Even after his accession, according to the prevailing practice Pratāparudra was generally called Kumāra Rudradēva for some more years. This is one of the strong reasons to believe that Rudramadevi was alive till A.D. 1295. But the unmistakable statement of the Chandupatla epigraph dispels all such doubts regarding Rudramadevi's last date, irrespective of the name of her successor whether it be Kumāra Rudra or Pratāparudra. In fact, the former term continued even in the king's last years as evidenced by Appayūraya's statement that he completed his work Jināndra Kalyāṇābhuyudaya in Śaka 1241 when Rudra Kumāra was ruling. This Śaka year corresponds to A.D. 1319. Thus the word Kumāra in his name cannot be the factor in deciding Rudramadevi's regnal period. He was already associated in the military undertakings and the government of his grandmother.

Pratāparudra's immediate responsibility was to wipe out the disgrace caused to the family and kingdom by the rebellion of the Kāyastha chief Ambadēva. He therefore lost no time in consolidating his military set up which lost its vigour during the previous years. The nāyaṇkara units of the military were re-organized and set on march against the traitor. Ambadeva feeling this danger threatening the security of his newly formed kingdom took necessary steps to defend his possession. Notwithstanding the series of victories on several fields of battle he felt that his army was decidedly unequal to cope with the Kakatiya forces. As hinted in his Tripurantakam
record he entered into alliance with the Seunas of Devagiri and the Pandyas in the South. His Nilagangavaram inscription further states that the Pandyas have assisted Amavadēva by sending elephants and horses. But Kumāra Rudradeva who was fully aware that any attack upon Amavadēva would certainly involve the Kakatiyas in a war with his powerful allies, concerted measures to launch a three pronged attack on Amavadēva’s territories and those of his allies. In the Śaka year 1213 an army was dispatched to Tripurantakam under the commandship of Manuma Gannaya, son of Kolani Śoma-mantri and his cousin Annaya-deva, son of Indulūri Peda Gannaya-mantri. Although no details of the conflict in this region are known, it is certain that Amavadēva was defeated and forced to retreat southwards to Mulikinādu. Śivavāgasaśaram informs us that the Kolani and Indulūri chiefs not only dispersed and enemy’s forces but also captured seventy-two of their forts during a single campaign. As a result of this Tripurantakam and the surrounding parts fell into the hands of Kumāra Rudradeva. The latest record of Amavadēva at Tripurantakam is dated in the month of Nijāśādha of the cyclic year Khara of Śaka 1213 and the earliest Kakatiya record, that is the inscription of Indulūri Annaya dēva is dated about two months later in the month of Śrāvana, of the same year Khara, Ś.1213. It is obvious that Tripurantakam and its neighbourhood must have changed hands within this short period of two months. Although some records of a later date belonging to his son Tripurāri are noticeable in
the Cuddapah region, no particular importance can be attached on that basis to the Kayastha authority in those quarters.

Nellore was the venue for the second Kakatiya attack. Adidas Mallu, the sakala-senadhipati and the right-hand man (dakshinabhuja-danda) of Prataparudra marched south-wards along the coast towards Vikramasimhapura (Nellore), where Mamuma Gandagopala, who Ambadova re-established formerly on the throne in A.D. 1282 was ruling. The Kakatiya armies defeated Mamuma Gandagopala and killed him in the battle. In his place as evident from his inscriptions in Ś.1212 (A.D. 1290), a certain Madhurantaka Pottapi-Chōda Rāganātha, also known as Rāja Gandagopala succeeded him on the throne. But this alliance of Prataparudra with Rāja Gandagopala, perhaps, a scion of the deceased king, proved most unwise as he soon turned to be a traitor to his benefactor, by joining hands with the Pāndyas. To punish him for his unfriendly attitude Prataparudra had to send a second expedition to Nellore which naturally involved him in a war with the Pāndyas. The Kakatiya army was led by certain Mamuma Gandagopala, another Telugu Chōla chief and ruler of the region in the neighbourhood of Narasaraopet in the Guntur district. Rāja Gandagopala and his Pāndyan allies offered stout opposition to him; nevertheless, they were defeated; for, according to the Narasaraopet inscription of Mamuma Gandagopala dated Ś.1219 he is said to have drunk up like the badabānala fire the ocean of Drāvida army, and after disgracing Rāja Gandagopala and his allies assumed the high sounding titles Drāvila-bala vārdhi-Parishapa-badabānala; Rāja Gandagopala - vihitābhita-mānabhaṅga.
Pratāparudra's third attack in this connection was against the Sēunas who supported Ambadēva. The Narasaraopet inscription of Manuma Gandagopāla also credits him with the titles "Sēuna-Kaṭaka-Vēnu Kabalanadēva- payaka" (the wild fire to the bamboo like army of the Sēunas) which obviously hints that he joined in an expedition of the Kākatiya monarch against the Sēuna kingdom. Some of the important events which had taken place during this invasion are recorded in an inscription set up in the fort of Raichur by Gōna Viṭṭhala, the Kākatiya feudatory ruling at Vardhamanapura in the Mahbubnagar district. According to this inscription dated 5.1216 (A.D. 1294), Viṭṭhala captured the forts of Adavani and Tumbālam in the Bellary district together with Manuva and Haluva in the Raichur doab. After reducing to subjection the chiefs who held sway over this region, Viṭṭhala finally entered the city of Raichur, where he erected a strong fort to protect its inhabitants. It is obvious that Gōna Viṭṭhala must have wrested the Krishna-Tungabhadra doab from the Yadavas of Dēvagiri.

Before Pratāparudra could consolidate his possessions in the south, he had to face a Muslim invasion from Delhi in the north. Gershāsp Malik, the son-in-law of Jalāl-ud-Din Khalji, the Sultan of Delhi, made an attack on the Yadava capital Dēvagiri in A.D. 1295 and seized it. Though he went back to Delhi after exacting heavy sums of money and jewels from king Rāmadēva by way of tribute, he was expected to come to the south to attack and plunder other Hindu kingdoms. Pratāparudra
expecting danger from the Muslims, re-organized the defences of his kingdom, toned up the nayamkara system, mustered an army of 9,00,000 archers, 20,000 horses and 100 elephants. This preparedness enabled Prataparudra to meet the Musalmans no less than seven times on the battle-field, though he had to make treaties of peace on more than one occasion, paying enormous tributes in shape of jewels, money horses, and elephants.

The earliest of the Musalman invasions over Telengana was that of Alā-ud-Dīn in A.D. 1303, under the leadership of Malik Fakhr-ud-Dīn Juna and Jhuju of Kara. The object of invasion was plunder and territorial expansion. The expedition reached Telengana by way of Bengal. Their advance was checked by the Kakatiya armies at Upparapalli. The velama chief Venna, son of Recherla Prasāditya and Potuganti Maili, the two commanders of the Kakatiya armies according to Velugotivari Vamsavali destroyed the pride of the Turushkas. To avenge this disaster suffered by his army 'Alā-ud-Dīn dispatched a large army in A.D. 1309 with Malik Naib Kafur and Khwaja Hāji as its commanders to conquer Telengana. Prataparudra made all possible arrangements to defend the fort. According to Pratapacharitra the outer fort was protected by seventy bastions, each of which was kept in the protection of a māyaka. The siege began on 19th January, A.D. 1310 and continued for a period of twenty five days. The defence of the inner fort became difficult and Prataparudra had to sue for peace at a cost of all his wealth, with a further promise of sending a
Prataparudra fulfilled his promise faithfully and friendly relations between him and the Sultan were maintained for a long time. This pre-occupation of the king was taken advantage of by vassals in the outlying provinces and they created trouble by asserting independence.

After the second Muslim invasion Prataparudra had to engage himself in the suppression of revolt in the southern part of his kingdom. The Telugu Chola ruler of Nellore, named Ranganatha asserted his independence, while in Gandikota in Muliki-nadu the Vaidumba chief Malladeva flouted the authority of the Kakatiya emperor. Prataparudra sent an army under Juttaya lemka Goṅkaya Reddi against Mallideva and these armies defeated Mallideva and captured Gandikota. Prataparudra appointed Goṅkaya Reddi as the Governor of Gandikota and the adjoining territories. In the meantime Ala-ud-Din Khalji solicited the assistance of Prataparudra during his invasion against the Pandyans in A.D.1311. Prataparudra took advantage of this opportunity, marched with his armies towards Kanchi and on the way suppressed the rebellion of Ranganatha. At this period, conditions in the Tamil country were far from satisfactory. The death of Maravarma Kulaśekhara in A.D.1310 and the outbreak of a civil war between his two sons Vīra Pāṇḍya and Sundara Pāṇḍya and the consequent confusion created in the Pāṇḍya dominions was aggravated by the invasion of the Hoysala king Ballāla III who made an attempt to regain the lost
possessions of his family in Tamil country. The attempt of
the Hoysala king was checked for some years by the Sultan's
armies led by Malik Naib in the Deccan. After the death of
the Sultan and the withdrawal of the Muslim forces from the
South, Ballāla III made a successful attack on Kanchi and
conquering Kānchi. This victory was only short lived. He
could however not keep Kānchi in his possession for long.
According to an inscription at Dakshāramam preserved in the
Mackanzie Manuscripts Pedda Rudra the commander of the
Kākatiya armies defeated Ballāla III and his allies Sambuvarāya
of Padaivīḍu and the Yādavarāya of Chandragiri, and occupied
Kānchi. These victories of the Kākatiya forces and their
march further terrified the Pāṇḍyas who mustered their force
and gave a stiff fight to the Kākatiya forces and attempted to
expel them from Kānchi. Pratāparudra himself took the lead in
the battle assisted by Telugu infantry of the Velama chiefs
Rācherla Īrra Dāча and Dēviri Nāya, etc. Deviri Nāyaka at
his master's command proceeded further inflicted a defeat on
Vīrapāṇḍya and his ally Malayāḷa Tīrūvavādi Ravivarman Kula-
Śekhara and re-established Sundara Pāṇḍya on his throne at
Vīrādha-vala. As a mark of his victory Deviri-nāyaka with
devotion to the god Śrīranganātha of the Kāmē island made a
gift to that god of the village Salakalavīḍu situated in the
present Giddaluru taluk, in A.D.1317.

On the death of Sultan Alāud-Dīn Khalji, Malik Naib Kāfur
placed the young prince Shihbū-ud-Dīn on the throne and began
to rule the country, on his behalf as regent. Kāfūr was, however, murdered soon; and Quth-ud-din Mubārak Shāh, another son of 'Alā-ud-Dīn set aside Shihāb-ud-dīn and seized the throne. Soon after, consolidating his position, Sultan Mubārak Shāh set out on an expedition to the Deccan in A.D. 1318, to suppress the rebellion of Harapāladeva in Māhārāṣṭra. Having reached Devagiri, he captured the fort from Harapāladeva and put him to death. The Sultān dispatched his faithful slave Khusrau Khān to Warangal at the head of an army to demand tribute from Pratāparudra, who had neglected to send it to Delhi as usual. Pratāparudra, without offering any resistance sued for peace and paid the annual tribute of 100 elephants and a large number of horses besides gold and precious stones and agreed in addition to cede five districts of his kingdom to the Sultan.

Pratāparudra's relation with Kampili, a neighbouring Hindu state in the south-west on the bank of Tungabhadra has been strained due to the invasion by Ballāla III against that small principality. According to the Kannada book Kumāra- Rāmana-Sāṅgatva, Kumāra Rāma, the son of Kampilirāya, solicited the help of Pratāparudra against Ballāla. But as Pratāparudra declined to join him against the Hoysala king Kumāra Rāma turned against Pratāparudra and provoked him by assuming some of the Kākatīya titles shoroaching on some of the Kākatīya territory in the western border. Pratāparudra therefore sent his armies to the frontiers of the kingdom of Kampili. According to a verse in Śrīnātha's Bhāgavata purāṇa, a Telugu
literary work, Prolaya Annaya, one of Prataparudra's commanders, destroyed Kummāṭa the capital of Kampilirāya. Similarly Kotikanti Ṛgghava, one of the sons of the Āravidu chief, Tāta Pinnama, probably a Kākatiya feudatory, is said to have defeated Kampilirāya and deprived him of his royal insignia. Taking these facts into consideration, it may be concluded that Prataparudra came into conflict with Kampilirāya and won some victories over him, though he does not seem to have gained any material benefit therefrom.

Sultan Qutb-ud-Dīn had to send Khusru Khān to the south for a second time to suppress a revolt in Maharashtra by Malik-Ek-Lakhy, its governor. The commander accordingly proceeded with a large army to put down the rebel and restore the royal authority in Maharashtra, which he accomplished successfully. Thence he proceeded against the Pāṇḍyan monarch at Paṭṭan in Ma'bar. Though he captured the city, he was arrested by his fellow commanders in the army, who suspected his disloyalty to his sovereign and carried him back to Delhi as prisoner. The Sultān, however, set him at liberty and punished the commanders for their misconduct. Khusru Khān however, showed no gratitude to his master, but treacherously assassinated him and usurped his throne. The Turkish nobles who resented his usurpation conspired against him and put him to death. Ghiyās-ud-Dīn Tughlūq, the leader of these rebels, ascended the throne and proclaimed himself the Sultān in A.D. 1320. Having consolidated his authority in
the kingdom in the first three years of his reign, he turned his attention to the south. An expedition against Telingäna was sent in A.D. 1323, under his son Ulugh Khan as its leader with instructions to conquer and annex that kingdom. The circumstances which led the new Sultan to send his forces against Telingäna are not clearly known; but Firishta, writing in the early years of the seventeenth century, states that Rudradēv, the Rāja of Warangal, during the late disturbances had refused to send his tributes and Ulugh Khān was therefore sent against him. This is not improbable for, Pratāparudra had on a former occasion withheld the payment of the annual tribute to the Sultan under similar circumstances. Pratāparudra, according to Firishta, opposed the advance of the Muslim army with all his might, but was obliged in the end to retreat to his capital, which was immediately invested by Ulugh Khān.

The siege was indeed both protracted and fierce. The fighting was not confined exclusively to Warangal and its neighbourhood. A part of the Delhi army under Majīr Abu-Riza was engaged in besieging Kōṭagiri at the time when Ulugh Khān was vainly attempting to capture Warangal. It is not at all unlikely that other places of importance in the country were also attacked by various detachments. Nevertheless, Ulugh Khān failed to achieve his object and had to beat a hasty retreat from Telingäna, hotly pursued by the Kākatīya army. The failure of Ulugh Khān is attributed by Muslim historians to the machinations of the poet 'Ubaid, a treacherous companion and friend of the prince. According to Barani, Ulugh Khān had closely invested
Warangal, and had reduced the defenders to extremities. Of the two forts that surrounded the city, the outer or the mud fort was about to fall, when Prataparudra sued for peace and offered to submit to the authority of the Sultan and to pay the tribute demanded; but Ulugh Khan who was determined to capture Prataparudra and his capital, rejected the offer. In the meanwhile, a change came over the spirit of the Muslim army. Since the postal system had broken down, no recent news had reached the camp from the capital, and at this juncture the poet Ubaid and Shaikh Zada-i-Dimashqi, who were intimate friends of Ulugh Khan, spread in the army the false rumour that the Sultan was dead in Delhi, that a usurper had seized the throne, and that the Khan was about to arrest some of the important chiefs of the army, their loyalty being suspect in his eyes on account of their Khalji sympathies. This information, coming as it did from the intimate companions of the Khan, created panic in their minds and they fled from the camp with their followers. The Muslim army was thrown into confusion as a consequence of their fright, and the Hindus, taking advantage of the sudden misfortune that had overtaken their enemies, stormed Ulugh Khan's camp and plundered it. Unable to withstand their attack, he rallied his troops and retreated in haste towards Devagiri. Ibn Battuta, who came to India some ten years after the conquest of Telengana, attributes the disaster to the miscarriage of the ambitious designs of Ulugh Khan himself, and represents Ubaid as an unfortunate victim of his treachery. Ulugh Khan, who, according
to Battuta, was planning to stir up a rebellion against his father, instigated 'Ubaid to spread in the army the false rumour of the Sultan's death, expecting that the leaders of the army would swear allegiance to him as their sovereign; but his plan miscarried. The amirs rose against him and would have killed him; but Malik Timur, one of the principal amirs in the army, offered him protection and helped him to flee to Delhi. Though the Sultan was aware of the treacherous designs of his son, he accepted the false accusations which the latter levelled against the amirs, and not only punished them severely but also sent him back with men and money to Telingâna to retrieve the disaster. Though Ibn Battuta visited India within a decade after the fall of Warangal, he actually wrote his Risala from memory in the last quarter of the fourteenth century, after his return to his native place Morocco. The correctness of this account is doubted by scholars; for, it not only contradicts the evidence of the contemporary Indian Muslim historians but also runs counter to the character of the Sultan. Ghiyas-ud-Din Tughluq Shah was a just and upright ruler. It is not likely that he would have condoned Ulugh Khan's treachery and sent him back to Telingâna with men and money, if the latter had really acted in the manner described by Battuta.

The most satisfactory account of the events mentioned above comes from the pen of 'Isami, the earliest to write on the subject, who finished his history in A.D.1349. According
to him Ulugh Khan plundered the country until he reached Warangal. He then invested the fort for six long months but could not reduce it. The Sultan at Delhi became impatient, and wrote letters to Ulugh Khan charging him with indifference in the execution of his commands. Ulugh Khan, in his eagerness to bring the siege to a successful end, consulted 'Ubaid, the astrologer, to find out the day on which the fort was destined to fall into his hands. The astrologer made his calculations, fixed the day of the fall, and declared that if the fort still remained unconquered on that day he would forfeit his life. The day was fixed and 'Ubaid approached; but the defenders of the fort showed no signs of submission. 'Ubaid was greatly alarmed. If his prediction should fall, as it appeared to be certain Ulugh Khan would certainly demand his head. To escape the evil consequences of the failure of his prediction, he devised a plan, and spreading in the army the false news of the Sultan's death, of a revolution in the capital, and of Ulugh Khan's secret resolve to kill the principal amirs in the camp for their alleged disloyalty, he created panic which led to the conclusion of peace by them with Pratāparudra and their subsequent flight from Warangal followed by that to Ulugh Khan himself.¹⁴

Although all the three Muslim writers mentioned above were contemporaries of Ulugh Khan (later Muhammad bin Tughluq) yet the account of 'Isami, as already stated, is the earliest,
and may probably be considered more trustworthy than the other two. What presumably happened at Warangal may now be stated briefly, though it is not possible owing to the conflicting character of the available evidence, to present an indisputably accurate picture of the events. Ulugh Khan marched to Warangal with his army and besieged the city for six months, but failed to capture it. A rebellion broke out in his camp owing to the machinations of 'Ubaid who is variously spoken of as a poet and an astrologer, and Ulugh Khan was obliged as a consequence to raise the siege and retreat homewards, hotly pursued by the Hindus, who attacked him frequently, plundered his baggage, and followed him until he reached Kotagiri, where Majir Abu Riza, who was engaged in besieging the fort, came to his help and saved his army from destruction.

Second Telengâna Expedition: Ghïyâs-ud-Dîn Tughlûq was a man of strong will and firm determination. Defeat did not discourage him, but rather urged him on to make a fresh effort to achieve his purpose. He severely punished the rebel amirs, and sent reinforcement to Dëvagiri, where Ulugh Khân had taken refuge, with instructions to his son to march again into Telêngâna and to subjugate the country. As soon as the reinforcement arrived in Dëvagiri, Ulugh Khan started for Telêngâna; by rapid marches he reached Badrikot (Bidar?), which he seized and posted strong garrisons along his route under trustworthy officers with instructions to hold the forts captured to the last. Finally he
came to Bodhan which was at a distance of ten days journey from Warangal. After a siege of three or four days the fort was captured, and the governor and his followers saved themselves by embracing Islam. Ulugh Khan next proceeded to Warangal and laid siege to the city. Not much information is available about the second siege of Warangal. It is disposed of briefly by Barani and the later Muslim historians who follow his account. It is stated that Ulugh Khan first laid siege to the mud fort and seized it; and that the inner citadel next fell into his hands. The fort was captured and Pratāparudra was taken prisoner and sent to the court of the Sultān at Delhi. The capture of Warangal was not so easily effected as these historians would have us believe; but for the amazing lack of foresight of Pratāparudra, it is doubtful whether Ulugh Khan would have effected its capture as quickly as he did. The siege, as a matter of fact, lasted for five months. Isami describes this siege and the circumstances in which the fort was captured. It appears that after the retreat of Ulugh Khan from Warangal at the end of his first expedition, Pratāparudra held a feast to celebrate his victory over the Muslims. Believing that they would not again invade his kingdom in the near future, he opened the granaries within the fort and sold the whole of the grain stored up there; he also commanded his subjects to abandon their military activities and to busy themselves with their cattle and crops. Within four months of his retreat Ulugh Khan returned with a fresh army and appeared before the walls of Warangal. The fort was
without proper garrison to maintain its defence, and lacked even adequate stores and provision to feed the garrison during the siege. Though taken by surprise Prataparudra put up a plucky fight; but the scanty stock of provisions which he hastily gathered together soon ran out, and the troops inside the fort began to suffer severely from hunger, Prataparudra was obliged to surrender. He threw open the gates of the fort, and delivered himself with the other members of his family into Ulugh Khan's hands. The Muslims then entered the fort, plundered the houses, and demolished the public buildings.

Considering that it was not safe to keep Prataparudra in the country, where his presence might lead to popular revolts and other political complications, Ulugh Khan sent him immediately to Delhi with all the members of his family, escorted by a contingent of his army under Qadir Khan and Khwaja Haji, two officers in whom he had great confidence. They were not, however, destined to bring the fallen monarch into the metropolis, for before they could reach Delhi he died. Shams-i-Siraj Afif, who wrote the account did not disclose the circumstances in which he died. More information is furnished by the inscriptions. In the Vilasa grant of Musunuri Prolaya Nayaka (C. A.D. 1330) it is stated that Prataparudra, while being carried away as a captive to Delhi, died on the banks of the river Somodbhava, i.e. the Narmada. His death does not seem to have been the result of natural causes, for according to the Kaluvacheru grant of the Reddi queen Anitalli, dated A.D. 1423,
he departed to the world of Gods by his own desire? This seems to suggest that he either committed suicide or was slain by one of his followers at his own instance. Pratäparudra was a proud monarch, and it would seem that he could not reconcile himself to the changed conditions of his life in captivity. Considering perhaps that death was preferable to dishonour he seems to have voluntarily embraced it. With the defeat and death of Pratäparudra ended the rule of the Käkatäya line of kings; and the country passed into the hands of rulers belonging to an alien race and religion.

Pratäparudra's family: The Pratäpacharitra a elate legendary account of the Käkatäya kings refers twice to his chief queen Viśālākṣi. Another queen of this king, name Lakshmīdevi is mentioned in an inscription recently found in the village Yelgedu in the Karimnagar district. Although various names like Juttaya Leṣka Goṅkā Reddi, Krishnan Nāyak appear in the records as the sons of Pratäparudra these names were those of the king's intimate and beloved subordinates only. Likewise the account given in the Pratäpacharita that Pratäparudra's son Viṇrabhadra was crowned king by the deceased king's brother Annamādeva is also absolutely ground-less as no authentic evidence to this effect has been recorded till now, although Annamādeva the progenitor of the later rulers of Bastar in the present Madhya Pradesh has been known by the Dantēswara inscription of Dīkpalādeva.
Prataparudra's vassals and generals: The Telugu Chola kings Opili Siddhi of Kotyadona, Manuma Ganda Gopala of Nellore and Telungu Bijjana were prominent among the vassals of Prataparudra. Telungu Bijjana is said to have visited the court of Delhi Sultan and has fought an exhibition duel with another noble of Prataparudra's court Potuganti Maili in the presence of Ala-ud-Din and Malik Naib and Bijjana was vanquished in this contest. This has been stated in the prasasti of the Velana chief Potuganti Maili in the family account Velugotivari Vaasavalii. The duel was probably arranged to satisfy the curiosity of the Sultan and his court who desired to witness a display of the swordsmanship for which the Deccanis had always been famous. The Cheraku family was one of the hereditary subordinates which served the Kakatiyas with the utmost devotion and faith since the time of Rudra.

The military officers of Prataparudra fall into two classes the Sahinis and Senadhipatis, the former being the officer employed for training the horses and elephants for the purpose of war, known as aśva-sahinis or gaja-sahinis respectively, whereas the senadhipatis were the commanders of the armies. Bendapudi Annaya who is said to have been the chief of the elephant forces of the Kakatiya king Maharaya-raja-sahini. He also held other post like commander and nāyaka. He is described in the records as 'moon to the ocean of the kingdom of the lord of nine lakhs of archers' the fire of destruction to the Yavana armies and the revager of the pleasure gardens of the city of Kummata. Among the senadhipatis and sakala-
senadhipatis Somayajula Rudradeva and Recherla Munnadinyaaka are two distinguished generals.

Characteristic Features of the Kākatīya Rulers:

1. From the foregoing chapters we observe that all the Kākatīya rulers were noted for their valour and sacrificed their lives for the cause of victory.

Gunda III died at the hands of the Eastern Chālukya prince Gummadi-ganda.

Gunda IV died in a war at the hands of Virīyāla Erra.

Prola II died at the hands of a Kōta chief.

Rudradeva is said to have died in a battle with the Śeunas.

Mahadeva met with the same fate in another battle with the Śeunas.

Rudraṇadevi is supposed to have died at the hands of Ambadeva.

Prataparudra the last king died as a captive.

Thus, leaving some early members and Gaṇapatiḍeva all other members of the family died as warriors. None of them was a weak ruler.

2. They attributed themselves with few titles which practically do not convey any significant feature. But their titles ending with gaJa-kesari were distinctly used for official purpose like seals, coins, measures and even tanks.
Prōla I and Prōla II adopted ari-ga.la-kesan (lion to elephant-like enemies) and issued coins and constructed tanks with that name, Kēsari-tatākas and Kēsari-samudras. Rudra had the title Dāya-gaja-kēsari and issued coins bearing this legend.

Gaṇapati bore the title Rāya-gaja-kēsari issued coins and other standard of measures and weights with the seal kēsari-tūmu, kēsari-puṭṭi etc.

Rudrācadevi appropriated the title Rāya-gaja-kēsari of her father.

She issued not only coins and measures with the title but also represented herself with this title in sculptural motif; where she is depicted as a warrior riding a lion standing on an elephant.

Pratāparudra bore the title Dāya-gaja-kēsari and issued coins and seals.

He is also represented in sculptural motif - lion - elephant.

3. Lastly it is only the Kākṣīya dynasty where we find a lady as sovereign queen in the annals of the medieval history of India.
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