SECTION II: SOVEREIGNTY AND GROWTH

CHAPTER V

RUDRADEVA
1) Emergence as Independent Rulers

**RUDRADEVA: A.D. 1158-1196**

Prola II was succeeded by his eldest son Rudradeva some time before Śaka 1080 (A.D. 1158) the date of the Dākshārāmam inscription of his minister Inaṅgala Brammireddi. In addition to the Śaka year 1080 the record mentions the 13th regnal year of the Chālukya Chōla king Rājarāja II which need not be considered seriously as it was customary at Dākshārāmam to date the records in the emperor's regnal years also and it does not however signify any political subordination of Rudra to the Chālukya-Chōla king. The name 'Rudra' is however without the usual epithets Mahāmāndalēśvara etc. He is simply mentioned as Anumakonda Rudradeva. It is also likely that Inaṅgala Brahmi Reddi might have accompanied Prola II to assist the Chālukya-Chōla king Rājarāja II in suppressing a rebellion of the Kōṭa chief Chōdayarāja and the Haihya chiefs Māmā Satya and Mallideva. Although they were finally defeated and Prola II seems to have lost his life, the Kākatiya general Inaṅgala Brammireddi had to state simply Rudradeva of Anumakonda as his master. The evidence is too meagre to deduce any positive conclusion.

The Thousand Pillar Temple inscription, as in the case of Prola II's victories gives us a detailed account of Rudra's military achievements also, which in fact is the historical document which proclaims Kākatiya sovereignty. The following are Rudra's outstanding victories which made him sovereign king.

1. He vanquished Dommarāja and captured his village Nagara
2. Subdued the prowess of Meda and defeated the confederacy of the rival kings.

3. Suppressed the pride that arose at the time of meeting with Mailigideva.

4. Acquired the wealth of Polavasa-ḍesa.

5. He invaded the town Vardhamāṇa of Bhīma, who proclaimed himself king, even after the death of Tailapa who died of dysentery caused by the terror of Rudra.

6. Burnt the town of Chōdaśodaya and married his daughter Padmā.

A glance at these and the victories of Prola already explained in the previous chapter, discloses that some of the enemies of Rudra are closely related to those of Prola. Meda was the elder brother of Gunda who was killed by Prola. Similarly Bhīmachoda was the elder brother of Gokarna Chōda.

This gives rise to the suspicion that Rudra might have participated in the military campaigns of his father and attributed the victories for himself as well. But a close examination, however reveals that both the sets of events are different to each other.

Let us now examine the above victories of Rudra. As already stated Tailapa-nripa was mentioned in connection with Bhīma's defeat.
[Even though Tailapa-nripa died of Rudra's terror, notwithstanding, Bhīma assumed the position of a king for a short period].

Tailapa-nripa here cannot be taken as Tailapa III who according to the Kisuvāda (Paṭṭada Kisuvola) inscription dated Śaka 1085, Subhānu (A.D.1163-4)\(^3\) was alive even after the Anumakonda record under review dated in the beginning of the previous year, that is Ś.1084, Chitrabhānu. Further it is stated that subsequent to the death of Tailapa Bhīma assumed the position of the king, obviously of Kandūrunāḍu the appanage of Kumāra Tailapa. Therefore, Bhīma's association in the verse lends support to the identity of Tailapa-nripa with Kumāra Tailapa. The meaning of the verse is, that so long as Kumāra Tailapa was alive Bhīma owed his allegiance to him and nobody raised any objection to that. But soon after Tailapa died, Bhīma instead of submitting himself to the king Jagadekamalla proclaimed himself king of Kandūrunāḍu. The word kshapikāṁ, that is for a short period, indicates the past event, implying that Bhīma was not allowed to remain long as the lord of Kandūrunāḍu as he desired. As a member of the royal family Kumāra Tailapa even after his defeat at the hands of Prōla II was allowed to live elsewhere, perhaps with the usual privileges and honours he was formerly enjoying and Bhīma might have been paying his tributes to him. But after his death Bhīma's disregard to any king made Rudra invade his town Vardhamānapuri and drive him away to the forests along with his followers. So this narration of Rudra's conquest of Kandūrunāḍu is in no way connected with king Tailapa III or his death. But, it might be possible that when Tailapa III usurped the
Chalukya throne, Bhima who was already in possession of Kandurunadu since the time of Kumara Tailapa, taking advantage of the disturbed condition in the Chalukya capital declared himself sovereign king. His nephew, Gokarna's son Udaya also might have lent his support to Bhima in this attempt. The Kakatiya chiefs Pröla and Rudra by virtue of the former's remarkable military exploits during Jagadekamalla's campaign to Telangana as noticed before, earned the recognition as local potentates. So, Rudra, could not remain unconcerned and tolerate Bhima's attitude of founding an independent kingdom in the neighbourhood of the Kakatiya territory. The reason for Rudra's provocation was mere envy. It is in no way concerned with the Chalukya overlord. It is entirely between themselves. The words 'apardhā-vardhita-garvā-parvata mahā śringāram ārōhati', significantly indicate their mutual rivalry. Rudra's attack on Bhima and the latter's flight is referred to in the Katakuru inscription also. In course of this campaign to Vardhamanapuri, after driving out Bhima, Rudra marched on Udayachoda's capital most likely Panugallu as indicated by the name Panugamti-vāda assigned by him to a locality in Orumgalu to commemorate his capture of that town. Udayachoda sued for peace offering his daughter to Rudra. We are not certain about the identity of another Udaya or Chododaya who is said to have died of Rudra's terror. Either it must be an exaggeration of the poet or that Udayachoda must be another chief whose identity at present is not known to us. One Udaya chōda appears in an unpublished epigraph found at Endabetta near Nagarkurnool, dated 11th regnal year of Jagadekamalla, A.D. 1148 which represents him to be a
subordinate of that Chalukya king. Two epigraphs, one from Kishtapuram and another from Rachuru both datable to A.D. 1157, representing Bhimachoda and Udayachoda respectively, furnish not only the identities of Rudra's enemies of their name sake but also the approximate date of his conflict with them, that is between A.D. 1157 and 1162. Of the other three enemies of Rudra namely, Dommaraja, Medaraja and Mailigi, Dommaraja was the lord of Nagunuru, a village near Karimnagar where besides several Jain vestiges four inscriptions of this chief are noticed. All these four epigraphs refer themselves to Dommaraja and record the victories of his warriors. One of these label inscriptions is dated in Chalukya Vikrama year Uttamavisya nalkeneva which is rather unintelligible. But the cyclic year is Pramadi, which owing to the faulty nature of the record, may be taken as Pramadin or Pramathin corresponding to A.D. 1133 or A.D. 1159 respectively ignoring the Chalukya Vikrama era which has become mere customary in several inscriptions of that period. The former year being too early to be assigned to Rudra's period, which lasted till A.D. 1195, we have to consider the latter year Pramathin corresponding to A.D. 1159. Though ambiguous in expression the year nalkeneva together with Pramathin surprisingly tallies with the fourth regnal year of Kalachuri Bijjala who according to Dr. P. B. Desai started his sovereign rule in A.D. 1156. This Nagunuru epigraph records the victory of Medaraja's son Jagadeva both of them being likely
Meda II and his son Jagadēva II.

This Meda must be the elder brother of Gundarāja and the chief of Polavāsadēsa as indicated in the Polavāsa inscription of his grandfather Meda I. He is first noticed in the Anumakonda Padmākshi temple inscription of Prōla II dated A.D. 1117. Jagadēva mentioned in the Nagunūru epigraph of Dommarāja, might have been an unknown son of Meda II, because Jagadēva I, son of Meda I in their genealogy given in Chapter III is not known to have lived beyond A.D. 1117, the date of the earliest record of his son Meda II, and cannot be a contemporary of Rudra. So on the basis of the above mentioned label inscriptions indicating war events connected with Dommarāja, his possible enemy can be taken to be Rudradēva and those events might have occurred in the year Pramāthin A.D. 1159.

This Meda II was the enemy of Rudra mentioned in the Anumakonda record wherein it is said that Rudra defeating Medarāja II annexed his region Polavāsadēsa to the Kākatiya territory. The fragmentary Hanumakonda record of Gāndhāra contains a graphic description of the defeat of Meda at the hands of Rudra. Medarāja according to that narration, unwilling to offer his daughter to Rudra, and sue for peace gave up his wealth, pride and family reputation.

The last enemy of this group is Maligidēva. Till now scholars are not able to identify this prince with any of the known chiefs of Teṅgāna. The verse actually reads as follows:
Here Rudra is praised as (1) capable of striking against the multitude of vain assertions or claims of Meda; (2) an expert in seizing (or turning down) the brave counsels and confederacies of irresistible hostile kings; (3) destroyer of the pride that arose at the time of encounter or meeting with Mailigidēva and (4) who acquired the wealth of the country of Śrī Polavāsādēśā.

This verse follows the verse which describes Rudra's victory over Dommarāja of Nagunūru. His encounter with Mailigī is stated between the statements regarding his attack on Meda and acquiring the wealth of Polavāsādēśā. We know Polavāsa as the capital of Medarāja again a chief in the neighbourhood of Dommarāja the lord of Nagunuru. So it seems quite reasonable that all these four events namely, the defeat of Dommarāja, defeat of Medarāja, conflict with Mailigī and the plundering of Polavāsādēśa were effected by Rudra in one and the same campaign. About Mailigī, we come across two princes of this name, one of the younger brother of Kalachuri Bijjala and the other his own son Kumāra Mailigī. According to the Chakkaligī epigraph the latter is noticed to be ruling the kingdom conjointly with his father in A.D. 1157. So we can identify Mailigī of our
record with either of these two princes. As a political successor to the Chalukya kingdom, Bijjala with the ambition of bringing back the Kākatiya king Rudra to subjection must have despatched an army with Mailigī at its head. Dommarāja, Medarāja II and the latter's son Jagadēva or Jagadeva who were already hostile to Rudra took this opportunity to take vengeance on the Kākatiya king and stood by the side of Mailugidēva against Rudra. The date of this conflict can be safely assigned to round about A.D. 1159 as furnished in the Nagunuru epigraph of Dommarāja referred to above. The plans of the confederacy of these and other chiefs as stated in the Anumakonda inscription were foiled by Rudra. In fact, the Nagunuru epigraph of Dommarāja indicate the death of several warriors and generals like Jagadēva whose past victories were recorded on the epitaphs. Dommarāja himself might have been killed by Rudra as Karna by Arjuna. Medarāja was driven into the woods. Instead of offering his daughter and making peace with Rudra he lost all his wealth, respect and fame as stated in the Hanumakonda epigraph of minister Gaṅgādhara. With these adversaries Mailugu lost hope in success and retreated to Kalyāna being pursued by the Kākatiya armies. Perhaps on the same occasion, Rudra might have made an attempt to capture Kalyāna, the capital of Bijjala. But he was repulsed by the Kalachuri armies as stated in the Lakshmesvara inscription of Bijjala dated A.D. 1161. The same statement which represents the king of Andhra namely Rudradēva as the
enemy of Bijjala dispells all the previous notions that Kākatīyas joined hands with Bijjala in overthrowing the Chālukyas. Here the king of Andhra cannot be other than Rudra as no other prominent king in the coastal region came into conflict with Bijjala in that period. The battle of Kochcherlakōṭa fought with the Karnāta armies by the Velanāti Kulottunga Rājendra Chōda II (A.D. 1162-1182) according to the inscriptions of Gonka the general of the Velanāti king took place in A.D. 1170, that is about ten years after the Lakshmeshvar inscription, dated A.D. 1161. Velanāti Rājendra Chōda, therefore, cannot be taken as Bijjala’s enemy intended in that record. As stated in the Pālavāsa inscription of Mādarāja, dated A.D. 1108 the present Telengāna region even in those days was included in Andhradēśa as at present. Polavāsa in the Karimnagar district is stated in that record to have been situated in Andhradēśa. So the Andhra king represented as the enemy of Bijjala in the Lakshmeshvara inscription can be identified without the least doubt with Kākatīya Rudradēva. Further, Rudra’s claim that his kingdom extended in the west upto Kaṭaka is justified in the sense, that his armies when in triumph upto Kalyāna Kaṭaka the capital of Bijjala. Having thus repulsed Mallugi and chased him upto Kalyāna, Rudra was left in unquestioned supremacy in the entire Telengāna. With the annexation of Polavāsa, his territory touched Gōdāvari in the north. His father had already set up a Victory-pillar at Śrīśaila in the south and Rudra driving away Bhīma Chōda annexed Kandūrunādu to the Kākatīya kingdom. However, as a conciliatory measure he married the daughter of Udayachōda and
allowed him to hold his fief in the lower region whereas the upper tract of the Śrīśaila forest was given as fief to the Charaku chiefs who assisted him in his campaign on the Chōda chiefs which events has been alluded to in the Jammuluru inscription of Charaku Bollaya dated Ś.1124, A.D.1202.

The record mentions the ocean, that is Bay of Bengal as the boundary of Rudra's kingdom in the east. The truthfulness of this statement is however doubted, because the coastal Andhra region was under the control of several māndalika chiefs like the Haihaya chiefs of Kona, the Chāḷukyas of Pithapuram branch, the Kolani(Sarasīpura) chiefs in the Eluru region, the Velanāṭi chief Rājendra Chōda II, the Kōṭa chiefs of Amarāvati, the Kondapadumaṭi chiefs and the Haihayas of Pālnādu. None of these māndalikas at that time was strictly owing allegiance to the Chāḷukya-Chōla king Rājarāja II. In fact they were exercising a sort of independence. It is noticed in the Dakshāramam inscription of Kōṭa Sūramamahādēvi dated Ś.1091 that her husband Kōṭa Chōdayarāja was attributed with the title Kakati-Prōlanir-dahana, thereby indicating that Prōla II died in a battlewith those chiefs. Although we are not in a position to know the exact date of this event, the inscription of Rudra's general Inaṅgāla Brahmi Rādjī at the same place dated Śaka 1080, A.D. 1158 furnishes a clue in this regard. Prōla with an ambition to extend his political influence in the coastal region might have gone there with an army and met with his death at the hands of Kōṭa Chōdayarāja. Rudra, in spite of
his father's death, deputed his general Inangala Brahmi Reddi, who made a headway in achieving his master's object, that is to make friends with some of the chiefs of coastal Andhra probably by way of rendering military assistance to the interested parties. Rudra was quite aware that Bijjala as a political successor to the Chālukyan kingdom would certainly coerce him to acknowledge his suzerainty. In order to meet any eventuality that may arise with Bijjala the Kākatīya chiefs after the former's usurpation of the Chālukya throne in about A.D.1156 lost no time in securing support from the chiefs of the coastal Andhra. As all the chiefs of Telingāna by this time were almost reduced to subjection, their enmity with the Kākatīya's still persisted and in case of war they would do more harm than good. So Rudra sought help from outside. We do not know whether he succeeded in this or he alone fought with the enemy. The presence of his general's inscription at Dākshārāmam in A.D. 1158 indicates not only Prōla's death before that year but also some military assistance from that corner to Rudra in his war with Mailugi and his allies that took place in the following year. Otherwise his general's presence at Dākshārāmam cannot be accounted for, as he did not conquer that region at that time. The statement in Rudra's Anumakonda record that his kingdom extended upto the ocean in the east is exaggerated, and justified only in the sense that like the equally powerful chief Velanāti Rajendrachāda II of Chandavōlu, Rudra too commands considerable influence among the petty māndalikas of the coastal Andhra. The method of
dating Brahmireddi's inscription in Saka 1080 along with the Chalukya-Chola king Rājarāja's 13th regnal year lends colour to the above view namely that Kākatīya Rudra could simply extend his influence in the coastal region at the expense of the nominal king, Rājarāja'II whose authority there has already reached its last phase of disappearance. It is a victory for Rudra's statesmanship. Thus, it took more than a decade from a.D.1150 to 1162 to establish his unquestioned authority in Telingana. After fully ascertaining that Bijjala could get the least support from the other powerful subordinates like the Hoysalas and the Sūnas and that the ousted Chalukya kings could never recover their lost fortunes and having already asserted his superiority over the local chieftains Rudra proclaimed his sovereignty with the most humble titles pati-hita-charita, vinaya-vibhūshana and Mahāmandalāsvaṇa.

From the above observations we can arrive at the following conclusions.

1. As in the case of Prōla II, we are at a loss to find in Rudra the least trace of disloyalty to his Chalukya overlord. Even at this stage he proclaims his loyalty in the titles pati-hita-charita, vinaya-vibhūshana and Mahāmandalāsvaṇa. But to his utter disappointment no rightful claimant to the Chalukya throne came forward.

2. After waiting for a long period, instead of submitting himself to the usurper Bijjala, he proclaimed independence.
3. Either Prōla II or Rudra never took part directly or otherwise in overthrowing the Chālukyas. They did not join hands with Bijjala; on the other hand Rudra was treated as enemy by Bijjala.

4. All the victories mentioned in the record took place in the Telīṅgāna region only. Tailapa mentioned in both cases was Kumāra Tailapa, but not king Tailapa III.

5. Other enemies, whom Prōla II and Rudra are said to have defeated, although mutually related in some cases, were attacked on different events in both the cases. Prōla's military achievements are datable to the thirties, whereas those of Rudra are datable to the fifties of twelfth century A.D.

ii) REST OF THE CAREER OF RUDRA:

The march of Kākatiya armies to the north beyond Godavary during the time of Rudra is noticed in one of the Hanumakonda fragmentary epigraphs of Gangādhara mantrī which states that Rudra defeated the king of Chakrakūṭa who on a former occasion wrested the title of "Mānyaṅkēṭakakārā, from Meḍarāja". It is not possible with our present knowledge to identify the Chakrakūṭa king nor the occasion when Rudra led an expedition against him. However it is probable that Rudra might have conducted this expedition at the instigation of the Chola king Rājarāja II whose 13th regnal year the Kākatiya general Brammi Reddi on his return journey mentions in the above cited Dāksharamam inscription.
Thus establishing himself as unquestioned master of Telengāṇa. Rudra turned his attention towards the coastal Andhra-dēṣa. The Velanāṭi chief Kulōttuṅga Rājēndra Chōḍa succeeded his father Goṅka II in A.D. 1162. These Velanāṭi chiefs were in the beginning faithful to their Chālukya Chōla kings so long Rājarāja II was alive. But when Rājarāja II died in 1172, Velnāṭi chief Kulōttuṅga Rājēndra Chōḍa II overthrew the authority of the new Chālukya-Chōda emperor Rājādhīrāja II and made himself master of the entire sea board tracts extending from Darsi in the Nellore district to Simhachālam in the Visakhapatnam district. Hence, Kākati Rudra could not exercise his authority over the coastal Andhra-dēṣa as long as the powerful Rājēndra Chōla II was supreme at Chandavōlu. Due to his unexpected death in A.D. 1181 and due to the out-break of a fratricidal war of the Palnāṭi chiefs Rudra got an opportunity to interfere in the political affairs of the coastal Andhra by way of responding to the call of one of the Palnāṭi chiefs Nalagāmā for assistance. Rudra at once set out with an army accompanied with capable nāyakas of the Malyāla, Komaravalli, Vipparla and Natavāḍi. Apart from the outcome of the Palnāṭi internecine war, Rudra defeated the Kōṭa chief Doḍḍa Bhīma and captured his town Daḥaṇikōṭa. But as a conciliatory measure he installed Kēṭa II, son of Doḍḍa Bhīma on the throne and gave him back his ancestral territories. With the assistance of Kēṭa II Rudra proceeded against the
velanadu chief and subjugated the kondapadumati chiefs who served as wardens of the western marches of the Velnati kingdom. An inscription at Tripurantakam dated A.D.1185 registers his gift of the village of Revuru on the bank of the Krishna in Kondapalli-nadu to the god Tripurantaka Mahadeva.

It is worth while to mention in this context that Rudra in course of his expedition to coastal Andhra has attacked the Mudugonda Chalukya chiefs Kusumaditya and his brother Nagatiraja. The Kukkanuru plates of the former state that soon after his accession there occurred some upheaval (bhū-praghaṭṭana) in the kingdom and as a result they had to seek shelter in other territories (para-mandala) undergoing troubles for a period of twelve years. Basing on the statement of the Paiampet inscription of Rēcharla Rudra dated A.D.1213, that he put certain Nagatiraja to flight, it may be inferred that these Mudugonda chiefs were driven out from Visurumadu, their own principality. After Rudra's reign they came back and issued the grant of the village Kriivaka to his ministers as explained in Chapter III above.

RUDRA AND THE YADAVAS:

Thus after accomplishing his desire of capturing the coastal Andhra-desa during the last decade of his life Rudra seems to have prepared himself for a northern expedition against the territories of the Seuna kings of Devagiri. Basing on a verse in Jalhana's Sūkti-muktāvali some scholars hold the view that Rudra was once defeated by the Yadava king Bhillama who
ruled between A.D. 1173 and 1192. The relevant portion in the verse reads 'vijita-bhūr-Babhru-rana-prāṇaṁ' which may be interpreted that (Bhillama) conquered (some) territory in the battle field of Babhru. According to Dr. P. B. Desai the word Babhru was meant for (Kakati) Rudra as that word is a synonym to Rudra (Śiva). But in the absence of other evidence this interpretation is doubtful. It is more likely that word Babhru is a Sanskritized place name. But on a later occasion Rudra seems to have invaded the Yadava territory. This attempt ended in utter failure as he seems to have lost his life in the expedition. The Patna inscription dated in the time of Yadava Singhana (A.D. 1280-47) states that his father Jaitugi put an end to the pleasures of the beloved ones of the ladies of Andhra. This has been further corroborated by Hemādri, the Śrīkaranādhīpa of Yadava Mahadeva, who boasted in the Vratakhandha of his Chaturvarga-chintāmanī that Jaitrapāla (Jaitugi) offered a human sacrifice by immolating a victim in the shape of Rudra the Trilīṅgādhīpa and thus vanquished the three worlds. On the basis of these statements Bhandarkar suggested that Rudra was killed by Jaitugi in a battle. But Dr. Ritti observes that there is no specific statement that Jaitugi killed Rudra. The figurative expression of the court panegyrist need not be taken in its literary sense. Had it been so, some Kakatiya record at least might have mentioned the incident as in the case of the death of Mahadeva. But it is certain that Rudra was routed by Jaitugi in the battle. Though the event has been recorded
in Siṅghana's time it actually took place during the time of his father Jaitugi (A.D. 1191-1210) in about A.D. 1195.

Rudra was a great conqueror. Assisted by Valiant chiefs like those of Cheraku, Malyāla, Rēcherla, he completed the task of conquering coastal Andhra left unfinished by his father. His conquest of the Velanādu kingdom was a fitting retaliation and revenge for his father's death. He was singularly lucky in his generals and ministers who spared no pains in enhancing the prestige and power of the ruling family. The name of Gaṅgādhara son of Gōvinda of Velanādu, a minister of Rudra needs special mention for the assistance he rendered in his wars as well as pious deeds.

Rudra was a patron of art and letters. He was a great builder. He was responsible for completing the stone fort at Orugallu which became the seat of Kākatiya power. He constructed the present Rudrēsvāra temple popularly known as Vēyāstambhālagudī (Thousand pillared temple) at Anumakonda on the architectural tradition of the Western Chālukyas.
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