SECTION I: THE BEGINNINGS

CHAPTER II
ORIGIN AND GENEALOGY
The earliest reference to the Kakatiya chiefs occurs in the Mangallu grant issued by the Eastern Chalukya prince Dänärpava in A.D. 956. Therein, some four members of the Kakartya family, also stated as Kakaty, are mentioned. The last member of them named Kākatya Gundyana won the favour of Dänärpava and got the charter granted by him to a brähmana. Basing on this, the early writers of the Kakatiya history propounded the theory that these chiefs were originally the subordinates of the Eastern Chalukya kings having their fief in the present Mandigama taluk of the Krishna district where the village Mangallu is situated. Some other scholars, although they accept the etymological connection between the words Kakartya, Kākatya and Kakatiya, could not come to the conclusion that the Kakatiyas of Ammakonda or Warangal were really the descendants of Kākatya Gundyana, the supposed feudatory of the Eastern Chalukyas. Thus, taking them to be the subordinates of the Eastern Chalukya rulers, scholars are generally inclined to assign Telugu origin to the Kakatiyas. Dr. M. Ramarao, however, suggests that though these chiefs hailed from a village Kākatī in the western borders of Andhradeśa, by entering into the service of the Eastern Chalukyas long back they became virtually Telugus. A close examination of the Mangallu grant reveals the true picture which of course supports Dr. Ramarao's theory, but not in the way he supposes.
This copper plate set has been first noticed by the Government Epigraphy branch and subsequently edited in Epigraphia Indica under the title "Māṅgalla Grant of Amma II" by V. Rangacharya. In view of its historical importance the charter has been re-edited in Epigraphia Andhrica I under the title "The Māṅgalla Grant of Dānārṇava" by the present writer. It will be noticed presently that Ammārāja II was in no way concerned with the charter, but it was Dānārṇava who independently issued it. The record briefs the political situation of the Vēṅgi country at that period by stating that the Eastern Chālukya king Ammārāja II, son of Bhīma II having ruled the earth for eleven years left for Kaliṅga on account of the wrath of Krishna who according to the context was Rāstrakūta Krishna III. His half brother Dānārṇava son of Bhīma by his queen Ankidēvi was ruling the kingdom which as stated in it, he acquired with the help of Vallabha, that is Krishna III. After a brief eulogy of the same king, follows the statement that such king Vijjayāditya at the request of Kākartya Gundyana granted the village Māṅgalla to a brāhmana named Dommana as a mark of his gratitude to the said general. Dommana performed a religious ceremony name Kaṃṭhavrata for the merit of the General Kākartya Gundyana and as a reward got the village Māṅgalla in Nātāvādi region as agrahāra. The inscription though undated can be assigned roughly to 956 A.D. for, Amma II according to his Maliyampūḍi Grant was coronated in S.367 that is, A.D. 945 and that he ruled the kingdom
for eleven years before he had to leave for Kalinga. It is evident from the above statement that Dānārṇava was made king of Vēṣāgi by Vallabha, the Rāstrakūṭa king Kṛishṇa III whose attack on Vēṣāgi made Amma II flee from the country and take refuge in Kaliṅga. In fact Dānārṇava being elder than Ammarāja, had a legitimate claim over the throne of Vēṣāgi. It is not unlikely that he sought the help of the Rāstrakūṭa king to reinstate him on the throne.

This being the situation of the political events before the grant was issued, the issuing authority or king must be Dānārṇava himself but not Ammarāja. The explicit statements that owing to the wrath of Kṛishṇa, Ammarāja had to flee to Kaliṅga and that Dānārṇava, having obtained the kingdom through Vallabha was protecting the earth to the satisfaction of one and all (sakala-jana-anudā) clearly indicate that Dānārṇava was not ruling the kingdom with the consent of Ammarāja, but on the other hand with the help of Kṛishṇa III. King Amma who was forced to leave the capital cannot be supposed to be the king under whose authority the charter was issued. The course of events narrated in it also contribute to his discredit. It would not be like that if Amma II were the issuing authority. The conventional narration in the records of the succeeding rulers of the family that Amma (II) ruled the kingdom for twenty five years (A.D. 945-970) and the same title 'Vijayāditya' which was originally borne by Amma and subsequently by the new
king Dānārṇava are the misleading points in assigning the grant to Amma. These two objections are mere apparent and do not stand for reasoning. Dānārṇava in the first place could not establish himself on the throne and his weakness gave room for Amma to recapture the throne before long. Secondly, Amma fled from Vēṅgi to Kaliṅga, the modern Visakapatnam and East Godavari districts which was included in his own territory where he could gather military resources to oust Dānārṇava. The latter, in that short interval could not win over the ministers and generals to his side and celebrate his coronation with the new title 'Vishnuvardhana' according to the general convention of the family. So, with the title of that crowned king namely 'Vijayāditya', Dānārṇava made the grant.

The foregoing discussion leads us to the conclusions
1) that Dānārṇava seized the throne of Vēṅgi kingdom with the help of the Rāstrakūta king Krishna III. 2) He alone issued the Maṅgallu grant to please the Rāstrakūta general Kakartya Gundyna who helped him in driving out the crowned king Amma. 3) The said general Kakartya Gundyna described in the record must be obviously a Rāstrakūta follower which fact is further supported by the names of his forefathers Gundiya-Rāstrakūta and Eriya-Rāstrakūta mentioned therein. 4) It is only by wrongly ascribing the Maṅgallu grant to Ammarāja and by assuming that Dānārṇava was ruling the kingdom with the permission of Amma, Kakartya Gundyna was misunderstood to be the general of the Eastern Chālukya kings and thereby of Telugu origin.
Incidentally the record furnishes the genealogy of Kakartya Gundyana up to three preceding generations. Accordingly, Gundyana's father was Bētiya, Grandfather was Kriya Rāstrakūta and great-grandfather was Gundyana or Gundyya-Rāstrakūta. Although this small genealogy of this record has been noticed as early as 1917, the historians, with an exception of few, could not make headway in identifying the chief with a member of the early Kakatīyas of Warangal for want of supporting evidence. The recent discovery of the Bayyaram tank inscription of Mailamadevi, sister of Kakati Ganapatideva which furnishes for the first time a lengthy genealogical list of the Kakatīya chiefs, dispells all hitherto lingering doubts regarding the ancestry of the family. It records the construction of the tank called Dhamakirti-samudra after her ḫuma-nāma or title Dhamakirti. Without going into the details of the record the genealogical list will be considered for the present purpose. In the line of Durjaya, it states, was born Venna-nripa whose son, grandson and great grandson all three were called by the same name Gunda, that is Gunda I, Gunda II and Gunda III; the son of the last mentioned was ḫra who was followed by Pindi-Gunda. Now from the two records we get the following two sets of names of Chiefs.
Comparing the above two tables it becomes evident that the names given in the Māṇgalū Grant are identically equal with the last three of the Bayyaram tank inscription, the difference being only the additional name of a member Bētiya in the former record. Unfortunately owing to the negligence of the scribe some portion before the word 'Bētiya-nāmadhēyaḥ' is missing in the record.\textsuperscript{13} The presence of the word tādiya at the end of the verse and the remnant letter of the lost portion 'ū' before 'Bētiya' make it possible to restore the missing portion with '[abhūt sa] tu' which means that Eriya Rastrakūṭa's son was Bētiya and the latter's son Gundya. Although it totally omits the name of Bētiya, the Bayyaram tank inscription denotes the continuity by the word 'tataḥ' meaning simply that after Erṛa, Pindi-Gunda succeeded him, without mentioning any relationship between the two. Hence it is possible to believe that Bētiya

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I. Māṇgalū Grant</th>
<th>II Bayyaram tank inscription</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kakatya family</td>
<td>Durjaya family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gundiyā Rastrakūṭa</td>
<td>Venna-pṛīpa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eriya Rastrakūṭa</td>
<td>Gunda I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bētiya m. Vandyanāmbā</td>
<td>Gunda II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kākartya Gundyaṇa</td>
<td>Gunda III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Erṛa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pindi-Gunda</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
might have been the father of Gundyana and the omission of his name in the second list is to be attributed to reasons like his premature death or any disability which after a long lapse of time made him insignificant and unnoticed. In the Mangallu record, on the other hand, Gundyana at whose request the grant was issued could not omit the names of his own parents while describing his forefathers. It becomes thus, evident that Gundyana was the son of Betiya and Vandyanamba as stated in the record. The prose passage following the verses states his family name as 'Kakatya' which further confirms the identity of himself and his forefathers with those of the respective names given in the Bayyaram record of Kakati Mailama, with slight alterations like Gunda for Gundiya, Bgra for Erya and Pindi-Gonda for Gundyana which are mere variations in common usage.

Similarly the variations of the family name Kakartya, Kakatya Kakatiya and Kaketa in later usage are identical.

Formerly it was believed that the suffixing word Rastra kite after the names of Gundiya and Erya in the Mangalla charter simply denoted the meaning of 'an officer' as in the case of the phrase 'rastrakuta-katumbina' which frequently occurs in the copper plate grants and interpreted as the officers and house holders of the concerned village to whom generally the copper plate charters were addressed by the issuing authorities. In overcoming this doubt also the same Bayyaram tank inscription for the first time offers a clue for taking into cognizance all the scattered and hitherto unnoticed bits
of evidence in this direction. To Pindi-Gunda or Gunda IV, the record states, was born Garudānka Bēta-nripati who on account of the family of that name became popular on the earth.

\[
\text{Jet-śamād Garudānka Bēta-nripatis tan-nāma-vah-anuvāt prakhyātah kahiti mandala supanidhir khūpāla chūdāmanih}^{14}
\]

What exactly the above passage implies is that Pindi-Gunda's son was called Bēta with the prefixing word Garuda, for the reason that he belonged to a family associated with Garuda. Why particularly Bēta alone among all his predecessors and successors in that line had this preferential treatment of being named with the family name along with his personal name will be discussed later. Garuda which means the mythical eagle or the divine vehicle of God Vishnu, was adopted as royal insignia by the Rāstrākūṭas and some other allied dynasties of the Deccan, who generally trace their descent from the puranic Vṛṣṇi-vāṃśa of lord Krishna. It is not improbable that the Kākatīyas who designated themselves as Rāstrākūṭas in the Māṅgalā grant bore the family name as 'Garuda' after their royal insignia.

Besides, the word 'Garuda' denotes the eagle banner of the Kākatīya chiefs, which fact is borne out by literary and other epigraphic evidences. Vidyānātha, the celebrated court poet of Pratāparudra in his Pratāparudrīya attributes the Garuda banner to his patron Pratāparudra also.\(^{15}\) Similarly the Ekāmranātha temple inscription of the time of Gaṇapatidēva attributes the same banner to Bēta II.\(^{16}\) There, he is described to have mounted
on a horse carrying the banner of Garuda and entered the city of
Kāśī like the god Viṣṇu. The Palampet epigraph also states that
the arrows of the Kākatīya general Rācharla Rudra were fitted
in the shafts marked with Garuda symbols. It is very appropriate
to note that in ancient days too it was customary that the war
material was marked with the royal symbol of the concerned king.
All these references lead to the conclusion that the Kākatīyas
were having the Garuda symbol on their banner which fact indicates
that they claim their origin from the Rāstrakūṭa dynasty. Contrary
to this, it may be also reasonably argued that the Kākatīyas being
once subordinates of the Rāstrakūṭa kings might have adopted the
Garuda symbol for themselves and they need not necessarily be
Rāstrakūṭas. But the suffix ‘rāstrakūṭa’ to the names of
Gondiya and Giriya in the Māṅgalla grant does however indicate
that, by birth also they were of the Rāstrakūṭa origin and not
mere subordinates of the Rāstrakūṭa kings.

In this connection we have to take note of another word
Viṣṭi which occurs in the inscriptions as a family name of the
Kākatīyas. For example in the Kazipet Dargah inscription of
Triśhuvaṇamalla Durgarāja, Bēta is said to have been born of
‘Sāmanta Viṣṭivaša’. Here the word ‘Viṣṭi’ appears to be a
corrupt form of ‘Viśṇi’ to which clan again some Rāstrakūṭas
trace their origin. This is further corroborated by the fact
that some chiefs of Rāstrakūṭa origin bore the title Viṣṭi-Nārāyaṇa,
that means as great as Nārāyaṇa or Viṣṇu of the Viśṇi family.
For example a Rāstrakūṭa subordinate named Sankaraganda is attributed
in his Akunuru epigraph, with the title ratta-Śūra and viṣṭi-Nārāyaṇa.
In the Māṇgallu grant we come across the words 'Sāmanta Votṭi-kula' with reference to the Kākatiya chiefs. Here the word Votṭi again appears to stand for Viṣṭi of the other records. However, the matter is open for further consideration.

The Māṇgallu grant has one more indication regarding the association of the early Kākatiya chiefs with the Rāstrakūṭas. Describing the forefathers of Kākatiya Gundyana it states that his great grandfather entered vipad-avāra (the gate of danger) in order to help his master Vallabhēśa while capturing Vāṇa or Vijayavāṭa, the capital of the Eastern Chālukya king. Unless he happens to be a Rāstrakūṭa follower he could not venture to sacrifice even his life to accomplish victory to the Rāstrakūṭa king.

Other views of the early writers regarding the origin of the Kākatiyas are not supported by evidences. For example, late C.R.K. Charlu while editing the Garavapādu plates of Gaṇapatidēva took Karikāla Chōḍa as the ancestor of the Kākatiya family as stated in that record and identified the village Kākati with the town Kākera or Kākariya in the old Bastar state. Stating that certain Chandrāditya Mahārāja a descendant of Kālīkāla Chōḍa was once ruling that region he expressed the view that the Kākatiyas were originally of that Chōḍa family of Kākera. But the Kākatiyas never appears to have mentioned Kāśyapa-gōtra in their praṇāṭiṇig which invariably occurs in the inscriptions of all the Chōḍa families. Excluding the Garavapādu plates, no other Kākatiya record mentions Karikāla as their ancestor. Thus their Chōḍa origin is not tenable.
Two views, contradictory to each other prevail regarding the meaning of the word Kākati from which this line of chiefs got their family name. Kumārasvāmi-Somapīthin the commentator of Vidyānātha's Pratīparudīya, who lived in about the fifteenth century A.D. states that the family of these kings is known as Kākatiya on account of their being the worshippers of the Goddess Kākati, one of the forms of Durga. This view has been supported by a Telugu work of later origin called Kṛṣṇaḥirāmamu of Vallabhārya which states that the deities Kākatamma and Ekavīrā were set up in Urugallu side by side. The Shitap Khan inscription of the early sixteenth century refers to the reinstal lation of the goddess, the mother of the universe (Jaraṃatīrikā) and the lotus seat of the Kākatirājya as it was destroyed by the Turushkas. These and other evidences indicate that the word Kākati applies to a Goddess. Although Kākati as one of the various forms of Durgā is not traceable in the Hindu mythology, it may be, with some reservation, equated to one of the innumerable village goddesses which are all generally attributed to be the forms of Durgā. Its association with Ekavīrā which is definitely known as village goddess lends support to the same view.

Another possibility of the meaning of this term is that it refers to a place and there are equally strong evidences in support of this view also. It is stated in explicit terms
in the above mentioned Bayyaram tank inscription that Venna, the founder of the family ruled the earth with his residence at Kakati, owing to which his descendants are known as Kakatiyas. The Garavapadu charter of Ganapatidēva also supports this view. There it is stated that Karikāla Chōla who is said to be a descendant of Durjaya the founder of the family, in course of hunting arrived at a town called Kakati and set up his camp in its extensive area. In this context late C.R. Krishnamacharlu expressed the view that Kānkēr the headquarters of the state of that name situated to the north of the Bastar State in Madhya Pradesh and formerly called Kākera or Kākaira or Kākariya might be identical with the town Kakati or Kakatya. But this appears to be mythical without any supporting evidence.

The latest view of Sri K. Lakshminarayana Rao former Government Epigraphist of India is worthy of consideration. In his opinion the word Kakati denotes a place and he identifies it with the present village of that name some 12 miles north of Belgaum, in Karnataka State. In view of the fact that no place known as Kakati or any place similar to that in name has as yet located in the Andhra region which is of course the area of the activity of these rulers and also in view of the fact that they began their political career as the subordinates of the Hastrakūṭas, it is not improbable that the Kakatiyas originally hailed from this place Kakati. However, the matter needs further investigation. That the word Kakati represents the name of a town is thus equally strong as in the case of a deity and cannot be easily left unnoticed.
We shall now take into consideration the tradition presumed in the late literary work Siddhāsvara-charitra which states that the ancestors of the family migrated from the town Kandārapura. This place is identifiable with Kandahar in the Nanded district. It is to be conceded that there is no evidence in support of this tradition, though Kandhar was an important centre during the Rāstrakūta period and though we assume that the Kakatiyas were the subordinates of the Rāstrakūtas. Kākati, the name of a deity worshipped by the family of these chiefs might have also been the name of the locality or part of the town inhabited by the chiefs and their goddess. Beyond these two authentic views all other traditions in this regard based on mere fictitious versions deserve no consideration.

Jain Affiliations of the Kakatiyas:

It was held by some early writers that the word Kakati stood for a Jaina deity of that name and suggested therefore that Kakatiyas were the followers of Jain faith. Of course, it was not uncommon in those days that certain deities of the Jain and Buddhist faith were later adopted into Hindu faith and vice versa. The present Hindu goddess Padmākshi on the hillock near Hanumakonda, for example, was during the time of Prola II (A.D. 1117) a Jain goddess as evidenced by the Jaina inscription before it and the other Jain images, carved in the same shrine. It is not unreasonable to believe that the goddess Padmāvati, the Śāsanadēvata of Pārvanātha was later on transformed into Padmākshi. On this analogy one might think that Kākati originally
belonging to Jain pantheon might have been later on taken into the Śaṅkī fold and called Durgā. But, we must bear in mind that Kākati is not really traced as deity either in the Hindu or Jain pantheon.

Indications however are not lacking for such assumption that the Kākatiyas were originally the followers of Jainism. That the Rāṣṭrakūṭas and their subordinates patronized Jainism with great zeal is well known. The Chālukyas of Vemulavāḍa in Telengāna were ardent followers of Jainism as evidenced by the Jain antiquities like Baddega-Jinālaya constructed by them at Vemulavada. The great works of Amoghavarsha, Sūmadēvasūri, Pampa, Mērutunga and a host of others are the monumental memorials of the spread of Jainism in the Rāṣṭrakūṭa period. With their Rāṣṭrakūṭa associations the early Kākatiyas could not be an exception. A contemporary family of chiefs of Polavāsa like Mēdārāja and Gundarāja trace their origin to the great Mādhavavarman who is said to have acquired his greatness through the favour of Yakshēśvari. Interestingly the Dakshāramā inscription of Durga son of Prōla II describes him as a descendant of Mādhava-yaśa probably the family of Mādhavavarman mentioned above. It is not unlikely that like the Polavāsa chiefs the Kākatiyas were also originally the followers of Jainism. The deity Kākati need not be the goddess Durga as Kumārasvamin the commentator of Prataparudrīya and other authorities would have us believe. In fact tradition also goes to say that Prōla II was the first Chief to introduce Śaivism in its real sense, as
family religion after taking initiation from the renowned Preceptor Rāmāśvara Pandita of the Pāṇḍūpāta persuasion. Since then they adopted Swayamkhudōva as their tutelary god. They gradually changed their personal names also from the hereditary Gunda, Erja, Bōta, Prōla etc. to Durga, Rudra, Mahadeva, Haribara, Ganapati etc. All these indicate that during the early days the Kākatīyas followed the Jaina faith and from the time of Prōla II, there is a marked change over in their religious attachment to Śaivism.

That the early members of the Kākatīyas were Jainas in their religious persuasion is a further evidence that they were more intimate with the Rāstrakūtas than the Eastern Chālukyas.

THE ROYAL EMBLEM:

Their undeniable association with the Rāstrakūta line of kings, the name of Bōta I as Garpūdra-Bōta and the explicit statements of Pratāparudrīya and Rāvanārṇa inscription that they were having Garuda as insignia on their standard, all put together lead us to the assumption that the Kākatīyas were originally having Garuda as their royal emblem. Subsequently when they became the subordinates of the Chālukyas of Kalyāna they adopted Varāha symbol as royal insignia. The Bayyaram epigraph in this regard states figuratively that because Prōla I, by excavating the big tank called Kēsari–samudra after his title sringaja-Kēsari up-lifted the earth or in other words placed their kingdom on firm basis his progeny out of gratitude adopted the symbol of varāha on their coins and cattle. It was Prōla I who
acquired through a charter the Anumakonda-vishaya from the Chalukya king Trailokyamalla Somesvara I. However, the Garuda seems to have continued to be the insignia on their royal banner even during Prataparudra's period as noticed already.

It may not be out of place to consider the real purpose behind their having the Garuda or eagle banner. The Polavasa chiefs were also having this symbol on their banner and they were undoubtedly the followers of the Jain persuasion. Similarly, the Kakatiyas in spite of their having the Garuda symbol, seldom appear to be the devotees of Vishnu. The Yaksha of Santinatha, the sixteenth Tirthankara is represented by the symbol of Garuda. We may not be wrong in believing that the Kakatiyas adopted the Garuda as their family symbol not out of their faith in the Vishnu cult but according to their attachment to Jainism.

To sum up:

1) That the Eastern Chalukya Prince Dhanarana having been assisted by the Rastrakuta king Krishna III, issued the Mangalla charter to please the Rastrakuta general Kaktya Gundyana who actually helped him,

2) that the forefathers of Gundyana possessed the suffixing word Rastrakuta after their names as Gundya-Rastrakuta and Ejiya-Rastrakuta,

3) that their early member Gundya-Rastrakuta ventured to sacrifice even his life to accomplish victory to his master Rastrakuta Krishna when the latter captured the Eastern Chalukya capital Vijavata,
4) that the prefixing word Garuda to the name of Gunda's son Bêta is attributed in the Bayyaram record to their family association with the Garuda banner, the Râstrakûta insignia which the Kâkatîyas also had on their banner.

5) that the family name sāmanta-Viṣṭi denotes their Vrishni clan which was also claimed by the Râstrakûtas, and

6) that the early members of the family were the followers of Jainism, the court religion of the Râstrakûtas

all put together lead us to the conclusion that the Kâkatîyas originally belonged to one of the Râstrakûta families.

They came to the Telugu country as the generals of the Râstrakûta kings which matter will be further discussed in Chapter IV.

They got their family name Kâki after their home town, the identity of which is yet to be confirmed.

Their tutelary deity was also called Kâki after their family. The goddess with that name had no popular worship among other Hindu religious sects like the Jains or the Śaivas or the Śaktiyeas.

CASTE:

To which of the four castes of the mediaeval Hindu society do these chiefs belong is another intriguing problem. Some late inscriptions of the time of Gaṇapatidēva trace the origin of the family from the famous mythical Manu, Karikāla etc. The Malkapuram inscription of Viśveśvara Śivāchārya, the spiritual preceptor of Gaṇapatidēva and Rudramadēvi also states that they
belonged to the Suryavamśa-kshatriya caste. Similarly the Motupally pillar inscription of Gaṇapati himself traces the genealogy from a mythical and legendary account of Manu, Ikshvāku, Māndhātri, Bhaṭīratha, Raghu, Dāśaratha and Rāma and states that in that line of kings was born Durjaya and after some generations Prōla. These two authorities are more than sufficient for believing that the Kakatiyas were of the kshatriya caste of the Solar race.

But a close examination of some other relevant sources, inscriptions as well as literature indicate that the above statements are far from truth. Leaving few, most of the inscriptions are silent about their caste. Although they make reference to the sovereign Kakatiya king, they do not furnish anything in this regard in the family praśāti. Nowhere their gōtra is mentioned although it was customary in those days that all the kshatriya rulers used to mention their gōtra. The Chālukyas, for example, mention Māṇavya-sūtra, the Chōlas state Kaśyapa-sūtra. The Rāstrakūtas in general, do not seem to have stated their gōtra in any of their records. According to Vidyānātha, the author of Pratāparudrīya, there is evidence to say that they were not kshatriyas. He says that their caste is above the two well known solar and lunar races, thereby indicating that the Kakatiyas as rulers were greater than the kshatriyas who generally come under these two classes. About the existence of kshatriya castes other than the solar and lunar races, there is little evidence. In fact this is a living controversy regarding the caste of many of the past Hindu ruling
dynasties. The nature of political conditions result in many changes. Marital relations, for example bring about such changes of caste. The Kākatiyas had their relations, with Kōṭa chiefs of the fourth caste. One of Gaṇapatideva's daughters, Gaṇapāmbā was given in marriage to Kōṭa Bēta whereas his other daughter Rudrama was married to Viśrāhodra a Chālukya prince of the lunar race. So, marriages are also not the deciding factors of the caste as they were in those days intended for certain political purposes. Vidyānātha, it is true, makes us believe in some contexts that they were kshatriyas. For instance, he states in the same verse cited above that the creator Brahma, now after the birth of Pratāparudra, feels satisfied that the creation made out of his shoulders is fully justified. It implies to say that owing to the birth of the poet's patron Pratāparudra, the creation of the kshatriya caste itself is justified. This statement of Vidyānātha need not necessarily indicate that the Kākatiyas were of the kshatriya caste. It can be easily explained that the Kākatiyas were kshatriyas only by their profession that is, by ruling the earth and by being great warriors noted for their strength of shoulders. This kind of expression in literature is called "Gaṇa-vṛtti" of a word that is the meaning of a word would be other than what is found in the lexicons but which depends on Gaṇa or quality. So what Vidyānātha said regarding the kṣatriya of the Kākatiyas is merely a 'Gaṇa' expression and cannot be taken in its lexical meaning, that is, the kṣatriya caste. Had they been really
kshatriyas Ganapatī after becoming one of the great powerful kings of the time need not go for marriage alliance for his daughter with the Kōta chief who plainly says that they belong to the fourth caste. At the time of marriage, the Kōta chiefs were certainly not greater than Ganapatī in power.

Thus, the sources furnish us two contradictory views regarding the caste of the Kākatiyas. Records of Ganapatidēva or his dependents like his spiritual preceptor Viśvēvara Śivāchārya state that they were born in the solar race, whereas Vidyānātha states that the Kākatiya family excelled both the Solar and Lunar races, thereby indicating that their was neither the solar race nor the lunar race. Keeping this contradiction in view one has to adopt the above mentioned gaṇa-vaṃśi alone in interpreting the word 'kshatriya' or the expression 'nīja-doh-prasūti (born from the shoulders of Brahma). Accordingly, these expressions signify their courage and valour and not the caste. That means the word 'kshatriya' in this context means a king gifted with valour.

Further, we have epigraphical evidence also to say that the Kākatiyas were other than kshatriyas. In the Bayyaram tank inscription, it is said as the words of the ministers of king Mahadeva that his daughter Mallāmba deserves the hand of Natavādi Rudra in marriage as the latter belongs to the same caste of the bride (kanyā-asvarṇaḥ)35 Both Kākatiyas and the Natavādi chiefs had their marital relations for two or three generations. In one of the inscriptions at Amaravati, the Natavādi chiefs are stated to be of the fourth caste.36 More reliable evidences
in this connection are the statements of the Bothpur and Vaddamanu inscriptions of Malyala Gundasenanl, a reputed general in the service of Ganapatidēva. Both the records state in unmistakable terms that the Kakatiyas were born in the fourth caste. Therefore instead of believing in the statements of the other records which are rather fictitious it is quite reasonable to accept the statements of Gundya's records.

II. Genealogy

The discovery of the Bayyaram Tank inscription by the present writer in 1965 opened new vistas in the history of the early Kakatiyas in more than one aspect. The new light it sheds on the genealogical account of the family is its most valuable contribution to the history of the Kakatiyas. Incised on the four sides of a huge black granite pillar it was set up during Ganapatidēva's period (A.D. 1199-1262) by his sister Mailama or Mailambā to record the construction of that large tank called Dharmakīrti-samudra after her name. This is the only record which furnishes a genealogical list of Kakatiya ancestors of eleven generations prior to Ganapatidēva. In the line of Durjaya, as stated in the record a king named Venna-nripa was born. His son, grandson and great grandson were called Gundas who were as valorous as the three Ramas, that is Parasurāma, Daśaratha-Rama and Bala-Rāma.

"Tat-putra-pautra-naptāraḥ Krauṣṭa-gunda-saṁjñakāh
jātāḥ-khyātā-nripāḥ-prithvyāḥ Rāma-trīṭya-vikramaḥ"

Third Gundā was followed by Erra-nripati who was the lord of the regions Kurravādi etc.

"Erranāma-nripatiḥ-cha tatparah Kurravādi-mukha-sarva-dāsapaḥ"

Next followed Pindi-Gunda-nripati who beheaded all the enemy kings.
"Piśāci-Gumda-nripati's tatō-khayat khaṇḍit-āri-nara-nātha-mandalaḥ!
To him was born Garuḍānka-Beta-nripati, so being the name of the family.
"Tatō-śāmad-Garuḍānka-Beta-nripatis-tan-nāma-vāh-ānvarat"
To Garuḍa-Beta was born Prōla-kṣitīśa who was popularly known asari-zaja-kāsari that is the lion for the elephants who were enemies.
"Tasmat Prōla-kṣitīśo-dhūt khyāt-āri-zaja-kāsari"
His son was Trīhuvanamalla whose spotless fame was extensively spread as the moon light.
"Tatā-śāmat Trīhuvanamalla-dhūmapalāḥ prālāya-dvuti-śāda-prabhāta kirṭīḥ"
Trīhuvanamalla's son was Prōla-dhūpa. This Prōla had among others two sons named Budra and Mahadēva who were prominently known. To Mahadēva by his queen Bayyamamba a son called Gaṇapaty-sādiśa and a daughter Mallamāmbā named after the god Mallikarjuna or Mallana were born. Now all the above mentioned chiefs may be represented in the following tabular form.
Taking this list furnished in the Bayyaram inscription as the basis, some more members whose names are noticed in other records and left over in the present one, are to be added so as to make the genealogy a comprehensive one. The Mangallu grant as noticed above, mentions a member named Betiya and his wife Vandyanamba as the parents of Gundyaana who can be identified with Pidi-Gunda or Gunda IV of the Bayyaram record. Owing to some unknown reason like premature death, his name is not mentioned in it,
whereas in the Mahāgallu charter, Gunda IV himself being instrumental in obtaining the grant he could not but mention his parents Betiya and Vandyanāma while describing his forefathers. Thus this Beta being the first member of that name in the family he will be noted as Beta I. Garuda Beta, son of Gunda IV will be Beta II and his son was Prōla I whose son was Tribhuvanamalla who is called as Beta II till now. But according to the new scheme he will be termed as Beta III. From the Kāzipet Darga inscription we know that Tribhuvanamalla, that is, Beta III had a son named Durgarāja who also bears the title Tribhuvanamalla. Beta III's other son was Prōla II. About Prōla II's sons, the Bayyaram tank inscription simply states that among his several sons only two namely Rudra and Mahadeva were prominent, indicating the existence of some more sons. In the Tripurantakam inscription also of Mailamśīva it is stated that Rudra and Mahadeva had two brothers named Harihara and Ganapati and others (ādiśvē) which again indicates that there were still some more brothers. One of the Dāksharamā inscriptions mentions certain Repolla-Duggabhūpa as the son of Prōla of Anumakonda. Repolla seems to be the name of a region in the Sabbi-nāgu-1000, in the present Karimnagar district. Prōla II's subordinate named Repolla Kūruvarasa is noticed in the Sanigaram inscriptions. On the basis of the date of the said Dāksharamā record which is equal to A.D. 1163, he can be also considered as one of the sons of Prōla II. Till now these five sons of Prōla II are known.

Very recently, in the village Itikala in Gajwel taluk, Medak district, an inscription is copied which records a gift to the
local temple by two Kakatiya princes named Mahamandalesvara Gundaraja and Mahamandalesvara Harihararaja of Anumakonda, in the year A.D.1138. The latter, namely Harihara can be identified with his namesake of the Tripurantakam inscription referred to above, as one of the sons of Pröla II. It seems reasonable to believe that Gundaraja of this record was either a brother or another son of Pröla II.

As regards the latter part of the genealogy, Pröla II's eldest son Rudra had no sons and his younger brother Mahadeva. The latter had a son Ganapatideva and two daughters named Mañilamba and Kundamba. Both these sisters were married to Natavadi Rudra. Ganapatideva came to power in succession. Ganapati had no sons, but only two daughters Rudramadevi, and Ganapamba. The former was married to Chalukya Virabhadrav and succeeded her father to the throne. His other daughter Ganapamba was married to a Kota chief named Beta. Rudramadevi also had no sons. Only three daughters and her eldest daughter Mummadamma was married to a Kakatiya prince Mahadeva. Second daughter whose name seems to be Rudrama again, is married to a Yadava prince Elanadeva. Rudramadevi's third daughter Ruyyama was married to Annapadaleva of the Induluri family. Mummadamma's son by her husband Kakati Mahadeva was Prataparudra, the last king of the dynasty.

Chronology:

The Māṅgallu charter while describing the forefathers of Gunda IV, states that his great grandfather Gundiyā Rastrakūta or Gunda III sacrificed his own life in order to enable his master
Vallabhesa, capture the Eastern Chalukya capital Vāṭa or Vijayavāṭa. The record being datable to A.D.956 and the narration alludes to a past event of three generations earlier, the Vallabhesa can be identified with the Rastrakūta king Krishna II (A.D. 880-912) who is known to have led more than one expedition on the Vengi country. On the other side Chalukya Bhīma I, who ruled Vengi from A.D.892-922 was his rival. It is interesting to note in the Masulipatam plates of this Bhīma I, that his son Irrimartiganda'slew on the battle-field certain Rastrakūta general dandana-Gunda. It is possible to identify this general with Kakatiya Gunda III of the Māṅgallu plates and if it is acceptable, he is to be treated as the earliest member of the Kakatiya family known to history. And he is to be assigned a date round about A.D.900, when Chalukya Bhīma was attacked by Krishna II. The next known date of these chiefs is that of the Māṅgallu charter itself which is of A.D.956 and this describes how Kakartya Gundyana that is Piṇḍi-Gunda (Gunda IV) was instrumental in getting the grant issued to the Brahmana named Dommana. We are helpless at present to say with accuracy either the date of the beginning of this political career or that of his end. But, the epigraphs recently discovered in the village Sanigaram, Karimnagar district, throw considerable light in this regard. One of these records belongs to Bēta II (according to the new scheme) and is dated Saka 973 and another with the Saka year 975 belongs to his son and successor Prōla I. Very conveniently these two dates namely A.D.1051 and 1053 with a short interval of about two years not only furnish the last
and the initial years of Beta II and Prola I, as 1051 and 1053 respectively, but also enable us to adjust the gap between Gumda IV and his son Beta II. Accordingly, the gap of ninety five years between A.D.956 the date of the Mangallu grant and A.D.1051 the last year of Beta II is to be adjusted between the two members only. In view of this comparatively long duration we have to assume that Gumda IV appeared in the Mangallu record in the initial stages of his political career. The omission of the name of his father Beta I in the Bayyaram tank inscription lends support to the view that Gumda IV succeeded not his father but his grandfather Giriya or Erra. The former in that case can be supposed to be a young man of twenty or twenty five years age when he was deputed the assist Danarnava in A.D.956. A man of about twenty years in 956 might have easily lived for fifty years more and died in about 1000 A.D. His son Beta II also might have led a political career of fifty years from A.D.1000 to 1051. The statement in the Telugu portion of the Gudur inscription that Kamavasani, a lady of the Viriyala family assisted the young Kakati chief Garuda Beta, that is Beta II in securing his position, gives room to think that he too like his father had to shoulder responsibility while he was quite young. But such a surmise becomes difficult when we ascribe a long rule of fifty years to his father. However, under the circumstances we can ascribe tentatively the period between C. A.D. 955 to 1000 to Gumda IV and C.1000-1051 to Beta II. Prola I, according to his Sanigaram epigraph cited above started his political career in A.D.1053. His son Beta III's first record is dated
in Śaka 1001, that is A.D. 1079 thus enabling us to fix Prōla I's period up to A.D. 1178. On the basis of another record at Sanigaram, set up by Bēta III in the year equal to A.D. 1107, we can assign a period between 1078 and 1108 to him. About his son Triśhuvaṃsastra Dūgaraṇa we have no evidence to say how long he ruled before his younger brother Prōla II succeeded to power in A.D. 1117, as known from his Pādākṣi Temple inscription. However, we can assign him a short period of 8 years between 1108-1116 because on the basis of the Kāzīpet Dargah inscription we know for certain that he was the legitimate successor of Bēta III. Prōla II's last known date also comes from another inscription found at Sanigaram dated A.D. 1149. The earliest known date of his son Rudra comes from a record in the Bhumīśvara temple at Dākshārana and is dated in the Śaka year 1089 or A.D. 1156. The last date of Prōla II is to be placed tentatively between 1149 and 1156 and on the basis of this, the career of Rudra may be presumed to have started in 1156 A.D. According to the Anumakonda inscription to be discussed below (Ch. V) he established himself as an independent ruler in A.D. 1163. The chronology of the succeeding rulers can be fixed with considerable certainty. Rudra was succeeded by his brother Mahadeva and ruled for a short period of 3 years 1195 to 1198. His son and successor Ganapatiśrīva ruled between 1199 and 1262. Ganapatiśrīva was succeeded by his daughter in 1262. The last date of this queen is known from an epigraph recently discovered at Chandupetla, which states that she died in 1289. The last ruler of the family, her grandson Pratīparudrārāṇa succeeded her in 1289.
and ruled up to 1323 when the Kakatiya kingdom became a part of the Delhi Sultanate.

Summing up all the foregoing observations, the following genealogical table may be constructed with the chronology discussed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family of Durjaya</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Venna (Founder of the Kakatiya line)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gunda I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gunda II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gunda III (who died in Peruvanguru battle some time before A.D. 900)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Erra
- Beta I (mentioned in the Mangallu grant only)
- Gunda IV (assisted Dänarpava in A.D. 956) (C.A.D. 956-1000 A.D.)
- Garuda Beta (Beta II) (C.A.D. 1000-1061)
- Pröla I (C.A.D. 1052-1078)
- Tribhuvanamalla (Beta III) (A.D. 1078-1108)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tribhuvanamalla Durgaraja (C.A.D. 1108-1116)</th>
<th>Pröla II (A.D. 1116-1155)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rudra (A.D. 1156-1195)</td>
<td>Muppama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>established sovereign power in 1163</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mahadeva</th>
<th>Harihara</th>
<th>Ganapati</th>
<th>Reparitix</th>
<th>Repolla</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ganapatidēva (A.D. 1199-1262)</th>
<th>Mailāmba</th>
<th>Kundāmba</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(daughter)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rudrama?</td>
<td>(daughter)</td>
<td>Canaparna m. Kota Beta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. Chālukya Virabhada</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mummadēmā</th>
<th>Rudrama?</th>
<th>Buyrēmā</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>m. (Kātati) Mahadeva</td>
<td>m. Yadava Prince</td>
<td>m. Indulīri</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pratapa Pradēva</th>
<th>1290 to 1323</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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