CHAPTER - IV

KAKATIYAS AS SUBORDINATE CHIEFS
i) **VENNA TO GUNDA II:**

As noticed earlier the first member of the family was Venna. He is said to have been born in the family of Durjaya. Some other ruling families of Andhradeśa like the Velanādu chiefs, Viryāla chiefs also claim their origin from Durjaya. But the historicity of any of these Durjayas cannot be established with certainty. The only information about Venna, the founder of the Kakatiya family is that he was ruling from the town Kākati, on account of which the members of the family were called Kakatīsas or the lords of Kākati. On the basis of the chronology discussed in the earlier chapter we can tentatively ascribe him the period between 800-815 A.D. About the next two rulers, Gunda I and Gunda II we have no information at all. We can place both of them between 815-865 A.D. About the next chief Gunda III, we have some interesting information.

ii) **GUNDA III BÉTA AND BETYÀ (BÉTA I):**

The Māṅgallu grant issued by the Eastern Chālukya prince Dānārvana in about A.D. 956 at the request of Kākatya Gundyana (Gunda IV) incidentally refers to the heroic death of his great grandfather Gunda III. Though faulty in several respects the verse describing this event is however, not inadmissible of interpretation with a degree of certainty. The verse after slight modification reads as

\[\text{Chālukya-vamśändita-bhūnipāla-śrīdvāra-sūjānugataṁ pravīṣva} \]
\[\text{nūnā vipad-dvāraṁ ahaṁ viśāṁ-īty-akshamāta Vāṭa-kata-Vallakheśaṁ} \]
[Translation: In compliance with the orders (of his master) entering the Śrīdvāra or the main entrance of the Chālukya king I (Gundana) certainly enter the gate of risk (or death) so saying (Gundana) allowed Vallabha who was in Vāta (to enter the fort)]

Irrespective of our corrections, the words aham vipad-dvāram viśāmi (I enter the gate of death by entering the royal gate of the Chālukya king) imply that in course of an attack on the Chālukya town Vāta by Vallabhāśa, Gundana while penetrating through the main gate died at the hands of the enemy. Because this relates to a past event that took place nearly three generations prior to A.D.956, the date of the record, we can place the incident in the last decade of the ninth century. More than once, the Rāstrakūta king Krishna II (A.D.880-912) led his armies into the Vēngi country during the reign of Chālukya Bhīma I, (A.D.892-922). There is hardly any doubt that this Gundā participated in one of the expeditions of Krishna II against Vijayavada and lost his life. In the Masulipatam plates of Bhīma I² we notice that his eldest son Irimartiganda killed a Rāstrakūta general Dandena Gundā in an engagement that took place at Peruvangūru. The Masulipatam plates are not dated, but it is well known that Bhīma I was a contemporary of Krishna II. On the basis of this it is possible to identify Gundā III of the former record with dandena Gundā of the latter who died at the hands of Chālukya Bhīma's son Irimartiganda. Peruvangūru where the incident occurred was identified by M. Somasekharasarma with a village of that name near Midadavolu³ in the Vēngi country.
In that case the verse in the Mahgallu charter is to be interpreted to mean that when Rāstrakūṭa Krishna II led a contingent of his forces to Vijayavāda, the capital of the Eastern Chālukyas, dandena-Gunda in order to divert the Chālukya forces opened another front at Peruvangūru to make his master's task easy to Vāta even at the cost of his life. The incident has been glorified in the Mahgallu grant. Therefore, Gunda III was the known earliest member of the Kākatīya family who came to the Telugu country. Therefore, the Kākatīya history begins with this event roughly datable to A.D. 900.

Gunda III was followed by Erra who according to the Bayyaram inscription was the ruler of Kurravādi with its surroundings. The exact location of this region is not known. However, it can be suggested that the present Koravi which is otherwise locally called Kurravādi in the present Mahbubābad taluk in the Warangal district situated about 50 miles to the east of Warangal may be identified with Kurravādi. There is sufficient reason to believe that Koravi during the reign of Chālukya Bhīma was once captured by Kannara Ballaha, Rāstrakūṭa Krishna II as stated in the Koravi epigraph. Subsequently it was again recovered by the Mudugonda Chālukya chief Gopaga with the help of Chālukya Bhīma as seen earlier. Probably, during this change of hands Krishna II might have posted Erra in the Koravi region to check the enemy's incursion. It is also possible, that the Kākatīyas settled in Telingāna during the time of Krishna II as frontier guards of the Rāstrakūṭa kingdom. When Koravi was re-occupied by the Mudugonda Chālukyas the Kākatīya chief retreated into the interior.
According to the Maṅgallu grant, Brṛa's son was Bṛtiya who as observed earlier had no significant role in the family history for which reason his name was totally omitted in the Bayyaram inscription.

GUNDA IV:

Bṛtiya's son was Gunda IV who was instrumental in getting the Maṅgallu grant issued by the Eastern Chālukya Prince Dānārṇava in about A.D. 956. The internecine war between Ammarāja II and his step-brother Dānārṇava offered Raṭrakūṭa Krishna III, an opportunity to interfere with the affairs of Vėṅgi. Ammarāja II succeeded his father Bhīma II in A.D. 944 ignoring the claim of his half-brother Dānārṇava though the latter was elder than him. Added to this, there were still some disruptive forces from the side of the minor branch of the family of Yuddhamalla II. Dānārṇava sought the help of Krishna III who readily deputed his general Gunda IV already stationed in the Koravi region. With his help Dānārṇava could oust the crowned king Amma II and temporarily took possession of the throne. Amma sought refuge in the Kaliṅga country and gathering military strength from those quarters could re-establish himself on the throne within a short period. This short duration of Dānārṇava's reign was not mentioned in any of the Chālukya records, the reason being that he could not consolidate his position and get himself coronated on the throne obtaining the general consent of the ministers and generals. That is why he issued the Mangallu grant with the title Vijayāditya borne by the coronated king Ammarāja II. On this
basis, the Māṅgallu grant was ascribed to Amma II by early scholars. It was customary in that royal family that only the coronated kings assumed the alternative titles Vishnvardhana and Vijayāditya. Until the succeeding king got himself coronated the title of the preceding ruler used to continue. Dānārṇava in the present case could not get himself coronated with the new title. Therefore with the title Vijayāditya, he granted the village Māṅgallu to the brahmana named Domman a who performed a ritual called Karpaṭi-vṛata for the benefit of Gunda, perhaps intending his success in the said military enterprise. This event according to the same record took place after a lapse of eleven years from the date of Ammarāja's coronation which from his other records is known to have taken place in A.D. 944. Therefore it can be presumed that by the time of this grant Gunda IV had been an active general of at least thirty years age. Beginning his career with this victorious deed Gunda earned a name among the Rāstrakūṭa generals and thereby a stronger hold in the eastern borders of Telīṅgāna.

Gunda IV continued as a loyal subordinate of the Rāstrakūṭas till their sudden collapse in A.D. 973. It was also the year when the rule of the Eastern Chālukyas was subjected to an eclipse of political interregnum which continued till the end of tenth century. Gunda, with Rāstrakūṭa affiliation as well as loyalty to his master was now in a dilemma whether to surrender himself to the new Chālukya king Tailapa II or Jatā Chōda Bhīma who siezed the Vēñgi kingdom after killing its ruler
Danarnava in A.D. 973. He did not choose either of the two, but preferred to remain independent with his small principality in the Koravi region. With such ambition he drove away the Mudugonda Chālukya chief from Koravi which was then the capital of those chiefs. These chiefs as already noticed owed allegiance to the Eastern Chālukyas for many generations. Being on the border of the Rāstrakūta kingdom they were frequently subjected to the onslaughts of those kings whenever their armies marched into the Vēṇgi country. Consequent to the death of Danarnava at the hands of Jatā-Choḍa Bhīma the Vēṇgi kingdom was thrown into anarchy, and this Buffer state of Koravi under its weak rulers was reduced to insignificance. Gunda IV availed himself of the opportunity in carving an independent principality of his own at the expense of the Mudugonda Chālukya chiefs. It seems they shifted their capital to some place towards south called Bōṭṭu, the identity of which is not certain. Since then these chiefs adopted Bōṭṭu as their family name in place of the erstwhile Mudugonda or Mudugondūru their original habitat even before they chose Koravi as their capital.

At this stage it is worth recollecting the statement of the Gūḍūr epigraph that Viriyāla Erra having slain Bōṭṭu Bēta's enemy in the battle reinstated that Bēta at Koravi. The record although dated in A.D. 1124, that is in the period of Kākatīya Prōla II, narrates this event which actually took place during the time of Viriyāla Erra, grandfather's father of Viriyāla Malla who set up that epigraph. Therefore, we may not be unreasonable in assigning this event to the time of Prōla II's grandfather's
father Beta I and the latter's father Gunda IV who is assumed to have lived up to A.D. 1000. So, Botṭu Beta's father might have been forced to flee from Koravi by the Kakatiya chief. But the incongruous nature of the genealogical list of the Botṭu chiefs furnished in the Kakkanauru plates of Kusumāditya datable to the latter part of twelfth century leads us to believe that at least two or three generations were skipped over in the list, giving only some members as already observed in the earlier chapter. As more than one chief is noticed possessing the name Beta in that family and omission of some members in the list seems to have been certain, Botṭu Beta who was reinstated at Koravi by Viriyāla Erā may be said to be a contemporary of Gunda IV. The possible course of events that took place in the Koravi region after the fall of the Rāstrakūṭas may be summarized as follows.

As noted above the Rāstrakūṭa subordinate Gunda IV asserted independence usurping the territory of the Mudugonda Chiefs instead of submitting himself to the Chālukya king Taila II. The latter chiefs most probably lent their support to the new king with an intention of getting back Koravi with his help by ousting Gunda IV. With the support of Taila II Viriyāla Erā killed Gunda in a battle and reinstated Botṭu Beta at Koravi. Thus Tailapa could root out the last traces of Rāstrakūṭa influence in Telingāna and establish his authority in this quarter posting his own kinsman, the Chālukya chief of the Mudugonda family as subordinate. The date of this event cannot be precisely said with our present knowledge, but we can say only that it took place some time in the last decade of the tenth century. The earliest
known record of the reign of Taila II in this region is the epigraph at Jammikunta near Anumakonda dated A.D.996. Here comes to an end the Rāstrakūta subordination of the early Kākatiyas.

iv) BÊTA II : C.A.D. 1000-1065:

In the Bayyaram inscription this chief is called as Garuda Bêta. The Gudur epigraph also mentions him with the same name possibly to distinguish him from the Mudugonda Chālukya chief Boytu Bêta. When his father Gunda IV was slain by Viriyāla Erra, Garuda Bêta according to the same record was too young to contest the enemies with arms. Consequent to the reinstatement of Boytu Bêta at Koravi he was virtually dispossessed of all what his father had acquired. The Kākatiya family itself was about to extinguish without any political recognition. Thanks to the good offices of Viriyāla Erra's wife Kamavasāni, the family was saved from this critical situation. The Gudur epigraph our main source of history of this chief narrates that Kamavasāni, took up the cause of young Garuda Bêta and having approached the emperor re-established the line of Kākati. This statement clearly implies that Kamavasāni most likely being related to the Kākatiya family strove hard to compensate the loss done to it by her husband. In fact, the family chronicle Siddhēśvarachāritra of a later date, though unreliable in several respects attributes the credit of restoring the lost fortunes of the family to a lady Kuntaladevi the paternal aunt of Eṅkadevarāja son of Gundy by acting as regent to the former who was young. Here, if the personal names Kamavasāni and Garuda Bêta of the Gudur epigraph
are equated to Kuntaladēvi and Erukadēvarāja respectively of the said family chronicle, the events in both the narrations tally with each other. Apart from this literary evidence, it is not at all unreasonable to believe that Viriyāla Ḫira's wife Kāmavaśāni who took up the cause of Garuda Bēṭa when he was in distress, had some close relation with the Kākatiya family. She might have achieved this only through her husband who already won the favour of the king by reinstating Boṭṭu Bēṭa at Koravi.

There is also another possibility. In the last verse of the same Gudur epigraph certain Sūra whose relationship with the above said Viriyāla couple is not specified is praised to have done some meritorious deeds namely, 1) having killed some Kādāya-nāyaka of Velpugonda set up Rāvanripa at Velpugonda and 2) obtained from him Mogadupalli, Boṭtipadu, Bekumāvidlu and the friendship of Garudaraṇa. This indicates that Sūra also helped Garuda Bēṭa when he was in distress and was favoured by him with the grant of the said villages. The nature of his help to Bēṭa is not clear. But it is stated that Sūra installed certain Rāvva-nippa at Velpugonda, which is identified with the modern Jaffarghad, a hill fort of the Rāstrakūṭa and later periods situated about twenty miles south-east of Warangal. Late K. Harshavardhana Sarma identified Rāvva-nippa with the young Kākatiya chief Beta II, that is Garuda Bēṭa and explained the verse that Sūra after killing Kādāya-nāyaka the chief of Velpugonda, installed in his place the Kākatiya chief Bēṭa. In that case, we have to assume that consequent to the loss of Koravi the Kākatiya chief Bēṭa II with the help of Sūra made temporarily Velpugonda his capital. Subsequently he could influence
the king and obtained Anumakonda-vishaya as fief. The Bayyaram inscription states that Garuda Beta having killed made Anumakonda his, pura or capital. This is supported by other evidence namely the present Gudur epigraph. It is Beta I who first came to Anumakonda and settled as a subordinate to the Western Chalukya king. About his other political activities we know very little. From the statement of the Kazipet Dargah inscription of Durgaraja, he is credited with the attribute Chola-chamu-vardhi-pramathana that is, who churned the ocean of the Chola armies. Being a petty chief, he cannot be supposed to have invaded the Chola country on his own accord, but it is possible that he participated in one of the Chalukya invasions and had an occasion to attack the Chola armies. The Sanigaram epigraph is the only record of this chief that has come to light so far and it is dated 6.973 corresponding to A.D. 1051. Having started his career in his boyhood sometime before A.D. 1000 it is not improbable that he led an active life till A.D. 1052.


With the recent discovery of the five epigraphs in the village Sanigaram near Karimnagar belonging to the four early members of the Kakatiya family namely, Beta II, Prōla I, Beta III and Prōla II we are now in a better position than before in assigning almost correct regnal periods to these chiefs. Accordingly, the last date of Beta II is known from his record datable to A.D. 1051 which was soon followed by his son Prōla I's record dated in A.D. 1053. But for these two records we have no direct evidence to ascertain their dates. From the Bayyaram
inscription Prōla I is known to be credited with the title arigaja-kōsari, lion to the elephant-like enemies, after which he constructed a tank called Kōsari-tataka, identifiable with the big tank near the village Kēsamudra a shortened form of Kēd situated about fifty kilometers from Warangal. Or it might be the same Kesariṣamudra referred to in the Anumakonda inscription of Prōla I. It is also stated in the Bayyaram record that his successors adopted varāha or divine boar which uplifted the earth from the ocean, on their coins and cattle. This indicates that the Kakatiyas during the time of Prōla I opted varāha as their insignia obviously to suit their loyalty to the Chālukya overlords. In this connection it may be also recollected that according to the Kazipet Dargah inscription, it was Prōla I who obtained Anumakonda-vishaya as permanent fief from king Trailokya. This is what is meant by uplifting the fortresses of the Kakatiyas by Prōla I. However, it is to be remembered that their original Garuda symbol continued to decorate their banner till the end as noticed in the earlier chapter.

About the political career of Prōla I the main source of our information is the Kazipet Dargah inscription set up by his grandson ragarāja in A.D.1097-98. There, it is said that Prōla set right the affairs of Chakrakūta-vishaya, put to flight certain Bhadraṅga defeated the Konkana and spread his fame all over the land. Having defeated the neighbouring chief Annaya of the great forest, the son of Kādaparti Durga and having killed in battle Gonna, Purukūṭa chief of Gūnasāgara (town) obtained from the king Trailokya Malladeva, Anumakonda-vishaya including the enemies
lands as permanent fief. Two sets of victories of Prōla I are stated in this record. The first set refers to his external victories whereas the second set to his local achievements. Taking them in order, Prōla set right the disorders of Chakrakūta, in other words the ruler of Chakrakūta was attacked and subjugated. Perhaps this may refer to the king's campaign over that region when Prōla participated in it. The identity of Bhadranga is not certain. However, it is possible that he was a scion of the Lēmulavāda Chalukya chiefs. Although we do not know anything about these chiefs after the fall of the Rāstrakūtas, there is every possibility that some last members of the family were still exercising some power in Sabbinādu, their ancestral province. Bhadraṅga is the Sanskritized form of Baddega which occurs as personal name of those chiefs including the last member. It is not unlikely that a descendant of that family opposed Prōla. The provenance of the inscriptions of Bēta I and Prōla I datable to A.D.1051 and A.D.1053 respectively at Sanigram which is about 30 kilometers from Vēmulavāda the capital of these Chalukyas lends support to this view. Probably Prōla I in his early career fought with the earstwhile rulers of that region, and put to flight their scion Baddega or Bhadranga. This event accounts for the spread of the Kākatiya power into Sabbinādu which was originally under the hold of the Chalukyas of Vēmulavāda. Yuddhamalla Jīnalaya at Sanigaram to which a grant was recorded in the record of Bēta II cited above was definitely a temple built by Yuddhamalla of the same family. The place has now come under the jurisdiction of the Kākatiya principality and its being a Jaina centre is
attested by several Jain visteges outside the village. Perhaps, consequent to this victory over Baddega, Prola for the first was rewarded with the territory of Sabhāṇādu by the king as indicated in his Sanigaram epigraph. The third event relates to his victory over Konkana. All these military undertakings of Prōla I, who was an chieftain holding a fief hardly equal to a modern taluk in area, cannot be supposed to have conducted on his own accord, but they must be only on behalf of his overlord Trailokya-Somāvarī. In his reign of more than a quarter century this Chālukya king invaded Chakrakūta as well as Konkana more than once. But in the period of Prōla I, it may be that he participated in the campaign of Yuvaraṇa Vikramāditya against Konkana and Chakrakūta.

Among the local chiefs whom he conquered and slew in the battle were Annaya, the son of Kāḍaparti Durga who was the chief of the forest-region and Gonna, the Purukūṭa chief of Gnasāgarā. It is not easy to identify these chieftains who had been probably petty local chiefs with no political standing. In recognition of his valour which he demonstrated in the said military campaigns and unfailing loyalty the king bestowed on him Anumakonda-vishaya as permanent fief.

vi) BETA III C.A.D. 1076-1108:

This Bēta's earliest known record is his Anumakonda epigraph dated A.D. 1079. Here this chief is credited with the title Śrīmān Vikrama-chakrā Śrī Bēta-māndalikōttamaḥ. It indicates that he started his career some time before this date almost simultaneously with his overlord Vikramāditya VI whose
accession took place in A.D. 1076. It is also worth recounting in this context that after the death of TrailokyaMalla in A.D. 1068 the accession of Sömëśvara II has been unceasingly contested by Vikramāditya. With his ultimate design to overthrow the former from the throne Vikramāditya managed to build up his strength by enrolling as many subordinates as possible on his side. In Telīṅgāma we have noticed before that Eruva Bhīma of Panugālī lent his support to him and obtained in recognition Kandūru-pādu as additional fief. Similarly the Kakatiya Chiefs Prōla I and his son Bēta III assured their full support to the new king, who as a mark of reward conferred on Bēta the title Vikrama-Chakrīn. The Dargah inscription of his son Durgārāja cited above also ascribes him with this title.

Four epigraphs of this Bēta have come to light so far, of which the above cited Anumakonda inscription is the earliest whereas the Sanigaram epigraph datable to A.D. 1107 is the latest. His other records are the Bānajīpet epigraph dated A.D. 1082 and his son Durga's Kazipet inscription datable to A.D. 1098 already cited. The last mentioned record consists of two parts. The first part records the creation of a locality called Śivapura in Anumakonda and the construction of a Śiva temple to the god Bētēśvara after his name. The said Śivapura was granted by him to the Kālāmukta Śaiva ascetic Rāmēśvara Pāndita, the Āchārya of Mallikārjuna Śilāmātha of Śriparvata on the occasion of a solar eclipse in the month of Kārtika of the year Pramōda corresponding to A.D. 24th Nov. A.D. 1090. The second part registers the setting up of an inscriptional pillar like Kīrtistambha by Bēta's
son Durgarāja's minister in the year Bahudānya, which corresponds to A.D. 1098. It is evident that the former part belongs to Beta III whereas the latter to his son Durgarāja. On the basis of this record it is formerly believed that the last date of Beta II was A.D. 1090. But as noted above his recently discovered inscription at Sanigaram made A.D. 1108 as his latest date.

The Banajipeṭ epigraph after referring itself to the prosperous reign of Tribhuvanamalla, mentions his subordinate mahāmandalēśvara Ugravādiya Mādarasa of Vengnoṭākula and the lineage of Mādhavavarman. To a Jaina temple set up by him, mahāmandalēśvara Kākatiya Betarasa the lord of Anmakondapūra is stated to have made some gifts of land and house site on the occasion of Uttarāyana-saṅkrānti in the year Dundubhi, Śaka year 1004 that is A.D. 1082.

It is to be noted in this connection that though the Sanigaram inscriptions indicate the Kākatiya authority over Sabbi-nādu, other inscriptions of Vikramāditya dated 1083 and 1106 state that in those respective years Sabbinādu was governed by the king's officers Rājāditya and Kumāra Sōmeśvara respectively. An inscription of 1108 at Vemulavada associates Paramāra Jagaddēva with this region. But in view of the total absence of Kākatiya records in Vemulavāda, the most important town in Sabbinādu and their presence in only Sanigaram we can say that only a part of Sabbinādu was bestowed on Prōia I by Trailōkyamalla and that is why only Anumakonda-vishaya is
mentioned in that charter whereas other pockets are stated as tat-tad-bhūvuta that is, including those lands which he conquered. Even that part of Sabbinādu it seems was deliberately taken over by Paramāra Jagaddēva the governor of Kollipāka in the first decade of the twelfth century. Then arose the necessity for Bēta to approach the king with the help of his minister Vaija and obtain the entire Sabbi-1000 from the king as stated in the Padmākshi temple inscription.

vii) DURGARĀJA:

As noticed above while discussing the genealogy of the family, Durgarāja succeeded his father Bēta III in about A.D.1108. We have only one record for him namely the Kazipet Dargah inscription which however bears the date A.D.1098, ten years earlier than when he actually succeeded. It contains two parts, the former being in Sanskrit verse composed by Devanabhatṭa-kavi of Oṃtiśvara and the latter in Kannada. The former contains the genealogical account of the Kākatiya chiefs from Bēta II to Bēta III. The latter is said to have created a locality called Śivapura to the south-west of Anumakonda wherein he also built a temple and installed the god Bētesvara in honour of his spiritual preceptor Rāmēśvara Pandita of Kālāmukha sect. The same contents have been recorded in Kannada language in the second part which commences with the praśasti of the Chālukya king Tribhuvanamalladeva. From the extent portion in both the parts of the record we understand that Bēta III set up the village Śivapura and built a temple for Bētesvara in it in the year 1012.
Pramoda corresponding to A.D. 1090, and subsequently the temple was endowed with some grants under the trusteeship of Rāmesvara Pandita by Bēta's son Durga-bhūpāla who also bears the title Tribhuvanamalla in the year Bahudhānya which corresponds to A.D. 1098. We know however from the Sanigaram epigraph that Bēta III lived till A.D. 1107. Hence it can be surmised that during Bēta's time itself his son Durga set up this inscriptional pillar, recording his father's religious deeds probably copying from an earlier record datable to A.D. 1090 with the additional grants of his own made in A.D. 1098. This indicates that Durgarāja was taking active part in the administration even in the life time of his father.

From the foregoing observation we are led to believe that Bēta's son Durgarāja celebrated his prince-coronation acquiring the title Tribhuvanamalla and probably Chalamarti-ganda also in the year A.D. 1098, in the presence of his father and the spiritual guru Rāmesvara Pandita. But quite to our surprise, we do not come across this chief anywhere in the whole realm of the Kākatiya annals.

It is however surprising that no other Kākatiya source epigraphical or literary does not mention Durgarāja. Further, within ten years after Bēta III, we see his second son Prōla II in power as is clear from his Anumakonda inscription of 1117. If at all, Durgarāja is to be supposed to have been in power in between these two dates namely A.D. 1108 and 1117. But the unpublished Kottapalli epigraph, in Nalgonda district of the time
of Ganapatidēva seems to give us clue to what might have happened at this juncture. While praising Prōla II, it states that he was so benevolent that he protected even his bhṛatirvva, that is his brother's son who sought asylum in him. Taking into consideration that Durgarāja had a very short period for him, together with this statement it is possible to surmise that Durgarāja's rule came to sudden end as a consequence of which his son had to seek the asylum in Prōla. In all likelihood Prōla himself managed to get the power for himself by putting an end to Durga. As a result of this, Prōla's line continued to rule over the area for generations and as such he is praised as the vamśavardhana or founder of the family.24 Obviously the Chalukya king also approved of this usurpation by Prōla since the latter was instrumental in putting down the rebellion of Jagaddēva on his behalf. Ramēśvara Pandita the family preceptor who appears as the preceptor of prince Durgarāja in the latter's Dargah inscription is noticed in a fragmentary record of Ammakonda25 to have been patronized by Prōla II. Therefore, Prōla's action of depriving Durgarāja of his legitimate right was sanctioned not only by the king but also by the spiritual guru. Surprisingly, all the chiefs Kakati Bōta II, his son Durgarāja, Mēda I and his son Jaggadēva died between A.D.1107 and A.D.1117. Paramāra Jagaddēva also left Teliṅgāna during the same period. All these put together give rise to the suspicion that some political disturbance took place among the local chieftains of Anumakonda and Sabbi-nēdu regions during that period of one decade.
As noticed above Prōla's succession was not altogether peaceful. However, he could establish himself with the full support of the king Vikramāditya VI. His earliest known record is the Padmākši temple inscription dated in the Chālukya Vikrama year 42, Ṣhevalambi, corresponding to A.D.1117. It is quite likely that he assumed power in 1116. It records the construction of a Jaina basadi called Kadalalāya-basadi by Mailama, wife of Kakati Prōla's minister Bētana-paraśa. It also records a gift of some land to the same institution by mahāmandalāvāra Medarasa of Ugravādi (region) who was born in the family of Mādhavavarman. Medarasa, here was Mēda II the elder son of Jaggarāja and the grandson of Mēda I according to the genealogy given in the Govinda puram epigraph. This Polavāsa chief Mēda II finds mention in the above cited Anumakonda Padmākši temple epigraph of Prōla II, after the latter's name, indicating his lower status than that of the Kakatiya chief. In this context we must bear in mind the political events that have taken place in this region of Telingāna during the previous decade beginning from A.D.1106, when the revolutionary attitude of Paramāra Jagaddēva caught the king's sight. The Kakatiyas availed themselves of the opportunity in gaining not only new additions to their principality but also an elevation in their political status.

Two of the Sanigaram epigraph belong to this Prōla whose savadore of Sabbi-sahasra named Ropolla Kuruvarasa is stated to have made the gifts. One of these two records was dated in the beginning of Bhūlōkamalla's reign whereas the other record was
dated in the Saka year 1071 A.D. 1149. The Maṭedu epigraph of
his bantu or servant named Vemabola Boddama Mallanāyaka of the
Pulinda family, dated in C.V. 45 Šārvari records the construction
of temples for the deities Hari, Hara and Bhāskara and endowments
to the same by him (Mallanāyaka). Incidentally it states that
his father Reva rendered service to Kākatīya Beta (III) by
defeating his dāyas or agnates and by collecting tributes on his
behalf. Here, the dāyas defeated by Reva may mean Kinsman of
Prōla, in which case it may also suggest the enmity between Prōla
and elder brother Durgarāja who was disposed of by the former
with the help of Reva and others. So long as Vikramāditya VI was
alive, all the subordinates in Teliṅgāna including Prōla II did
not raise any internal troubles, but soon after the accession of
Bhūlōkamalla Śomeśvara in A.D. 1127 most of the subordinate chiefs
of Teliṅgāna raised the standard of revolt. Prōla, as a loyal
subordinate, had struggled hard in suppressing the revolts against
Bhūlōkamalla as well as his son Jagadekamalla II. The details
of Prōla's military achievements during their successive reigns
will be discussed in detail in the following paragraphs.

The Anumakonda inscription of Kakati Rudradeva set up
in the Thousand Pillar Temple (Vayistambhāla-gudī) is a unique
record of the history of the Kakatiyas. In fact, after its
masterly edition by J.F. Fleet in the last quarter of the
nineteenth century in Indian Antiquary authentic researches
in the history of this dynasty started.

The main purpose of the inscription is to record the
installation of the gods Śrī Rudrēśvara, Śrī Vāsudēva and Śrī
Sūryadēva by Mahāmandalēśvara Kākati Rudradēva in the Śaka year 1084, Chitrabhānu Māgha śu.13, Vaddavāra which regularly corresponds to 19th January, 1163 A.D. Saturday. Although very simple in its main object, the record by all means intends to proclaim the commencement of Rudrā's sovereign rule in its virtual sense. In order to justify the proclamation a detailed account of the military exploits of himself and his father Prōla II, is furnished in mellifluous Sanskrit verse.

I. The victories of Prōla II according to the record, may be briefly stated as follows:

1. He (Prōla II) made Chālukya Tailapadeva captive in war, and set him free out of loyalty and affection.
2. He made Gōvindarāja also captive and after releasing him bestowed the kingdom on Udayarāja.
3. Beheaded Gunda, the lord of Mantrakūṭa
4. Made certain Bṛha flee from the field of battle in the presence of the king.
5. Jagaddēva who invaded the town of Anumakonda was repulsed and forced to raise the siege in no time.

Before proceeding further let us examine other references to Prōla's victories which may help us in identifying his enemies and their periods. The Gaṇapēśvaram inscription of Gaṇapatidēva recounts Prōla's military exploits in the following verses.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Kechit } & \text{Manthena Gundavat kshitiḥbrītah khaḍgaṇa niḥ-khaḍgitaḥ} \\
\text{Kechit } & \text{Tailapadevaḥ gaja-hvaś yuddha-vīlīr̥ tyajitaḥ} \\
\text{Kechi } & \text{duraṃ apohitaḥ=sa-manato Gōvinda-dandaśavat} \\
\text{Kechit } & \text{sva-sva-padeśu yena nihitaś Chododaya-khūśavat} \\
\end{align*}
\]
Some kings like Manthena Gunda were slain with the sword. Some like Tailapadeva were let off after attacking the elephants and horses. Some like Govinda-dandesa were driven away from the field of battle. Some like king Chōdodaya were reinstated in their own positions. This verse is more compact and helpful in identifying the enemies mentioned in it than the narration in the Thousand Pillar Temple inscription. It does not contain Prola's last mentioned victory namely his repulsing of Jagaddēva. This obviously indicates that the event did not take place during his regnal period, but some time earlier than A.D.1117, as already observed before. We can easily identify the four enemies of Prola, mentioned in the Gananēsvarā record, all contemporaneous. Manthena Gunda is noticed in a fragmentary epigraph of the time of Bhūlokamalla Sōmēśvara III, found at Gangāpuram near Manthena (Mantrakuta) in the Karimnagar District. He was the younger brother of Medaraja the ruler of Polavāsadeśa. His inscriptions are found in Mulug and Govindapuram near Narasampet, in the Warangal district. Tailapadeva was the Chālukya prince popularly known as Kumāra Tailapa, the younger brother of Bhūlokamalla, who was holding the province of Kandūrutādu as kumāra-vṛitti since the time of his father Vikramāditya VI. His inscriptions in this region which comprises the present Jadcherla, Kalvakurthy, Nagarkurnool, Acchampet taluks of the Mahbubnagar district and Nalgonda and Miryalaguda taluks of the Nalgonda district, are noticeable from A.D.1110 to 1137, that is till the end of Bhūlokamalla's reign. Prola's third enemy was
Govinda-dandesa who according to the above verse was driven away from the battle field by the former. About his identity we shall take up later. The fourth enemy was Chododaya who, according to minister Gangadhara's epigraph found in Harmakonda was the son of Gokarna Choda. All these four opponents of Pröla II stated in the above verse of the Ganapëśvaram inscription namely Manthena Gunda Taiapadêva, Govinda-dandesa and Chododaya are identifiable with four known prominent persons of the period of Bhûlokamalla Sômëśvara III (A.D.1127-1138). Now let us examine their identities in detail in the chronological order of events based on the recently discovered records.

1. The Chöda chiefs - Gokarna, Udaya and Bhima:

The genealogy and regnal periods of the Chöda chiefs of Kandûru are in a state of confusion owing to the irregular dates furnished in most of their records. The unusual custom of assuming the power of issuing independent grants by young princes besides the eldest heirs in the family causes much more difficulty in formulating scheme of reliable chronology.

It is worth noting that in their later records they do not refer to any overlord either Châlukya or Kakatiya. The two Anamala epigraphs are very important in the fact that they furnish a clue in deciding the date of Gokarna Chöda's death, the starting point of our inquiry. In spite of its irregular dating, the epigraph of Gokarna I mentions Bhûlokamalla as the ruling king in the year Pravamga (Pavamga) corresponding to A.D.1127-8. In the very next year Kilaka, A.D.1128-9, another
chief named Śrīdevi Tondaya of the same family is noticed in another epigraph at the same place granting the lordship (prabhutva) of Alamala in Cheqgaku-70 to his minister Ajjala Erayana peggada. What happened to Gōkarna I who issued the former grant is to be investigated. The Anumakonda Thousand Pillar Temple inscription, while narrating his military exploits states that Gōkarna was killed by his brother Bhīma. The second record of Anumala conspicuously does not mention either the overlord or his regnal year which indicates for the first time that this branch of the Kanduru Chōdas was trying to throw off the Chālukya yoke. This is the only record where we find the name Tondaya with the prefix Śrīdevi, very likely the name of his mother. About his relation with Bhīma, we are not certain. However, there is a likelihood of her being the wife of the eldest brother Udaya Chōda I, mentioned in their mother's Panugallu inscription dated C.V. 46, A.D. 1124. As he is not noticed in any other record, it is also not unlikely that this Udaya Chōda died a premature death. His son probably Śrīdevi Tondaya being young, Gōkarna his brother might have become the ruler of Panugallu. Gōkarna's elder brother Bhīma shared the Kanduru region with Vardhamānapuri as its capital. After his Anamala epigraph datable to A.D.1127-8 Gōkarna is not noticed so far in any of their records. Similarly Śrīdevi Tondaya appears only in his Anamala epigraph referred to above dated A.D. 1128, and not known otherwise. After A.D. 1128-29, the next record of these chiefs is that of Udaya Chōda found at Peruru village dated A.D. 1136 with a gap of about seven years. Bhīma IV and Gōkarna II appear in the Māmillapalli epigraph.
dated A.D.1178. As these brothers were far removed from the date of Rudra's Anumakonda record under review, that is A.D.1163 and as Gōkarna according to the statement of the same record was killed before that date we need not consider them in the present context. Thus, we are left with Bhīma III and Gōkarna I of the genealogy given in chapter III before. Of these two the latter disappears after A.D.1128 whereas the former on the basis of the statement in Rudra's record, is to be believed to have survived his master Tailapa, whose identity will be discussed later. We have therefore, to infer that subsequent to the death of Udaya Chōda I his kingdom was temporarily bestowed on Gōkarna by Kumāra Tailapa, the master of this region. After sometime there arose differences among these chiefs. Bhīma along with his nephew Śrīdēvi Tondaya encouraged Kumāra Tailapa to become independent, throwing off the yoke of subordination under Bhūlōkamalla. Although he did not openly approve of this counsel, Kumāra Tailapa indirectly encouraged these chiefs not to acknowledge the sovereignty of Bhūlōkamalla. But Gōkarna as a loyal subordinate and perhaps with an ambition to secure Panugallu region for himself superseding the claims of Śrīdēvi Tondaya with the approval of the king, did not join hands with Bhīma. On the pretext of protecting Śrīdēvi Tondaya's claims Bhīma killed Gōkarna. There is an indication in the Mamillapalli epigraph of Gōkarna's grandson Bhīma IV dated A.D.1178, cited above that this Gōkarna (I) died owing to his failure to join the confederacy. Subsequent to Gōkarna's death, the Panugallu region might have been restored to its rightful claimant Śrīdēvi Tondaya who conferred the prabhutva of Anamala included in Charaku-70 on his minister in A.D.1128. And in the absence of his records in the Panugallu region after this date it cannot be said how long
this Tondaya continued his rule.

2. Govinda-dandaśa:

He was the Chālukya general governing at this time Kondapalli-sīma. It is quite possible that besides Śrīdēvi Tondayaś, Gōvinda-dandaśa also was offered a part of Pānugallurājya as fief by Kumāra Tailapa. The late Mallampalli Somasekhara Sarma identified Gōvindarāja, the enemy of Prōla II with his namesake, the son of Bāgi Mādimayya nāyaka a Chālukya general, of Īṭṭāgī agrahāra. According to the same authority this Gōvindarāja, son of Bāgi Mādimayya along with Lakṣmāndandaśa, son of Mākamayya and the governor of Vēṅgīnāḍu participated in the Gōdāvari battle which took place in A.D. 1135 between the Western Chālukya forces and the local māndalika chiefs on the banks of the Gōdāvari. But Gōvindarāja of the Anumakonda and Gaṇapēśvaram inscriptions is more likely the nephew of Anantapāla dandaśa than the son of Bāgi Mādimayya-nāyaka, for, the former was governing Kondapalli-sīma extending up to the present Huzurnagar in the Nalgonda district where his inscriptions are noticed and it lies on the south-eastern border of Pānugallurājya. Secondly, this Gōvindarāja (Anantapāla’s nephew) is credited with the title Saucha-Gāṅgēya, as pure as Bhīṣma the son of Gaṅgā, in his Tripurāntakam inscription dated A.D. 1126 with which title he is stated as the enemy of Prōla II in the Hanumakonda epigraph of Rudra’s minister Gaṅgādhara. Thirdly, the Anumakonda inscription under review states that Prōla, having captured and released Gōvindarāja bestowed the kingdom (rājya) on Udaya-kṣhitibhīr. This way of representing the incidents as
cause and effect indicates that Śaucha-Gangeya Gōvindarāja had encroached upon Udaya Chōda's fief, which again offers the clue that he was in the neighbourhood of Panugallu. Therefore, Gōvindarāja, the enemy of Prōla II was more likely the nephew of Anantapāla-dandarājakā than the son of Bāgi Madīmayya-māyaka of Ittāgi whose presence in Telingāna is not supported by any evidence. Though loyal to his master Bhūlōkamalla, this reputed general Gōvinda-dandaśa thinking Śrīdevi Tondaya to be the rightful owner of Pānugallurāja lent his support to the latter. We can also reasonably say that soon after Gōkarna Chōda's death Śrīdevi Tondaya and Gōvinda-dandaśa were offered Pānugallurāja in parts by Kumāra Tailapa and subsequently Prōla II ousting both of them restored it to Gōkarna's son Udaya Chōda very likely by the command of Bhūlōkamalla. The date of this event might have been about A.D.1131, the fifth regnal year of that king reckoned in one of the epigraphs at Peruru.

3. Tailapa:

Tailapa whose mention is made in both Prōla's as well as Rudra's victories cannot be taken as Tailapa III who dethroned his elder brother, the crowned king Jagadēkamalla II in A.D.1151. The popular belief among scholars is that the Kākatīyas revolted against Tailapa III and asserted independence. Although it seems logically sound, we have absolutely no evidence to prove it. The assumption is based on mere coincidence of the events namely, the fall of the Chālukyan power at Kālynā and the rise of the Kākatīyas in Telingāna, the Sāunas in Mahārāshtra and the Hoysalas
in Mysore. In fact, none of these powerful subordinates lent their support to Kalachuri Bijnala in overthrowing the Chalukya power. No doubt, Chalukya Tailapa is stated as the enemy of Kākatiya Prōla and his son Rudra as well. If he were to be taken as Tailapa III, why and where did the Kākatiya chiefs meet him in war? Upto A.D. 1149, the date of his Sasigrama epigraph, Prōla II was quite loyal to his overlord Jagadekamalla II whose pādatepdmpājivī he is stated to be. It is to be said that only after Jagadekamalla was dislodged from power the Kākatiyas revolted against the new king and attempted to assert independence. It follows that Tailapa III might have marched into the Kākatiya principality in order to bring them back to subjection. But it is evident from the language of the present Anumakonda inscription of Rudra that he was defeated, by the Kākatiyas or even died subsequently. If the king were so defeated, the Kākatiya chiefs need not wait till 1163 to proclaim independence. They might have easily done it in A.D. 1157, when Bijnala usurped the Chalukya throne or even earlier, when the event is supposed to have occurred. The possibility of their conspiracy with Bijnala in overthrowing Tailapa III will be taken up later. It is true that Kākatiyas never acknowledged Tailapa III as their overlord, nor did they do so Bijnala. In fact, records referring themselves to either of these two kings are not traceable in Telingaṇa including Kandurunāḍu, the region of Telugu Chōdas. Tailapa III was a weak king who could not even consolidate his position in the capital. It can also be said that he could usurp the throne only with the help of Bijnala, who with an evil design to grab power easily from a weak
king seated him on the throne. The possibility of Tailapa's marching into Telingana to suppress the Kakatiya revolt is thus much doubted. It is equally unsound to argue that Kakatiya Pröla II and his son Rudra invaded the Chalukya capital and seized Tailapa as captive. For, in such case they would have captured Kalyana and usurped the Chalukya throne as Bijjala did later. We have no evidence to prove that Kakatiyas entertained such design as to overthrow the Chalukya king at Kalyana. Had it been so, they would not have left Tailapa out of compassion as stated in the records. Therefore, the incident of Pröla's seizing Tailapa is to be said to have taken place in Telingana alone, the possibility of which is much doubted. In either case whether it were in Telingana or outside, the Kakatiyas having achieved such a remarkable victory like capturing the armed king on the battle-field would not leave him alive lest it would result in a more serious threat than before. The statement that Tailapa died of terror caused by Rudra is not believable if he were king Tailapa III because he is noticed to be alive till 610850, one year later than Chitraňhānu the year of Rudra's present Anumakonda record.

Let us also consider whether Pröla and Rudra had fought with Tailapa III on behalf of the ousted king Jagadekamalla II whom they considered to be their real overlord and who was still alive and acknowledged as the sovereign at least in some parts of the kingdom. The Chintumbalam inscription dated A.D. 1155 and the Bagali inscription dated A.D.1160 refer to the prosperous reign of Jagadekamalla with his popular title Pratapachakravartin. Then why should Pröla, after making Tailapa once a captive release him
at all? Their esteemed master Jagadekamalla must have been restored to the throne keeping Tailapa behind the bars. This did not happen. Therefore, they did not fight with king Tailapa III on behalf of the ousted king Jagadekamalla II.

Now let us examine the position of Kumāra Tailapa the younger brother of Bhūlōkamalla Śoneśvara III. He was in possession of Kandūrunādu-1100, as kumāra-vṛitti since the time of his father Vikramāditya VI and his inscriptions in that region are noticed from C.V.35, A.D. 1110 to C.V. 60, Nala corresponding to A.D.1127. In addition to Kandūrunādu he was also holding Sindavādi-1000, with its capital at Tumbalām near Adoni. Some of his inscriptions mention him as Yuvarāja-Tailapadeva. As long as Vikramāditya VI was alive the Kandūru Chōdas were quite loyal to him and were dating their inscriptions in Chālukya Vikrama reckoning. Since Bhūlōkamalla's accession there appear signs of disloyalty among these Chōda chiefs, to their overlords. For the first time we notice it in the Anmmala epigraph of Śrīdēvi Tondaya datable to A.D.1128 which conspicuously does not refer to any overlord nor the regnal year of Bhūlōkamalla or his father Vikramāditya VI. All the Chōda chiefs of Kandūrunādu directly owed their allegiance to Kumāra Tailapa because the entire region was his appanage. It is noticed that this prince in the closing years of Bhūlōkamalla's reign made an attempt to become independent. His Rāchuru epigraph dated C.V. 60 (expired) Nala, Phālguṇa Amāvāṣya corresponding to A.D.1137 February, 21 represents him as sovereign king with Gaṅgāpura as nelāvidu. Non-reference to Bhūlōkamalla's reign and assumption of sovereign titles indicate that Kumāra
Tailapa was attempting to assert independence in his appanage in Telingāna. The method of dating the record in Chālukya Vikrama era in this record is also unusual for him, when compared to his other records of Bhūlokamalla's period which contain the regnal years of that king only. The reading of this epigraph is as follows:

"Svasti samasta-bhuvanāśraya Śrī Prithvīvallabha . . . .
... Satyāśraya-kula-tilaka-Chālukyābharana Śrīmat Tailapa đēvara vijaya-rājya uttarottar-abhvīldhi pravardhamānam āchandrārka tāraž-
baraž Gaṅgāpurāda nelavidi nalu sukhasaṅkathā vinōdatī rājya śey yuttamire śrī maṭchālukya-Vikrama-varshadā[ō]Nāla samvatsarada".

Perhaps he might have obtained full support from his loyal subordinate Bhīma the Chōda chief. Only with this intention Tailapa created a quarrel between the brothers Bhīma and Gōkarna, in which the latter who was loyal to Bhūlokamalla was slain by the former. Subsequently part of his Pānugallu region might have been bestowed on Gōvinda-dandañāyaka so as to ensure that general's support in case of any armed conflict with the king. Tailapa therefore, started indirectly to strengthen his position, in Kandurunādu. It is very likely that by the command of the king Bhūlokamalla, Kākatiya Prōla II took up the cause of Gōkarna's son Udaya Chōda and reinstated him in the Pānugallu-rājya driving away Gōvinda-dandañāyaka. Tailapa with a vengeance on Kākatiya Prōla instigated Meḍarāja and his brother Gundarāja to raise some trouble on the northern border of the Kākatiya territory. These chiefs were already showing their disloyalty to the king by not
making any reference to the overlord as noticed in their Gōvindapuram epigraph dated A.D. 1122⁵⁴, and other records of earlier dates. By the time when Jagadēkamalla succeeded his father in A.D. 1138, Telangāṇa was in a state of revolt owing to Kumāra Tailapa's evil designs to assert independence which he almost achieved within his appanage i.e. Kandūrunāḍu. The Kākatīyas, by this time with their unfailing loyalty to the Chālukya king asserted their superiority among all the subordinate chiefs in Teliṅgāṇa. Soon after his accession to the throne, Jagadēkamalla II turned his attention towards Teliṅgāṇa and personally marched there with the necessary military following. Kākatīya Pūla, the only loyal subordinate in the region stood by his side and led his armies first against Kumāra Tailapa whom he captured and let off out of loyalty and affection. We are not sure whether Gōvinda-dandēsa was driven away from Pānugallu in this expedition or some years earlier, because there is no epigraphic evidence to prove his existence in Teliṅgāṇa as late as Jagadēkamalla's accession. Kumāra Tailapa, after this event was deprived of his right over Kandūrunāḍu which he enjoyed for more than a quarter of a century. His records bearing dates after A.D.1137 are not traceable in this region. Jagadēkamalla's inscriptions dated in his fourth and sixth regnal years A.D.1141 and A.D. 1143 respectively are found in Gangāpura the nelavīḍu⁵⁵ of Tailapa according to his above mentioned Rāchhūru epigraph which represents him as a sovereign king.

The foregoing account of Kumāra Tailapa's silent revolt against his brother king Bhūlōkamalla right from the latter's
accession in A.D. 1127 enables us to explain the full importance of the phrase 'sasvad-yuddha-nibaddha-sahvaram-matim' i.e. whose mind always entertains the deep hidden designs of revolt or battle. This applies to Kumāra Tailapa alone. Prōla II, we have noticed, intervened twice at least, once to restore Panugallu to Udaya Chōda some time between A.D. 1130-1136 and for a second time to dispose of Kumāra Tailapa himself immediately after Jagadēkamalla's accession or just before that. King Tailapa III, on the other hand is not noticed to have any struggle, much less a prolonged one with Prōla. Moreover, all the four enemies of Prōla namely Manthena Gunda, Tailapa, Gōvinda-dandāsā and Chōdōdayā narrated in a single verse in the above cited Ganaḍēsvaram inscription are quite conveniently assignable to the thirties of the twelfth century. No reason, therefore, prevails to detach Tailapa from this group and identify him with king Tailapa III who was later by two decades.

4. Gundāraja and Ēdarāja:

Jagadēkamalla next marched against Medāraja and his brother Gunda in the Mantrakūṭa or Manthena-vishaya who disregarded the sovereignty of the Chālukya king since long. In this campaign also Kakatiya Prōla took an active part displaying his valour in subjugating those chiefs. Prōla beheaded Gunda with his head shaved and his chest marked with the symbol of varāha as a mark of humiliation. Eda, another chief of the same region and likely of the same family of Meda, ran away in the presence of the king from the battle-field to his town and did not come back to offer any encounter even though he was challenged by Prōla. The same
event has been referred to in the fragmentary record of Rudra's minister Gaṅgādhara found recently at Hanumakonda. According to that broken epigraph Prōla put to flight Eṣa-phūpāla the king of Manyaka with his hair untied before the king Jagadekamalla. This Eṣa has been identified with a petty chief of that name bearing the titles Lattalūr-puravarādhiśvara and Suvarpa-garuda-dhvaja in an undated fragmentary epigraph found at the village Ramagundam in the Peddapalli taluk, Karimnagar district. These titles along with mahāmandalāśvara bear similarity with those of Medarāja found in his Polayasa epigraph. The phrase nripesvarasvā (in the presence of the king) stated in the Anumakonda inscription can be safely equated to rājānga Prī Jagadekamalla-prithvipatē of the fragmentary epigraph discovered recently in Hanumakonda. It also states that Prōla having crossed the river Krishna worshipped the god Mallikārjuna of Śrīśaila and set up there a Victory-pillar. His son was Rudradeva. From the above statement it is clear that Prōla during his conquest of Kandūrūnādu proceeded triumphantly to Śrīśaila and set up there his Victory-pillar victory in the present context means his success over Kumāra Tallapa who proclaimed himself king. Unfortunately Prōla's Victory-pillar at Śrīśaila is not traceable. It is evident from the above Hanumakonda fragmentary epigraph that king Jagadekamalla paid a personal visit to Teliṅgāna to bring back the disloyal subordinates including his uncle Tailapa into his fold. The mention of nripēśvarasvā purataḥ or rājānga Prī Jagadekamalla-prithvipatē gives us the definite indication that Prōla as a loyal subordinate stood by the side of the king in suppressing the revolts.
Thus the chronological sequence of all these events related to Prōla's victories may be shown as follows:

1. Prōla repelled Jagaddēva's attack on Anumakonda before he came to power, some time before A.D. 1117. (Chapter III above)
2. Gōkarna's death at the hands of his elder brother Bhīma took place in A.D. 1128.
3. Pānugallu-rajya was bestowed on śrīdēvi Tondaya and also likely on Govinda-dandaravaka by Kumāra Tailapa in the same year.
4. Kakatiya Prōla driving away Govindarāja from Pānugallu restored that rajya to Gōkarna's son Udayachocda, some time before A.D. 1136 the date of his earliest known inscription found at Peruru in Nalgonda district.
5. Prōla might have killed Gundarāja at the same time when he put Edarāja to flight in the presence of king Jagadēkamalla that is after A.D. 1138 and before A.D. 1141, the date of his Gaṅgāpuram epigraph.
6. Kumāra Tailapa's defeat at the hands of Prōla must have taken place after A.D. 1137 the date of his Rachur epigraph which represents him as sovereign king and before Jagadēkamalla's first known record of Gaṅgāpuram in Kandūrunādu dated A.D. 1141.

Conclusion:

From all the foregoing discussion regarding Prōla II's victories narrated in the Anumakonda inscription of Rudradeva, we have absolutely no evidence to prove that Prōla II revolted against the Chālukyas. On the other hand it can be proved on the basis of the phrase nripēśvarasya puratah (in the presence
of the king) as explained above that Prōla as a loyal subordinate strove hard with unsparing efforts to protect the supreme authority of the Chālukya King Jagadeśamalla II in Telingāna.

Prōla II, according to an inscription at Daksharamam was slain by Chōdayarāja of the Kota family and the Haihaya chiefs Satyga and Mallideva of the Kona country. This is confirmed by Pithapuram Pillar inscription dated S.1117 (A.D.1195). Mahadevarāja, a Sūryavāmśa chief and a subordinate of the later Eastern Chālukya king Malla Vīshnuvardhana of the Bēta Vijayāditya line who bears the title 'Prōrai-Madabānala' (the submarine fire to the enemy named Prōla), in the Madras Museum Plates of his overlord claims for himself the credit of killing Prōla. These references show that Prōla II was killed in a battle with the above chiefs probably in his attempt to conquer the coastal Ānihrai-dēśa.

Prōla II's wife was Muppamamba, the sister of Natavādi Durggarāja, who was also a subordinate of the Chālukyas of Kalyāna having his fief near Inugurti in the Mahābubabad taluk, Warangal district. Among their sons Rudra and Mahadeva were prominently known, whereas other sons Harihara, Ganapati and Repolla Durggarāja are known only by references in the inscriptions as already noticed in the genealogy of the family.
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