one may be permitted to point out this: All, including those who have built up the above theory of Prithvīyuvarāja-Vishnuvardhana identification, do take the expression like Brahmadvavarāja or Čuvavarāja [of the Kasakudi plates] Akalankatinvaravāryar (i.e. Čuvavarāja) [of the Ambur (North Arcot District) inscription of Nripatunga] and Māngiyuvarāja [of the Eastern Chalukyan records] as personal names only. No body has gone to the extent of treating them...
as titles in the sense of heir-apparents of Brahman, of Akalanka and of Mangi respectively. Similarly, though Prithivivallabha is a title and means 'the husband of the earth', the expressions like Prithiviraja, Prithivimaharaja, Prithivipati, etc., are always treated as personal names of the respective kings and none is inclined to treat them as titles meaning respectively "the king of the earth", "the great king of the earth" and "the husband of the earth". Therefore like the last mentioned names, Prithividuvaraja of the Kopparam charter may also have to be taken as a personal name rather than as a title. Besides, the above argument, based on the contrast between Prithiviyuvvaraja and Prithivivallabha, carries, in fact, little or no weight at all. For even when he was a yuvraja, Kubja Vishnuvardhana had assumed the bimda Prithivivallabha "lord of the earth" and his Satara plates of 616 A.D. refer to him as Sri-Prithivivallabha-Vishnuvardhana-Yuvraja-Vishamsi-dhidi, while it introduces Pulakesi simply by the title Maharanaja. Therefore as has been observed earlier, Prithividuvaraja of the Kopparam plates may better be identified with his namesake of the Chezerla inscription. While editing the Kopparam plates, Dr. Hultzsch was not aware of the name Prithiviyuvvaraja occurring in the Chezerla record. Therefore to follow his path even to-day is to ignore the later discovery and research.

Even accepting that this Prithividuvaraja of the Kopparam plates was Vishnupardhana I, one is at a loss to
understand why he should boast himself of having secured the kingdom in the lineage of his son by conquering his enemies. Does it not betray that he had already made his son the king of the territory he had conquered, himself remaining without any claim to the royal position? Such a boast would indeed pass strange in the context of Vishnuvardhana's position in 631 A.D. For, by that time he had himself probably become a king. Even if he was a mere heir-apparent at that time there can not be any doubt that he had secured the kingdom for himself and his own lineage. On the other hand, if it is presumed that he had not secured the kingdom for himself and his own lineage by that date, then he could not have secured it for his son's lineage also. Therefore in either way it would be incongruous with his status to boast himself of securing the kingdom in the lineage of his son, excluding himself.

On the contrary the above description in the Köpparam record, if applied to Prithiviyuvvaraja of the Chezerla record, would have its purpose and meaning. For, as we have already seen, that chief had no claim to royalty. The fact that he granted something for the welfare of the lineage of his son reveals that his son was already in power at least in a de jure, if not in a de facto, capacity. Thus, the circumstances indicated by both the Chezerla and Köpparam records go to suggest that Prithiviyuvvaraja continued to be a yuvārāja or crown-prince even during the reign of his son,
probably because the crown directly went from somebody else to his son. Such a succession was not unknown in the area under question. For, there was already a precedence in the example of the Pallava yuvamahārāja or yuvārāja Vishnu-gopa who remained a crown prince even during the reign of his son as the crown went from his father Skandavarman I to his (Vishnugopa's) son Simhavarman. Similarly, even in a later period when the Eastern Chalukya king Rājarāja I died and the kingdom came to his step-brother Vijayaditya VII, the latter did not choose to be the king. Rather he gave the kingdom to his son Śaktivarman II out of paternal affection in October 1061 A.D.

The above detailed study of the contents of these two records and the identification of persons and places mentioned therein may help us to understand the history of the period under question. The fact that the Chezerla inscription of Prithiviyuvarāja is dated in the regnal year of Mahendravarman shows that the former was a feudatory of that Pallava monarch. We have seen earlier how the Pallava reduced the Ānandas to vassalage and how Mādhavavarman II vanquished the Pallava and captured the Ānanda territory and appointed the princes of his own family as governors. The Vishnu-kuṇḍi might have done so only by driving the Ānanda chief out of the latter's territory. It was therefore quite natural that the Ānanda was waiting for an opportunity to recapture his homeland. In that venture who could help him excepting his powerful Pallava sovereign?
We have earlier studied the circumstances under which the Vishnukundis were forced to abandon their hold over the Ananda territory. The Ananda ruler Kandara of the Chezerla inscription or his immediate predecessor must have re-established his power in the area by driving out the Vishnukundi, understandably with the help of his Pallava lord. The vanquisher appropriated for himself the title Trikūta-Malavādhināti, of the vanquished with a modification. Therefore Kandara and his successors must have remained loyal feudatories of the Pallava.

As we have already seen, the 28th verse of the Aihole prāṣasti tells us that in the battle of Koleru Pulakēśi II employed elephants, evidently of his own, and killed many army men. This battle was fought in 616 A.D. as pointed out earlier. On the other hand, in the Chezerla record of almost the same period, Pṛthiviyvarāja, a feudatory of Mahāndra-varman, claims to be camping with a huge army under him and to have killed many elephants of the enemy in Kolissaras i.e. Koleru. Moreover immediately after describing the battle of Koleru (verse 28), the Aihole prāṣasti informs us (verse 29) this: A certain Pallava king, with his six-fold forces viz., the hereditary troops and the rest, suppressed the rise of the power, or made ineffective the eminence of the army, of Pulakēśi. And Pulakēśi compelled that Pallava to take shelter behind the ramparts of his capital Kāṇchī. The verse under consideration reads:
It has been agreed in general that the Pallava's enemy of Pulakesi II, referred to in the above verse, was Mahendra-varman I, who, as we saw, was no other than the king Mahendra-vikrama of the Chezerla record. These cumulative evidences strongly suggest that the person who gave a tough fight to Pulakesi on the bank of the Koleru was Prithiviyuvraja and that the latter fought with a huge army on the side, or on behalf of, his overlord, Pallava Mahendravarman I. True, it may be a mere 'speculation' if the expression ākrant-ātmabal-ōnnetim Pallavanam patim of the above verse is taken to be an indication "that the Pallava had attempted to nip in the bud the rise of the Chālukyas", as early as the time of Kṛttivarman I. But it seems to be a fact that in the above verse of the praśasti, there is a reference to the conflict of the two powers viz., the Chālukya and Pallava, even before the siege of Kaṇchī by Pulakesi, but soon after Pulakesi's capture of Pishṭapura. The Marutra grant and the Chezerla and Aihole records give us to understand that the avenue of the above confrontation was Koleru.

With the material now available, it is difficult to be sure about the circumstances that led to the above Pallava-
Chalukya conflict. However, it may not be unreasonable to suggest this: As we have seen earlier, the house of Vishṇukūṇḍis suddenly disappeared about 612 A.D., resulting in an utter confusion and chaos in the region. The situation must have been so tempting as to attract the attention of Mahendra-varman as it did that of Pulakeśi II. The former's dominions included territories just on the other side of the Krishṇa as the Chezerla inscription indicates. We have already referred to the probability of Mahendra-varman's being a Vishṇukūṇḍi on his mother's side. Therefore it was quite natural that even before Pulakeśi II entered Vengi, Mahendra-varman aimed at acquiring the kingdom of the Vishṇukūṇḍis. He simply crossed the Krishṇa and marched at least as far as the Koleru, which was after all not far removed from his provincial capital Dhanyakaṭa. Here he had before him the tempting example of the Pallava Simhavarman of the Mangaluru grant, who too, only about half a century earlier, crossed the Krishṇa and occupied the Vengirāṣṭra almost up to the same lake. There on the bank of the lake, the army of the Pallava Mahendra-varman met the army of the Chalukya marching from the north. Thus the struggle between the Pallava and Chalukya rulers must have ensued from the attempts of both to capture Vengi, the erstwhile kingdom of the Vishṇukūṇḍis.

The Aihole prasasti gives us to understand that Pulakeśi had inflicted heavy damages to his enemy's army in the battle of Koleru. But it does not give us an impression that the monarch had won the battle easily. We saw
earlier that he lost there his beloved general Alukarāja.
At the same time Prithivīyuvarāja claims to have crushed the
army of elephants of the enemy, and to be bent upon vanquish-
ing the atibala or "the most powerful" which probably refers
to Pulakēśi II himself. These perhaps betray that Pulakēśi
was not successful in that battle, to begin with atleast.
Yet, the course of subsequent events show that the stars
of the Chālukya started going up soon afterwards. Pulakēśi
II must have won the battle and annexed the Vengi area
finally. Therefore in this sense Dr. Fleet may be right in
saying that the Vengi country was taken away by the Chālukya
from the Pallavas. Pulakēśi did not stop at that. As a
retaliatory measure he marched and penetrated farther south
well into the heart of the Pallava territory. And the Aihole
prāśasti tells us that he besieged Kāńchī itself, the capital
of the Pallavas.

One cannot be quite sure whether Pulakēśi did all
these immediately following the date of the Maratura grant,
or only after sometime. An investigation of this question
is beyond the scope of the present study. Yet this much
may be certain: It is clear from the Kopparam plates that
Pulakēśi II was present in person in the Guntur region in
631 A.D. His presence there at that time must have been most
probably only in connection with the conquest of the area.
But at the same time Maratura grant informs us that he was
near the Kolern in 616 A.D. As it is very unlikely that he
continued to stay in the Bast for sixteen long years i.e. from 616 to 631 A.D., it is logical to conclude that after the battle of Koleru Pulakeśi probably abandoned, for the time being, the idea of continuing further conquest in the East coast and returned home entrusting to his brother Vishnuvardhana the task of consolidating the newly and partly conquered territories in the east. This change of policy was obviously due to the remarkable shrewdness of Pulakeśi in realising hard realities. The Pallava king Mahendravarman, the lord of the trans-Krishnā region, was really a powerful monarch and he had under him in the area a capable feudatory in Prithvīyuvarāja in command of a formidable army.

By 630 A.D. circumstances changed in favour of Pulakeśi. About that time Mahendravarman I was no more. As indicated by the Kopparam plates, Mahendravarman's powerful vassal Prithvīyuvarāja changed his allegiance from the Pallava to the Chālukyan side. The reason for this change-over is not known. It is after all an ordinary phenomenon in politics that yesterday's enemies turn to be today's friends and vice versa. Pulakeśi was equally shrewd enough not to miss that opportune time. He seems to have revisited the east coast to complete the scheme of conquest left earlier unfinished. Now in this war-activities in the area he seems to have received considerable help from Prithvīyuvarāja. In recognition of the latter's service, the emperor seems to have confirmed the rulership of the Ānanda territory
on Prithiviyuvaraja’s son and the latter’s descendants, understandably as the vassals under the Chalukya sovereign, just as they had been under their earlier overlords of the Pallava dynasty. Thus there appears to be much truth when scholars observe that the conquest of Vengi preceded that of the Guntur region at least by a decade.

NOTES

1 See notes on Insocr. XVI.

2 The passage under question is Pishatapuraaka-dena-grahan-anantaryana probably meaning “after the surrender and capture of Pishatapura”. However, in the light of the evidence of the Aihole Prasasti, according to which Pishatapura was pounded and captured, one may also correct the above passage into Pishatapura-kadana-grahan-anantaryana “after the destruction and capture of Pishatapura”.

3 In the expression Kalura=kalvaratam-upagatam, the Ablative is probably according to the rule Lyah-lope karmasy=adhiyaratam ca (varttika under Pa, I, iv, 31) and the complete expression with the lyah-anta, understood, may be Kalura sackyanaka dvanvaram-upagatam “one who has become god by fighting at Kalura”. There are umpteen passages in literature telling us that the heroes, who die fighting turn to be gods. See e.g. Vir. Raja, pp. 405 ff. So, the passage cannot mean “(one) who took up the overlord of Kalura” as some have taken (APGAS, No. 6, pp. 12, 34). Besides Pulakesi would not have made the gift for the akshayya-phaela for such a conqueror.
4 See below.

5 The expression Kadamba(mba)-nāma-dhēva may not indicate that the queen was of the Kadamba clan as has been believed by some (APGAS, No. 6, p. 33). Rather she seems to be an Ālupa princess. See below.

6 This name is spelt as both Āluka (Mahākūṭa Pillar Inscr.) and Ālupa (Aīhole Praśasti).

7 Ancient Karnataka, I, p. 82.

8 It reminds us of the Mallam (Nellore District) record dated in the 16th year of the Pallava Nandivarman II Pallavamalla (acc. c. 730 A.D.) i.e. c. 744-45 A.D. (CA, p. 283) recording a gift of gold to a Subrahmapya temple of the place made by certain persons as the executors of the Chālukka araśar (i.e. the Chālukya Vikramaditya II) (ibid.), at the instance of an Ālupa king. That inscription perhaps indicates the route followed by Vikramaditya II on his way back home (EHĐ, p. 229) after his campaign and occupation of Kāṇchī as evidenced by his own Kailāśanātha temple inscription (EI, III, p. 359-60). That Ālupa king of the Mallam epigraph must have followed the example of his distant predecessor Āluka-mahārāja of the Maraṭhura grant and took part in the Chālukyaan campaign of the Pallava country.

9 See below.
10 APGAS, No. 6, p. 16; Kesih., pp. 65-66.

11 See below.

12 EI, XXXI, pp. 29 ff. and plate. Near Pithapuram itself there is another village called Kolēru in the Ramachandrapuram taluk and that village has been taken as we have already seen (Ch. IV, Sect. 1 and n. 7), to be the gift village of the Challuru plates of Vīrachōga. But that Kolēru figures in that record only as a village and not as a pura or city as it is characterised in the present record. Again to locate Kalurapura of the Māruṣura grant near Kolēru lake is more in tune with the description of Pulakeśi’s campaign in the Aihole Praśasti and it may help one to identify the gift villages of the grant with the nearby localities, which the Chāluṣya must have brought under himself by the date of the record. Moreover it may be remembered that Dr. Hultzsch was of the opinion that the place Kolēru of the above grant of Vīra Chōga itself had some connection with the Kolēru lake (SII, I, p. 52, f.n. 2).

13 APGAS, No. 6, p. 16.

14 Therefore the contention that Mangalore attained the status of the Ālupa capital only in later days (Ancient Karnataka pp. 173, 219) may require reconsideration.

15 IA, VI, p. 72 ff. and pl.

16 EI, XVIII, pp. 257 ff. and pl.
17 IA, XVI, pp. 109-10.
18 IA, XVII, p. 141; CII, III, Introd. p. 79 f.n.
19 IA, XX, p. 2; Kielhorn, List of Ins. of S. Ind., No. 10 and f.n.
20 BG, p. 366, f.n. 3.
21 IA, XX, p. 3; BG, p. 351.
22 EI, XIX, p. 261.
24 BG, p. 348.
25 However this distinction seems to have lost its currency subsequently and that is why in the Koppam plates the 21st year, though to be counted from the king's coronation in 610-11 A.D., is referred to simply as the year of reign. See below.
26 See Appendix V.
27 IA, XX, p. 12.
28 EHD, p. 472.
29 JOR, IX, pp. 17 ff.
30 See above Ch. VII, Sect. ii.
See CA, pp. 251-52; IA, XIX, pp. 303 ff; see also BG, pp. 356-57. Here the expression is only *śrī-mahārājasya pravardhane mānaka-sāvatsarā aśtānā. Therefore like the Marutara grant the Satara plates also probably belong to the 616 A.D.

To assign Vishnuvardhana's reign to a period of 615-33 A.D. and at the same time the Chālukyan conquest of Vēngi to 631 A.D. may amount to assign only three years to Vishnuvardhana's rule over that country (CA 250-52), taking no cognizance of the Eastern Chālukyan records which are unanimous in declaring that the said king actually ruled over Vēngi for eighteen years. See e.g. SII, I, p. 47.

(iii) Chālukyan Occupation of Vēngi

CA, pp. 232-33.

Above Ch. VI, Sect. iii.

EHD, p. 209; See also BG, p. 349.

BG, p. 194.

Ibid. p. 350, f.n. 2; p. 386 f.n. 1. See also CA, p. 235.

Rāṣṭrakūṭas and Their Times, pp. 8-10; EHD, p. 250.
41 EI, XI, pp. 27 ff. and Pl.

42 EI, XXVIII, pp. 3-4.

43 CA, p. 202 f.

44 See ibid., for the theory that that Gōvindarāja's father Durgarāja flourished about the middle of the 7th century and was probably appointed a rāṣṭrākūṭa or provincial governor by Pulaḵēśi II.

45 EHD, p. 212.

46 BG, pp. 385-86.

47 Above Ch. IV, Sect. ii

48 Above Ch. VI, Sect. iii.

49 Above Ch. VII, Sect. ii.

50 BG, p. 361.

51 See EHD, p. 215.

52 See above Ch. VII, Sect. ii; Ch. VIII, Sect. iii.

53 AHD, p. 113.

54 ED, p. 538.

55 SBHI, 4th Ed., p. 441.

56 QJMS, XXX, pp. 328-29.

57 EHD, p. 216.
MDG, Godavari, I, p. 19.

CA, pp. 211, 238, 250.

IA, XX, p. 94 f; BG, p. 352.

See above Ch. VII, Sect. i.

IA, XX, p. 94.

Above Ch. I, Sect. ii.

IC, XV, p. 20; CA, p. 226. See also ED, p. 539; APGAS No. 2, p. 23; Bhārati, Nov. 1967, p. 37.

See above Ch. VII, Sect. ii.

See Inscr. XVI, lines 19-20 and n.

(iii) Pulakeśi and Prithivīnuvarāśa

For, in the ARB for the year 1900, there is no 155 A in the list of inscriptions copied in 1899, as we find in SII, VI. See below.

SII, VI, Nos. 594 and 595.

Ibid. Preface. record in situ shows that the

TL, pp. 52-53. My personal examination of the/observations of K.V.S. Aiyer are correct. Yet the treatment of texts in SII, VI under two different general numbers had led to much speculations, as e.g. at JAHRS, XI, pp. 46-47; EHAG, p. 186.
71 SII, VI, Preface.


73 See EI, VI, plate facing p. 6.

74 See SII, II, plate facing page 340; EI, X, plate facing p. 6.

75 EI, X, p. 2.

76 TL, p. 53; HSAD, II, p. 21. The view that the characters of the record belongs to the 3rd century (ARE, 1920, p. 95) is untenable and is not accepted by scholars. See TL, p. 153; EHAC, p. 187, f.n. 10; CA, p. 203, f.n.1.

77 This record, though often referred to by scholars, has not been critically edited and its contents have not been fully discussed so far. This has led to some serious misgivings as in JAHRS, XI, pp. 43 ff; SS, pp. 396-97; ESI, p. 107; etc. As the record is very important for the study of the history of the period, it is dealt with here in detail a little.

78 Usually the reference to the place of camp of the donor is found in the beginning of the copper plate charters and not in the stone inscriptions. But the Velpuru stone inscription of Madhavevarman II, also coming from the same region, commences, the expression nīthām (Skt. dṛṣṭāntam) "seen", with which only the copper plate charters are known to begin. Moreover the Nasik
Cave inscr. of the 18th regnal year of Gautamiputra Satakarni (EI, VIII, pp. 71 ff.) records the king’s order issued from an unnamed place of his victorious military camp, donating some land. Coming to the later ages, the lithic records of the Cholas and Pandyas often specify respective places of residence of the monarchs (See e.g. SII, IV, pp. 109, 167; V, pp. 114, 117, 156, 178). Again as in the modern days so in the ancient times too all communications, especially of the kings, were probably expected to quote in the beginning the name of the place of their origin. See e.g. Pushyamitra’s letter to his son Agnimitra that reads as Yajñasaarasat Senapati Pushyamitra etc. (The Malavitaka, p. 104); and the king Tarapida’s letter to his son Chandrapida running as “Sravty-Ulasimita + + + Tarapida etc. (Kada, p. 449).

79 Cf. vishaya-mandala-chatushtay-adhipati, a title of Satyasraya Dhuvaraja Indravarmen in his Goa plates (JEBRAS [03] X, p. 365). Like vishaya and mandala, the word janapada also mean "province" (See BG, pp. 349, 355).

80 Similar descriptions are often met with in literature. (See Inscr. XVIII, n. 6). So it may not be correct to interpret the epithet samavagda etc. in the sense "defeating Benefactor, Kandara captured the Andhra-sundaris". (BBA & Ah, p. 109). Nor is there any reference in the epithet to Kandara’s causing the widowhood of many Andhra women (APGAS, No. 10, p. 14).
K.V.S. Aiyer, (TL, p. 52 f; HSAD, II, p. 20 f.) was also of the same view. However it has been proposed to take the expression ppithiyuvvarājah of the record not as a Nominative but as a Genitive singular of ppithiyuvva-
rat and to treat it either as a title of Kandararāja (CA, p. 203) or as a title of the father of the person who is described in lines 12 ff. in Nominative singular, and who was the grandson of Kandarāja (BHAC, p. 182).
True, just as rājaṁ becomes rājam in the Nominative singular at the end of the compound, so also rāt becomes rājap in the Genitive singular. But such Genitive forms, though employed in verses for the sake of metre, are not generally met with in prose passages especially in epigraphical literature. For, to avoid confusion the writers would naturally prefer the form prjāsya. It may be observed that even the composer of the text of the Chezerla record uses Kandarprjāsya (line 11) in preference to Kandarprjāh, though the latter is grammatically correct Genitive form. Similarly in the same record the originally engraved feminine Koliśarasyah had been corrected into the neuter Sarasah to be in tune with the adjective prathitāt, in preference to correcting the last mentioned adjective into the feminine prathitāyah. See Inscr. XVIII, n. 3. It seems to have been done so, lest there should be a confusion whether Sarasah is Ablative or Genitive. Therefore in the light of the names like Brahmayuvvarājā,
Prithivirāja, Prithivimahārāja etc., one may better take Prithiviyuvarāja as a proper name, in the Nominative, of a person whose epithets are found in lines 12 ff. See below.

82 This epithet may not indicate that the chief was of a Rāṣṭrakūṭa stalk (TL, p. 52; HSAD, II, p. 20 f.). For, the Rāṣṭrakūṭas in their records claim to have got only Garudalāṇchana (SI, VII, p. 227; see also Dr. Mirashi Felicitation Volume, plate facing p. 390), and nowhere their seal is known to bear the representation of Viṣṇu mounted on Garuḍa.

83 In this context it is interesting to note that the Dhanyakatāka region which Prithiviyuvarāja was ruling (see below) had been subsequently described by Yuan Chwang as a country with rich soil yielding abundant crops (FNSI, p. 100).

The expression janapad-ādhipati of the epithet has been taken by some writers as an indication that the chief was a Rāṣṭrakūṭa (See TL, p. 52; HSAD II, p. 20). But one should not forget that the chief was the lord not of the janapada alone, but of the palla also. Again, as we have already seen, his maternal grandfather Kandara, who was decidedly a member of the Ānanda family, is said to be the lord of two janapadas. Moreover the expression janapadādhina is met with even in the early literatures like the Rāmā.
There seems to be no reference to a seated vulture (SS, p. 397). This epithet also has been taken to prove the Āśāḥra toṣṭa origin of the chief (TL, p. 52 f; HSAD II, p. 20). But there is nothing to show that the Āśāḥra toṣṭas themselves had the gridhra-kētana. It is known that they had only the pālidhva and ēka-kētyu of which the latter had been doubtfully rendered by Fleet as 'bird-ensign' (BG, pp. 387, 402). They had also Garuḍa-lāñcchana (see f.n. 82 above) on their seals. But gridhra is a vulture while Garuḍa is a mythical bird, believed to be the vehicle of Vishnu (cf. line 22 of the record).

Cf. saha-kamalini-svārā-saṇḍhy-ādayah, "one who was the morning twilight to the lotus plants that were the assemblies of the learned", a description of a ruler in the Paschimbag plates of the Chandra king Śrīchandra (EI, XXXVII, p. 301, verse 5, p. 291 f.n. 1). The epithet of Prithivīyuvarāja indicates that the chief actually took a leading part in the learned assemblies. Such descriptions of the kings are well known in literature (See Kāda, pp. 13-14). Therefore one may not be justified in disconnecting the expression Satsabhāmalla from the rest of the compound (EHAC, p. 139) and in treating it as a personal name of the chief. Such a treatment as well as a study of the
record up to this epithet alone, have led to a misgiving that the record belongs to a chief called Satsabhāmalla (JAHRS, XI, pp. 47, 49-50; SS, pp. 396-97; CA, 203).

86 Cf. Samudragupta's title Śrīvikrama found in his gold coin. (JNSI, V, p. 136).

87 It may be noted that, according to the reports of Yuan Chwang, there existed Dēva-temples more than 100 in number in the Dhānyakaṭaka country (FNSI, p. 100) over which the chief under question had earlier held sway (See below).

88 See below.

89 The expression Bappa in similar context is usually taken to mean 'father'. See BI, IV, 145; XXX, p. 2; XXXI, p. 3; BHAC, p. 169 f.n.

90 See Inscr. XVIII, n. 20. The portions preceding and following the expression Vēgasati-sanātha are totally lost. Yet it does not appear to constitute independently, like Avanibhādana, an epithet of Mahēndra-vikrama as believed by some writers (JAHRS, XI, p. 46; TL, p. 52). For sanātha may not yield a meaning to that effect. Cf. the epithets Vēppanātha, Vēgasatvāh patih etc. See Inscr. XVIII, lines 7-8 and n. 6.

91 TL, p. 53; HSAD II, p. 20.

92 SII, II, p. 351, text lines 103 and 106.
See above f.n. 82, 83, 84.

_Goorg Insers._, I (1914), No. 1 and plate.

TL, pp. 50 ff. The identification of Akālaversha with the Rāṣṭrakūṭa Kṛishṇa had been earlier suggested by B.L. Rice. See _Goorg Insers._, I, Introd., p. 5 f.

See above n. 95. See also BG, p. 292, f.n. 10; Kielhorn’s _List of Inscr. of S. Ind._, No. 112 and f.n.

BG, p. 334.

Ibid., p. 394.

JAHRS, XI, pp. 44 ff; CA, p. 203.

CA, p. 203, f.n.

Chapter VI, Sect. ii, Appendix IV. The contention that any three-peaked hill might have been called _Trikūṭaparvata_ (EHAC, pp. 188-89) ignores the fact that no other king of the dynasty and of the area had assumed that or similar title.

See EHAC, p. 186, f.n. 9.

See K.R. Srinivasan, _Cave Temples of the Pallavas_ (Arch. Surv. of Temples, No. 1), pp. 37, 54, 91.

Ibid., p. 79.
It is difficult to ascertain the significance of the number "seven". May be, it is "used to express an indefinite plurality" (SED, s.v.). Cf. yū-nāka-lakṣaṇa-sādhana=āyodhana-śirasi Vikramādityam etc., in the Kurām plates of the Pallava Paramēśvaravarm (SII, I, p. 149, line 40). In MB, Yudhishṭhira's army is said to have consisted of seven divisions (see Udyoga, Ch. 154, verse 7). Here in the present expression avasakti etc. the compound is Bahuvrīhi and is to be dissolved as sva + sanātana Dhānya-kaṭayaṇa rana-sapta-koṭayāḥ yasmān tasmāt. This epithet may not credit Kandara or Prithivīyuvāraja with victory in some battle at Dānysakaṭa in Kāśmīr (Cf. JAHR, XI, p. 44; SS, p. 397; CA, p. 203). For, in that case it is rather difficult to dissolve the compound satisfactorily. The interpretation of sapta-kotī as "a war-implement with seven edges" (JAHR, XI, p. 44) hardly suits the context.
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108
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110

111

112

113
of the objections raised by Watters (op. cit., II, p. 216). M. Williams also recognises Dhānyakaṭaka as a name of a country (SED, s.v.).

114 EI, XVII, pp. 327 ff. and pl.

115 CA, p. 203.

116 BRA & AH, p. 109, f.n. 2.

117 CA, p. 203.

118 See above.

119 CA, pp. 259, 283. Some writers assign this king to 530-630 A.D. See Cave-Temples of the Pallavas, op. cit. p. 5; HSI, p. 150.

120 Ibid., pp. 259, 430-31.

121 Ibid.

122 Cf. the Mayidavolu plates (EI, VI, pp. 84 ff.) recording a similar order of the Yuvamahārāja Śivaskandavarmā. The expression *vidhivat=saṃpradattā + + + Prithivīdu-vājasaśāyājñantih* is usually rendered as "the execution of (the present grant) was formally bestowed on Prithivīyuvārāja" (EI, XVIII, p. 260). But such a passage with similar import is not met with in the similar context anywhere else.

123 The text is as corrected by Dr. Hultzsch. See EI, XVIII, pp. 259, lines 7–10.
Above Ch. VII, Sect. ii.

ABORI, IV, pt. i, pp. 46 ff. This identification has been endorsed by other scholars also. See e.g. ED, pp. 344 ff.

JBRAS(95), X, pp. 365 and plates.

EI, XVIII, p. 253.

See e.g. SS, p. 118; CA, p. 250; EGV, p. 46 ff; EHD, pp. 216, 472.


EI, IV, p. 180 ff.

I.e., a name met with more than once in the genealogical list of the Chāhamāna kings.

I.e., a name of the donor of the Tandivada grants.

I.e., a name met with in the genealogical list of the Ganga kings of Talakad.

IA, XIX, p. 309, lines 11-12, 35.

CF, XXXI, p. 130, f.n. 3.

For, in the undated Timmapuram plates (EI, IX, pp. 317 ff.) Vishnuvardhana I styles himself as Mahārāja. Now, apart from the above untenable theory of Prithividuvārāja = Vishnuvardhana identification, there seems to be practically no reason why one should not assign
that record to a date anterior to that of the Kopparam plates.

137 See CA, p. 279.

138 Cf. Grihītvā sva-sūta snehāt raśvā śrī-Śaktivarmā, nyastam etc. JAHRS, IX, pt. i, p. 31.

139 See EI, XXXV, pp. 262-64.

140 See above Ch. IV, Sect. ii.

141 See above Ch. VI, Sect. ii.

142 See Appendix IV.

143 The Instrumental balaṁ śaṅvidhaiḥ "with six-fold forces" (in the first half of the verse) has been usually construed with the very akarōt, (almost at the end of the fourth quarter), of which the kartri or the subject is yah; i.e. Pulakeśi (ASWI, III, p. 138; EI, VI, p. 11). Naturally therefore the six-fold forces has been taken to be of that Chālukya ruler. (Ibid.) However the act of ākramaṇa or 'over-powering' of the eminence of Pulakeśi's bala needs an Instrumental which must be obviously some bala. Therefore there should be no reason why the above Instrumental should ignore the immediately following ākṛanta and go with the distant akarōt (cf. pratham-ātikramaṇā kārap-ābhāvāḥ). As Pallavanāman-śati is the kartri of ākṛanta, the six-fold forces are to be taken as an army of the Pallava and not of the Chālukya.
The six fold forces as classified by Kautilya, are:
the hereditary troops (mana-bala); the hired troops
(bhritaka-bala), the corporation of soldiers (śraṇi-
bala); the troops belonging to the friends (mitra-bala)
the troops belonging to the enemies (amitra-bala); and
the troops of wild tribes (atavy-bala). See Artha.
pp. 342 ff.

Ākrānt-ātma-balūmāti has been rendered by Kielhorn
as "who had opposed the rise of his (i.e. Pulakeši's)
power" (HI, VI, p. 11) and by Prof. K.A.N. Sastri as
"who had approached him (Pulakeši) in strength and
eminence" (Journ. of Andhra Hist. and Cult., I, p.
170). See also KESIH, p. 79.

According to some, the Pallava rival
of Pulakeši referred to in the above verse was not
Mahendravarman I but his son Narasimhavarman I. See
A Miscellany of Papers (Giguju Venkaṭārāma-murti
Pantulu Com. Vol.), p. 104; IHQ, XXVIII, pp. 60 ff.;
KESIH, p. 79.

On some other grounds Dubreuil had independently come
to the same conclusion (See The Pallavas, p. 35).
Hence there is no wonder if a Bapa chief, named Ranavikrama, of the Anantapur region, is found changing his allegiance from the Chalukya to the Pallava (BHD, p. 217). (During this period)