Chapter IV

The Haihayas of Palanādu

1. Introduction: The Haihayas:

The famous battle of Palanādu, the subject matter of the epic-ballad under the present study took place in the ruling family of the Haihayas, who described themselves in their inscriptions as the descendants of Arjuna-Kārtavīrya, of the Haihaya dynasty. The Haihayas were a famous tribe in the epic-purānic literature of ancient times, as a branch of Yadus, founded their kingdom in Cēdi country, with its capital at Māhiśmatī-purā and that Arjuna-Kārtavīrya in the lineage was celebrated as the hero with thousand hands. The inscriptions of the Haihayas of Palanādu, like several other lines of the dynasty in different parts of medieval India, describe the kings as lords of the country from the river Narmadā to Sētū, bounded by the waves of ocean on east and west. But, the boasting of the Haihaya kings seems to have some justification because, several lines of the dynasty were ruling over the country from Narmadā in the north and Sētū in the south, bounded by oceans on east and west.

It was quite a natural phenomenon that medieval ruling dynasties boast of themselves as to have descended from some famous ruling line of the epic-purānic times, or mythical personalities, or some celebrated kings in the past. The Haihayas of Palanādu too described that the dynasty belonged to lunar lineage, to which the Cedi-Haihayas of epic-purānic times belonged. Historians usually discredit such claims of descent, of the medieval kings, of course rightly in most cases, but not always reasonably. Closer studies into the chapters on geography of the purānic texts, with the view of tracing horizontal movements of peoples and tribes would reveal that several peoples, used to move across the country from time to time; to have founded their settlements at different places at different times and that their tribal organizations used to split up again and again in the process of such movements and settlements. This phenomenon can be noticed as early as the Vēdic times, the Brāhmaya and Āranyaka books making
allusions to such popular migrations, which are more explicit and numerous in the epic-purāṇic literature. Those tribes and peoples of ancient times must have mingled and interacted with the autochthones in the course of which composite peoples and cultures, in different territories and localities came into being and it was in fact the process of evolution of Indian civilization and culture. These numerous peoples and cultures of different regions and localities certainly share some common traits of culture, pan-Indian in nature, at the same time, retaining their distinct local and ethnic characteristics. But, the modern scholarship prefers to scan only one of these aspects, either the pan-Indian, or purely local, as if the two were mutually incompatible.

Indian history is replete with events and incidents of enterprising conquerors, in every age, leading their armies on a career of conquests and expansion of their power. Taking the example of Maurya Candragupta in the third century B.C., the Sātavāhṇas that followed them in the early centuries of Christian era, the Imperial Guptas, the Rāṣṭrakūṭas, the Cāḷukyas of Kaḷyāṇa, the Imperial Cōḷas, and others in ancient and medieval times, exemplify the aspirations of empire-building, by their conquests. Though, none of them could conquer the entire sub-continent and completely subjugate all the ruling powers of their times, so as to confer political unity to the country, under a single imperial structure, nevertheless, they created histories of their own, by their enterprising careers of conquests. Historians must be able to see in such events of conquests and expansionism, a large number of peoples that formed their armies should have moved along with their suzerains and a large number of them to have settled in different parts of the country, instead of coming back to their native country. It was plainly because traversing the country from one corner to another was a stupendous task and those in the armed forces, generally recruited from poorer sections of the society and from primitive tribes, would not have had permanent interests on their land of birth. As they could carve out their livelihood by means of their skills in arts and crafts, or physical labour, they would have settled on lands, endowed by nature with bounteous resources and where people and popular settlements were dense. When these possibilities are kept in mind, there would be no difficulty in
assessing the truth in the tall claims of the ruling powers, as to their descent, from celebrated lines of kings and personalities in epic-purānic literature.

Some inscriptions of the Haihaya dynasties in medieval Āndhradēśa give the dynastic name as “Ahi-haya” as a variant of the term, Haihaya⁷, which seems to be the original form, though the latter has been well established in epic-purānic literature in Sanskrit language. The hard consonant, ‘ha’ in Sanskrit is generally softened into ‘a’ in Telugu, in the course of usage of common people and considered by grammarians as vikṛti, or corrupt form. But there is equally a strong possibility of a Prakrit term, beginning with ‘a’ could have been Sanskritized, in the course of which the initial ‘a’ would have been rendered into ‘ha’. Apart from this grammatical observation of less certainty, the term ‘ahi’ means ‘snake’ in Sanskrit itself and thus the dynasty could have been related to the Nāgas, who were one of the earlier inhabitants in the country, especially in the region under study. The epic-ballad, Palanāṭivīra Caritāra, makes copious allusions to the Nāgā relation of the country and people of Palanādu, belonging to a hoary past, which must have become inborn to the people by the medieval times. The second part of the dynastic name ‘haya’ means ‘horse; and a people, variously called as Aśvakas, or Aśmakas, appear to have arrived at the region in centuries before Christ and they were one of the principal segments in the metamorphosis of the Āndhras, in general. The combined people of the two tribes, the Nāgā and Aśvaka, could have taken leading part in the progress of civilization, acculturating autochthons, and eventually formed into the “Ahihayas”, which term might have transformed into “Haihaya” in course of time and came to stay in Sanskrit language. Of course, these developments cannot be said to have been limited to Āndhradēśa, or to the region of Palanādu, but relevant to the entire Indian sub-continent.

Two lines of Haihaya dynasties appear in medieval Āndhradēśa, apart from that of Palanādu in the country south of the river Kṛiṣhṇā—one in the Kōnāmapāḍalā and another in the region of Paṅcadhārālā, in the country north of the river Gōḍāvari. All these powers described themselves in general, as the Lords of Māhīṣhmatīpurā and descendents of Arjuna-Kārtavīrya, who had thousand hands,
but there appears no dynastic relation between these various Haihaya ruling lines, inspite of their common dynastic name and descriptions. Obviously, they belonged to different segments of the ancient Haihaya tribe, moved at different times so as to settle at different places.

Pandit Akkiraju Umakantam opined the Haihayas were originally ruling over Cedi country in the present day Madhya Pradesh, with Jambhanapurī as their capital, which he took to be the same as Jubbalpore and that they might have lost their kingdom either in the wake of Muslim invasions or, because of the rise of Vaghēlas. He seems to have been convinced with the narration in the epic-ballad of Palanādu that Anugurāja had to leave his original realms in the Jubbalpore region, down to Āndhradēśa and settled down in Palanādu. He was also apparently subscribed to the description that the king came from north India on pilgrimage, to cleanse himself from the sins committed by his ancestor, Arjuna-Kārtavirya. A version of the epic-ballad, collected by Robert Sewell and Palanaṭivīra Bhāratam, of Mudigopda Vīrabhadraṇaī also give the same information, that the king was ruling in north India and Jambhanāpurī was his chief town. These sources of evidence made the learned scholar to take the trouble of identifying the town with modern Jubbalpore and to trace the circumstances in which the Haihayas came down to Āndhradēśa. However, the version of the epic-ballad, collected and published by Pingali Lakshmikantam, which is referred to in the present essay as the ‘standard version’, gives that Anugurāja was ruling in north India, from Pālamācāpurī but not from Jambhanāpurī, as his capital and this description is supported by the oral version, collected by Roghair as well. B.S.L. Hanumantarao suggested that the Haihayas might have arrived Āndhradēśa, in the invasion of Yasahkarṇadēva, the Kaḷacuri-Cedi king of Haihaya lineage, who was ruling over the region of Jubbalpore in central India. Obviously, he was convinced by the conclusion of Robert Sewell, and the description in Palanaṭivīra Bhāratam, that the Haihaya line of Palanādu originally hailed from the Jubbalpore region in north India. But, as it will be shown below, they appear to have come more likely from Karṇāṭaka in the west, notwithstanding the descriptions in various versions of the epic-ballad.
2. Early Haihayas in Palanāḍu:

The region of Palanāḍu is recognized to have commanded a great strategic importance in the political developments in the history of Āndhradēśa, in the medieval times, of twelfth century, having been situated on the borders of two contending Imperial power-structures, of the Cāḷukya-Cōjas of Tanjore and the Western Cāḷukyas of Kāḷyāṇā. The observation is of course right, but it was not only in the early medieval times, but the situation was the same since the time of Sātavāhanas and Ikṣūvākūs in the early centuries of Christian era. It requires a separate study in detail, to substantiate this observation, which has been refrained for the present. The earliest epigraphical evidence of the Haihayas in Palanāḍu points out that they were political subordinates to Vikramāditya VI of the Western Cāḷukyas; and facilitated his frequent inroads into coastal Āndhradēśa, as they held the key to open gates, on the frontier of his empire. As such, they must have been opposed to the Velanāṭicōdas, who were exercising overlordship on the territory, on behalf of the Cāḷukya-Cōja emperors of Tanjore and the principal contenders to the Western Cāḷukyan expansionism over the coastal Āndhradēśa.

The earliest known historical personality among the Haihayas of Palanāḍu was Bēṭabhūpa, or Bēṭarāja, known from an inscription from Sātrasāla, dated in the Śaka year 1025 (A.D. 1103). The record is in a bad state of preservation, apparently a few lines in its beginning are lost as the stone, on which it was engraved, is damaged. However, the substance of the record is relatively clear—one Maṇḍādi Rēvināyaka, who declared that Bēṭarāja was his overlord, issued it. The extant portion of the record begins abruptly with the expression, tat-pāda-padmāṇaṃ-ōpajīvi, meaning one who lives at his lotus feet, which stands for Rēvināyaka and that he was the servant of the lotus feet of Bēṭabhūpa.

Maṇḍādi Rēvināyaka, described himself in the inscription as Mallavrōḷupuravāraṇa, meaning, the lord of Mallavrōlu, the best of the cities, obviously the territory around the town and also as Māhīšmati-dēśa-raṭṭadā. The epithet means that he was a chief that belonged to the Māhīšmati-dēśa, in other words, a
Haihaya by descent, as the chieftains of Haihaya lineages usually describe themselves by referring to their lordship of the city of Mābiṣmatī. But at the same time he claimed to have been *Haihaya-rājya-pratīṣṭhāpanāchārya*, meaning one who had founded, or restored, the Haihaya kingdom. The substance of these statements seems to be that both Rēvināyaka and Bētarāja were Haihayas, by descent; that the former was ruling over a territory around Mallavrolū, or Mallavolu, and that he played an important role in foundation, or the restoration of the Haihaya rule in Palanāḍu. The he was not an independent ruler, but one who lives at the lotus feet of his overlord, clearly speaks that he was an important subordinate of Bētarāja and was chiefly instrumental in the latter’s conquest of the region and foundation of his rule over Palanāḍu about A.D. 110017.

Maṇḍādi Rēvināyaka held another title, *Sanivarasiddhi*, whose meaning and sense are not clear, but V. Yasodadevi18 suggested that it signifies his obedience to the Western Cālukya emperor, Vikramāditya VI. Probably, she might be correct, and if the suggestion is accepted, his overlord, namely Bētarāja, must also have been a Western Cālukya subordinate and their foundation of a kingdom in Palanāḍu must have had permission and even an active encouragement of the Western Cālukya emperor, if not he had stationed them on the borders of Palanāḍu.

Though, the hypothesis about the foundation of the Haihaya kingdom in Palanāḍu, by Bētarāja, assisted by his subordinate, Rēvināyaka, is based on many premises, there need not be any doubt about that the Haihayas, before Bētarāja of the Satrāsāla inscription, were not native to Palanāḍu, in the Telugu-speaking country. No evidence comes forth of his predecessors from the region, as well as the significant influence of Kannada on the language of their inscriptions19, points out that they must have come from the neighbouring country of Kuntalā20, which was in the Western Cālukya Empire and they must have come to coastal Āndhradēśa, in their invading armies.

Another inscription that refers to Bētarāja comes from Mācerlā21, known as the Nāgastambhā inscription, dated in the Śaka year 1033, A.D. 1111, which gives his name as Cāgi Bēta, born in the lunar dynasty, to which the ancient
Haihaya kings also belonged. It was issued by one Aditya, son of Śrīdhara, who built a temple of Śiva, in his own name as Ādityēśvara, and it records that the king made munificent charities to the temple. The Cāgi Bēta of the inscription has to be identified with the Bētarāja, known from the Satrasāla inscription, referred to above, for it would be next to impossibility of two kings, named Bētarāja, to have lived and ruled over the same region, within a short time as a decade. In fact, the Cāgi kings were another minor ruling family in medieval Āndhradēśa, in the region of the river Kṛishnā on either side and were reportedly a lunar dynasty. As such, there could have been some dynastic relations between the kings and the Haihayas of Palanādu, who were ruling over contiguous regions in the Kṛishnā valley.

The Nāgastambhā inscription at Mācerlā gives that Cāgi Bēta had four sons, the eldest being Anumgu-gāma, followed by Birudu-gāma, Rāyapadēva and Āhavamalla. The inscription is in Sanskrit verses, whose order in the description of the dynastic details of Bētarāja, is not in chronological sequence but, such poetical usages are by no means uncommon in medieval inscriptions. However, it created some confusion to some scholars in interpreting the inscription, leading them to some unnatural, and even unwarranted, assumptions.

The verse in lines 10-12 describes Cāgi Bēta was born in the lunar family, so as to beautify it, just like the moon beautifies the ocean by his birth, followed by two verses in lines 12-18, which gives about the four sons of the king and their greatness; and then comes the crucial verse, whose substance confused the scholars. It states that Bēta-kṣhmpāti was the son of Virakāma and his wife, Dāramā, just as Lord Viṣhṇu was born to Adiś and Kaśyapa and Moon to Anasūya and Atri. The Bēta-kṣhmpāti, in the verse, could have been none other than the Cāgi Bēta, father of the four sons, mentioned in the preceding verse, ll. 10-12, of the same inscription and identified with the king of the same name, mentioned in the Satrasāla inscription. The verse, along with the two preceding verses, speaking about the four sons of Cāgi Bēta, is only another aspect of his description, in figurative poetical expression, extolling his birth by comparing his parents with two celebrated pairs from purānic stories. From the cumulative
information from the two inscriptions, he can be understood as to have come to 
rule over Palanādu in A.D. 1103, as the Satrasāla inscription gives, and ruled upto 
A.D. 1111, as the Nāgastambhā inscription at Mācerā gives.

But, a recent scholar to work on the history of the dynasty, Sri Tirupati 
Venkata Lakshminarasimha Rao, however tries to extract too much substance out 
of the verse, resorting to a preposterous conclusion, which deserves a detailed 
analysis. It is very much necessary to have a clear idea of the sense of the verse, 
in order to arrange the genealogical scheme of the early Haihayas of Palanādu.

Ll. 10-12 of the record contain a verse, which reads like, Sūtamśu-vamśam-
abhivardhayitum-Ramesas-sdk§ad-iva-ksititale=jani Cāgi Bētaḥ | Yō-vikrama-
krāma-vaśiṅkṛita-sarvalōkah Prithvīm-Śriyām-sam-āhara-balito=dvīṣhattah|| The 
verse means that Cāgi Bēta was born in the lunar dynasty (Sūtamśu-vamśa), as if
Lord Viṣṇu had himself incarnated, so as to enhance its prestige, who 
appropriated the earth and wealth of enemy kings, by virtue of his own power and 
prowess25. The next in ll. 12-14, gives that he had four sons, the eldest being 
Anumgu-gāma (or Anugu-Kāma, in plain language) and the others were Birudu-
gāma, Rāyapadēva and Āhavamalla and the next verse, in ll. 15-18, describes the 
four sons of Cāgi Bēta were great heroes and men of virtue. Then comes the 
crucial verse, in ll. 18-21, reading: Aditir-iva-Ramēśam-Kaśyapād-vikramōtkam | 
Mridukaram-Anasūyā-putram-Atṛēr-iv-ādhyam || Ajanayad-atha-Betakṣmā-
patim-Dāramāryā|Naya-bhuja-vijit-ārim-Virakāma-kṣhitītāt || The verse clearly 
means that Betakṣmāpa, in other words, Cāgi Bēta, was born to Dāramā (his 
mother) by the king Virakāma, who conquered his foes both by the strength of his 
arms as well as shrewd intelligence just like Aditī gave birth to Viṣṇu, the Lord 
of Lakṣmī, by Kaśyapa; and Anasūyā gave birth the Moon, whose rays are cool 
(mridukara), by Atri26. Thus, the verse gives that Cāgi Bēta was the son of 
Dāramā and the king, Virakāma, and compared them with the great personalities 
in purāṇic mythology.

But, the learned scholar sought to extract an impossible meaning of the 
verse—as Viṣṇu, the Lord of Lakṣhmi, who was originally the son of Aditī (and 
Kaśyapa), became the son of Anasūyā (and Atri), Virakāma, who was originally
the son of Dāramā, became the son of Mēdamā, whose name is not in the verse, of the inscription, but in another inscription on the same Nāgā pillar. It gives that Āditya got the Nāgastambha erected, in the Śaka year 1035, equivalent to A.D. 1113, during the reign of Vīrakāma, son of Mēdāmbikā. That, Āditya, who got the pillar installed, was the same as the one who was mentioned in the inscription, referred to above, dated in the Śaka year 1033, A.D. 1111, which gives his name as Cāgi Bēta, to have made munificent gifts to the temple raised by the former. But, only in a period of two years, Vīrakāma, son of Mēdāmbikā, is known to have been ruling Palanādu, from the same town as Mācerlā, which fact seem to have puzzled him. Thus, he brought a Mēdāmbikā, from the house of Kandūrucōdas, who were ruling on the other side of the river Kṛiṣhṇā, in the Nalgonda and Mahabubnagar districts. He identified the king Vīrakāma, mentioned in the earlier inscription with the king, mentioned in the latter one and imagined that he was, originally the son of Cāgi Bēta and Dāramā, was adopted by Mēdāmbikā, a queen in the Kandūrucōḍā house and thus the latter power must have rendered all the necessary help for his occupying Palanādu. There appears likely that Vīrakāma or Anugukāma received political asylum and was probably helped with necessary military assistance, but it was not in the first decade of the century, which will be properly explained in its context. But one thing is certain, that there was no adoption of the king by the Kandūrucōḍā queen, Mēdāmbikā.

The information, available from the two inscriptions on the Nāgastambhā at Mācerlā, when correlated with each other, gives that Cāgi Bēta, or Bētabhūpa I, was the son of Vīrakāma, whose wife was Dāramā and his eldest son, Anumugagāma, ascended throne at Mācerlā, who had an alternate name as Vīrakāma, obviously called after the name of his paternal grandfather. He and his three brothers were the sons of Mēdāmbikā, the queen of Bētabhūpa, and this way understanding the two inscriptions does not require any twisting the verse, cited above, as Sri Tirupati Venkata Lakshmi Narasimha Rao has resorted to. Vīrakāma, the son of Cāgi Bēta, or Bētabhūpa I, who may be referred to as Vīrakāma II, as the term anugu alternately anumgu, in Telugu means ‘darling’ and thus, Vīrakāma II, appear to have an alternate name as Anugukāma, with
which name he was mentioned in the first of the inscriptions, dated A.D. 1111 and in the second, dated A.D. 1113, he was mentioned as Vīrakāma. The fact that one of the sons of Bēṭabhūpa I was named as Āhavamalla, obviously after the Western Cāḷukyan emperor, Sōmēśvara I, father and predecessor of Vikramādiṭya VI, suggests that the king was a subordinate, successively of the two emperors and there can be no doubt about his having been stationed on the borders of the empire by the latter.

There is another Nāgastambhā inscription, but at Gurazāla²⁸, dated in the Saka year 1051 (A.D. 1129), which mentions that Bēṭabhūpa was ruling over the country as a subordinate of Bhūlōkamalladeva, who was the same as Sōmēśvara III, the Western Cāḷukyan emperor and the son and successor of Vikramādiṭya VI. Two inscriptions—one from Bhrugubāṇḍā in Sattenapalle taluk of the modern Guntur district²⁹, dated in the Śaka year 1040 (A.D. 1118) and another from Satrasāla³⁰, dated in the Śaka year 1087 (A.D. 1165), give names of two Haihaya kings, as Rājarāja and his son Bēṭabhūpa alias Birudāṅka-Rudra³¹.

An inscription from Peddavūrā, in Miryalaguda taluk of the neighbouring Nalgonda district³², dated in the Saka year 1064 (A.D. 1142) gives about a Haihaya king, Rāyaparāja, as to have been ruling over the region. He could have been the same as the one mentioned in the Nāgastambhā inscription at Mācerlā, as one of the sons of Bēṭabhūpa, or Cāgi Bēṭa.

This epigraphical data suggests that Anumgu-kāma alias Vīrakāma II, the eldest son of Bēṭabhūpa I, or Cāgi Bēṭa, succeeded him on the throne of Pālānuḍu, with Mācerlā as its capital in A.D. 1111 and his rule in the year A.D. 1113 is attested by another inscription on the Nāgastambhā at Mācerlā. The Haihaya kingdom seems to have extended over other bank of the river Kṛişhṇā as well, as Rāyaparāja, another son of the Bēṭabhūpa I, or Cāgi Bēṭa, was ruling over the region, north of the river. At the same time, another line of the family, represented by Rājarāja and his son, Birudāṅka-Rudra alias, Bēṭabhūpa II, appears to have been ruling a part of the Haihaya kingdom, from Gurazālā, at least from A.D. 1118 to 1165, who continued to be the subordinates of the Western Cāḷukyan emperor Bhūlōkamallā Sōmēśvara III, as their inscriptions speak. The
line of kings that was ruling from Mäcerlā might have remained subordinate to the Western Cālukyan emperor, Vikramāditya VI, the father and predecessor of Sōmēśvara III, upto A.D. 1113, but the same cannot be confidently said after the year, as it will be explained below.

It appears possible that Rājarāja was a brother of Bētabhūpa I, or Cāgi Bēta, but the nature of their relations is difficult to be ascertained at the present state of knowledge. Even if he is supposed to have associated with Bētabhūpa in his wars for the conquest of Palanādu and in foundation of the kingdom, the same cannot be said to have continued subsequently. He had probably risen in revolt, after the death of Bētabhūpa, about A.D. 1113 and associated by his son, Bētabhūpa II, he seems to have defeated Anugukāma, surnamed Virakāma II, and expelled him from Palanādu by A.D. 1118. However, Anugukāma alias Virakāma II staged come back to Palanādu, which is suggested in the narration of the epic-ballad, in the form of his pilgrimage, in the course of which has reportedly came to the country and desired to settle down. Anugukāma, or the Virakāma II, was the father of Nalagāma, who was the ruler of Palanādu, at the time of the great battle, the subject of the epic-ballad.

T. V. L. Narasimharao, who has come out more or less a similar conclusion, made some interesting suggestions, with the help of an inscription from Sōmasilā in the Kollapur region of Mahbubnagar district\textsuperscript{33}, issued by a Haihaya king, named Sarasvatidēva, in the Śaka year 977 (A.D. 1055). This has to be taken as the earliest of Haihayas inscriptions in Kṛishpā valley and the king as earliest of the Haihaya rulers so far known, connected with Palanādu region, and their kingdom extended over parts Nalgonda and Mahbubnagar districts as well, as a part of the Western Cālukyan Empire. This is a very significant contribution to the history of the dynasty, which is supported by the predominance of Kannada on the Telugu language of the Haihaya inscriptions in Palanādu. But, his suggestion that the Haihayas could have eventually extended their rule over the Palanādu region, cannot be simply accepted, in the light of the analysis made above; they came to coastal Āndhradēśa, not out of their own expansionist enterprise, but in the train of the Western Cālukyan armies of Vikramāditya VI. However, T.V.L.
Narasimha Rao had also viewed that Anugukāma, who was the father of Nalagāma, spent a long time in exile, in the territories on other side of the river Kṛṣṇā, in the kingdom of Kandūrucōdas, before he came to occupy Palanādu. He too has suggested that the account of Anugurāja’s pilgrimage, that the epic-ballad describes, was in reality an expedition to re-conquer Palanādu. But, what is significant in the present context is that he came from outside and had to conquer the kingdom in Palanādu, simply because he was dispossessed of it about the year A.D. 1118.

V. Yasodadevi34 arranged the chronology of the Haihaya kings of Palanādu, from the inscriptions known by the time of her writing—that Bētabhūpa I, known from the Satrasāla inscription, was the earliest known Haihaya king, who founded the Haihaya kingdom of Palanādu, with the help of his subordinate, Maṇḍādi Rēvināyaka, around A.D. 1103. She has suggested also that the king might have ruled till A.D. 1110-11 and that he was followed by Virakāma, identifying him with Anugu-kāma, the eldest son of the king and that he might have ruled till A.D. 1118. So far, her scheme is quite acceptable. But, she supposed that Rājarāja and his son Bētabhūpa II, or Birudānka-Rudra ruled jointly with Anugu-kāma, eventhough; she was indefinite of their relation and could not substantiate her inference. Her further supposition that sometime later Rājarāja and his son succeeded Anugu-kāma and ruled independently, as they styled themselves as Mahāmaṇḍalēśvaras, without acknowledging any suzerain power, is quite surprising, as the title signifies that they were subordinates to some suzerain power. She suggested that Bētabhūpa II was probably ruling singly as an individual and independent ruler, when he issued his Nāgastambhā inscription, dated Śaka 1051 (A.D. 1129), at Gurazālā35, failing to note that it describes him as a subordinate of Bhūlōkamalla, Sōmēśvara III, of the Western Cālukyas and thus he was not an independent ruler. She supposed that the king, Bētabhūpa II might have ruled till A.D., 113436, but could not explain what followed next and how Anugurāja, could come to rule in Palanādu, from A.D. 1147, with Gurazālā as his chief town. It was because; she was quite indefinite about the relation between the kings and thus could not have an insight into the course of events that might
have taken place, during the period from A.D. 1118 to 1147. She could not thus foresee the possibility of Anuguräja coming over to rule the kingdom of Palanädu, somewhere from outside, occupying the country once again. She was obviously under the mistaken idea of continuity of Haihaya rule from the same town, Gurazälä, under Bëtabhûpa II, followed by the rule of Anuguräja, and could not take note of the change of the ruling branches of the Haihaya family during the time. As such, she simply suggested that there could have been some interval between the last years of the rule of Bëtaraja II and the initial year of the rule of Anuguräja, between the years A.D. 1142 to 1147, for which she could assign no reason.

B. S. L. Hanumantharao followed the genealogical succession of the kings as suggested by Yasodadevi, though he felt that her chronological scheme created confusion, but he had no alternate to solve the confusion. Roghair also supposed that during the period of suzerainty of Western Cälukyas, Cägi Bëta, Vîrakäma, Bëtabhûpa II (A.D. 1118-1134) ruled Palanädu in succession, till Gofika II of the Velanäticodas defeated the last mentioned, in the year A.D.1137.

The confusion to which Yasodadevi and other scholars were subjected to and the consequent lacuna in their schemes of chronology, has to be removed only by a fresh attempt, to study the political relations between the Haihayas of Palanädu with the Western Cälukyas on one hand and subsequently with the Velanäticodas on the other. Again, it is necessary to arrange the chronology at the first instance, in the light of such a political analysis, which would guide in arranging the genealogy at the next step.

V. Yasodadevi and B.S.L. Hanumantharao, following her, supposed that Sanivarasiddhi, the epithet held by Maṇḍädi Rëvinäyaka, signifies that he was a subordinate to Western Cälukyan emperor, Vikramädiya VI. In support of their surmise, the suggest that Āditya, who issued the longer inscription on the Nāgastambha inscription at Mäcerlā was a western Cälukyan general, who was appointed at the place as a supervisory power over Cägi Bëta I, and that he was probably the same as one of the western Cälukyan generals, appearing in two different Dākṣärāma inscriptions. Eventhough, Roghair had neither brought the
title *Sanivarasiddhi* nor the evidence of the two Dākṣārāma inscriptions into discussion, but implicitly followed them, in suggesting Rēvināyaka and his overlord, Cāgi Bēta, were Western Cālukyan subordinates. They were probably right, though neither was certain as to the meaning of the title and how it relates the chief with the Western Cālukyas, as latter’s subordinate. There is no evidence contrary to their suggestion, as there is either positive evidence, but circumstantial evidence suggests its possibility.

That the region of Palanādu was strategically located between the Western Cālukyan empire on one hand and the Cālukya-Cōja empires and thus the Haihayas were on the fence—they could accept the suzerainty of either this or that, according to their own advantage. Vikramaditya VI, the Western Cālukyan emperor was at the zenith of his power at the time and sending repeated expeditions on coastal Andhradesa. The kingdom of Vēṇgi, which held the country under its rule till the first quarter of the eleventh century, lost its individuality, having become virtually a province in the Cālukya-Cōja Empire, with its capital at Tanjore in distant south and thus the country was left with no kingdom, worth the name. As such, the coastal Andhradesa was meekly exposed to the Western Cālukyan invasions and the situation must have prompted the Haihayas to be their subordinates. Hence, the scholars may be correct in their suggestion so far, but not in their view that Āditya, the donor of the Nāgastambhā inscription at Mācerlā, was a Western Cālukyan general and that he was identical with one of the same name known from two Dākṣārāma inscriptions.

The Nāgastambhā inscription at Mācerlā is dated in Cālukya-Vikrama year and no doubt it suggests that Cāgi Bēta continued to be a Western Cālukyan subordinate, but it does not speak the same about Āditya and thus, he appears more like an officer in the service of the Haihaya king, rather than a general to have come from Kālyāṅā, with superior power to keep the latter under check. One of the two Dākṣārāma inscriptions, the scholars cited in support of their thesis, is dated in Cālukya-Vikrama year 45, corresponding to Saka 1043 (A.D. 1121) and thus Āditya, referred to in it, was undoubtedly a Western Cālukyan general. It was the time, when several other Western Cālukyan generals, such as
Govinda-dapdēśa and his brother, Lakṣmaṇa-dapdēśa, were overrunning coastal Āndhradēśa and Āditya could be one that came to the country along with them. But the Dākśārāma inscription gives that he was the son of a certain Brammadevanāyaka, whereas Āditya, the donor of the Nāgastambhā inscription was the son of Śridhara. Hence, the two Ādityas cannot be taken identical, while another Dākśārāma inscription, they cited in support, curiously enough, does not name any Āditya at all.

On the other hand, the Nāgastambhā inscription at Mācerlā seems to suggest the Āditya was an officer in the service of the king, Cāgi Bēta, as suggested above. If that was not the case, he could not have time to build the temple, unlike any other Western Cālukyan generals like Govinda-dapdēśa, Anantapālaya, etc. who are not known to have constructed temples, as parallel examples. The name of another officer in the inscription, Kannada Nāgimayya, obviously suggests him to have come from Karpāṭaka but that does not mean that he must be a Western Cālukyan officer and all those that would have come from Kannada speaking land need not be the imperial generals only. On the other hand, he too might have been in the service of Bētarāja, or Cāgi Bēta—who himself came from Karpāṭaka along with his associate, Rēvināyaka, and several other associates of the king also might have similarly come along with him. Āditya and Kannada Nāgimayya might have been already in the service of the king and came along with him to Palanādu, the land adjacent to Āndhradēśa. Eventhough, this analysis disproves the validity of the evidence that the scholars had depended upon, their conclusion that Bētabhūpa I, or Cāgi Bēta, was a Western Cālukyan subordinate, need not be contended, as it has been explained above. But it cannot be said that the situation was the same, after the king, as it has also been pointed out above.

3. Anugu-kāma or Virakama II

Anumgu-kāma, the eldest son of Cāgi Bēta, succeeded him on the throne of Palanādu, with the surname, Virakāma II, about A.D. 1113, as the second inscription on the Nāgastambhā at Mācerlā gives and ruled till the year A.D.
1118. From the year, inscriptions of Rājarāja and his son Birudāṅkarudra-Bētabhūpa, or Bētabhūpa II appear in Palanāḍu, as mentioned above and those of Anugu-gāma, or Vīrakāma II, are totally absent. Scholars to whom reference has been made above, supposed that these kings ruled concurrently, rather conjointly, with Anugu-gāma, or Vīrakāma II, but these kings must have belonged to a collateral line of the family and expelled Anugu-gāma, or Vīrakāma II, from Palanāḍu.

The inscription of Birudāṅkarudra-Bēta on the Nā gasthambhā at Gurazālā, of the year A.D. 1129, gives that he was a subordinate of the Western Cālukyas, but, as mentioned above, Anumgu-kāma cannot be said to have been still a Western Cālukyan feudatory. As such, there is reason to believe that the latter might have tried to assert his independence while the former, Bētabhūpa II, was supported by the suzerain authority in his usurping the throne, from his cousin, Anugu-kāma. The Western Cālukyan generals, Anantapālaya and his nephew, Gövindadaṇḍēśa, were on their invasion on coastal Āndhradēśa at the time, who must have supported him in the revolt against Anugu-kāma.43

B. S. L. Hanumantharao44 supposed Bētabhūpa II was probably killed in the battle of Gödāvari, as nothing is heard of him after A.D. 1135, that the rule of Anugurāja, appears from the same year and thus, the latter was the son of Bētabhūpa II. He further supposed that he might have accompanied the latter to the battle and shared the debacle and thus it was probably the reason for the Haihayas losing their kingdom of Palanāḍu. Obviously, he could not see the possibility of Bētabhūpa II belonging to a collateral line and an agnate rival of Anugurāja, usurped throne from him and even expelled him out of Palanāḍu and further, he was not aware of the inscriptive evidence to the rule of Birudāṅkarudra-Bēta, obviously same as Bētabhūpa II, in Palanāḍu, as late as A.D. 1165. Without any serious examination of evidence, even the ‘historical analysis’ of Roghair45 adopted the same conclusion, but Yasodadevi was wise enough to leave away the question of relation between the two kings, without any definition. Hanumantharao further suggested that the sin, that the Haihayas were described to have accrued, which Anugurāja sought to cleanse by his pilgrimage,
was probably due their disloyalty to the Čalukya-Coḷa Empire, by joining hands with the Western Čalukyan emperor⁴⁶. In fact, this was first suggested by B. V. Krishnarao⁴⁷ and the learned scholar sought to further substantiate, but Roghair had correctly observed⁴⁸ that there is no evidence to postulate that early Haihayas were, at any time, subordinates to the Čalukya-Coḷas, before they came under the Western Čalukyan suzerainty.

As mentioned above, T.V.L. Narasimharao has been perhaps the single scholar to suggest that Rājarāja or his son, Birudāṅkarudra-Bēta, of the collateral line might have defeated Anugukāma of the main line of Haihayas and expelled him from the country; and that the latter repaired to the Kandūrucoḍa kingdom. He cited a Dāksārāma inscription⁴⁹, dated in the Śaka year 1043 (A.D. 1121) and in the Čalukya-Vikrama year 46, issued by Mailamā, queen of the Kandūrucoḍa king, Ėruva Toṇḍaya, which suggests that she was at the place in the year. The Kandūrucoḍas were Western Čalukyan subordinates and the emperor, Bhūlōkamalla Sōmēśvara (or Sōmēśvara III), had come there personally in the year at the place, as attested by his inscriptions dated in the year A. D. 1132⁵⁰. Obviously, he came there on a decisive war with the Vēlanāṭicōḍas and Ėruva Toṇḍaya must have accompanied the emperor; and Anugurāja, who appears to have been in the latter's service, must also have accompanied the invading army. Sri Narasimha Rao also surmised these facts, but his further conjecture, based on the needless presumption that Virakāma or Anugukāma, the son of Mēḍāmbikā, was adopted by the Kandūrucoḍa queen, Mailamā, as mentioned above and rejected. The situation would be the same, even without the presumption, as Virakāma or Anugukāma was in the Kandūrucoḍa kingdom, seeking political asylum, he must have accompanied his overlord to the battle field at Dāksārāma.

His supposition that the Kandūrucoḍa queen had adopted Virakāma, alias Anugukāma as her son had a link with the causal factors of the Battle of Palanāḍu, suggesting that Ėruva Toṇḍaya, the Kandūrucoḍa king, was the father of Gaya-Bhīmarāju, the father of Bhūramādevī, whom Anumgu-kāma is described to have married, in the course of his pilgrimage. He suggests that the princess had an alternate name as Mailamādevī, that she was the mother of Nalagāma, and that the
king was not the son of Mailamā, the Velanāṭi princess, as it is generally supposed, as the epic-ballad gives such an impression. His argument is quite interesting but the evidence he had presented in support of it, is quite conjectural and heresy, which cannot, in fact, unsuitable for verification in scientific historical investigation.

Eventhough, his suggestion that Anugurāja was probably at Dākṣārāmā is quite acceptable, the course of events that he presented is not much convincing. Unable to read the minds of political powers at such situations, he felt that the king, who was a subordinate of the Western Cālukyas, would not have been reinstated to rule over Palanāḍu, by the Velanāṭi king Cōḍa II, by making him his son-in-law and granting the region to his daughter, Mailamā, as dowry at the time of her marriage. As such, he prefers to presume that Anugurāja conquered the region of Palanāḍu, by his own capability and also defeated the Velanāṭi king, in the course of his warfare for conquering the country and that the latter sought to have peaceful alliance with him, by means of the matrimony. B.S.L. Hanumantharao, also felt more or less similarly, but these views are based on improper understanding of the history of the Velanāṭicōḍas at the time, who were at the zenith of their power, especially following the battle of Gōḍāvārī.

Undoubtedly, the Western Cālukyan emperor, Bhūlōkamalla Sōmēśvara, was decisively defeated by the Velanāṭicōḍa prince, Rajēndracōḍa II, in the battle of Gōḍāvārī, near Dākṣārāmā, or Jānanāthapurā, in the year A.D. 1132, together with the chiefs such as Eṉuva Toṉdaya that accompanied him. This was the final defeat of the Western Cālukyas, which liberated coastal Āṇḍhraḍēśa from their menacing impact, and their generals such as Govindadaṇḍēśa, who occupied large areas of the country and carved their own kingdoms, were eventually expelled. Anugukāma alias Vīrukāma II, must have shared the defeat in the battle along with the Kandurucōḍas, who must have carefully understood that there was no longer the Western Cālukyan empire, to whose supremacy he was obedient till the time. Eventhough, the standard version of the epic-ballad gives that a war took place between the king of Candōlu, in other words, Goṅka II, the Velanāṭicōḍa king at the time and the Haihaya king, Anugukāma or Anugurāja, the oral version
does not suggest a war to have taken place between them. Its substance is that there was conciliation, between the two, before confrontation and thus it appears likely that the Haihaya king, who was deprived of his kingdom at the time, attracted the attention of the Velanâtiçôda king, decided to reinstate him over the kingdom of Palanâdu, by extending his political support and cementing it by means of matrimonial alliance, with the view of their mutual benefit.

Bêtabhûpa II, who was ruling over Palanâdu at the time, was a Western Câlukyan subordinate, as mentioned above, who must have marched across the country following the Western Câlukyan generals, to the region of Dâkshârâmanâ, in order to participate in the battle of Gôdâvari. It was a definite challenge to the Velanâtiçôda king, in utter disregard to the latter’s power and position and the latter must have determined to cut his size. As he had to share the crushing defeat in the battle, along with his suzerain, the Velanâtiçôda king, Gôñka II, appears to have wrested a large part of Palanâdu, as signified by some of the inscriptions of his administrative officials (in fact, his vassal chiefs, who were sent to look after the administration of the region). The Velanâtiçôda king, under such situation, seems to have thought it wise to restore the fugitive prince of the ruling family of the country and juxtaposing Bêtabhûpa II, who was still ruling over a part of Palanâdu. He must have thought it by way of marrying his daughter to the prince, Anugukâma or Anugurâja, giving the kingdom as dowry to his daughter at the time of marriage. Thus, the genealogical and chronological constructions of scholars in the past, B.S.L. Hanumantharao, V. Yasodadevi and even the recent scholar, Roghair, on the relation between Anugukâma alias Vîrakâma II and the Velanâtiçôdas, as the outcome of the battle of Gôdâvari are not acceptable.

The Velanâtiçôda victory over the Haihayas and restoration of Anugurâja over the kingdom of Palanâdu can be related with each other, and the course of events can be formulated on the basis of epigraphical evidence, as analysed below. Two inscriptions, one from Pedakodamاغudlâ, dated in the Śaka year 1069 (A.D. 1147) and another from Kârëmpûdî dated in the Śaka year 1076 (A.D. 1154), issued by Ísânapeggada, the mudiseli, of Kulottungacôda Gônikarâja, speak that Palanâdu was definitely under the Velanâti overlordship, following the
Haihaya rout in the battle of Gödāvari about A.D. 1132. The former inscription records the gifts in the form of concessions in taxes, made by Isanapeggada, out of the revenues; obviously he was entitled to collect, from Palanādu. The second states that he raised a temple at Kārempuḍi, and made arrangements for perpetual lamp in the temple, which suggests that he was in charge of the kingdom, for a considerably long time, for construction of a temple would have taken much time. Thus the Velanāti overlordship must have been firm over the region, by stationing their officers, who collected taxes and constructed temples.

But, at the same time, it has to be noted that Birudānka-Rudra Bēta, or Bētabhūpa II, did not die in the battle of Gödāvari, as Hanumantarao supposed and his power did not completely vanish, as suggested by his inscriptions in the years A.D. 1142 and 1154.

From the sketch of political events in the Haihaya history of Palanādu, in correlation with those of Western Cālukyas and Velanāticōdas, the succession of the kings can be chronologically arranged as shown below.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Virakāma} & \quad (\text{his wife Dāramā)} \\
\text{Rājarāja} & \quad \text{Cāgi Bēta, or Bētabhūpa I} \\
& \quad (\text{his wife Mēdāmbikā)} \\
& \quad \text{(The Nagastambha inscription at Mācerlā was issued during his rule (A.D. 1103 to 1113)} \\
\text{Bētabhūpa II} & \quad \text{alias Birudānka-Rudra (A.D. 1118 to 1165)} \\
& \quad \text{(subordinate to the Western Cālukyan emperor, Bhūlōkamalla, Sōmeśvara III)} \\
\text{Anumgu-gama} & \quad \text{Birudu-gāma} \\
& \quad \text{Rayapadēva} \\
& \quad \text{Āhavamalla} \\
& \quad \text{(succeeded his father, in the year A.D. 1113 and same as Virakāma (II), known from another inscription on the Nagastambhā at Mācerlā; expelled from Palanādu by Bētabhūpa II)} \\
& \quad \text{(known from an inscription from Peddavūra, as to have been ruling over region of Miryālagūḍa in the modern Nalgonda district.)}
\end{align*}
\]
4. The Haihaya Restoration and Anugu (or Alugu) raju:

It is no wrong to suppose that the history of Haihayas in Palanādu proper begins with him, rather his restoration to rule over the country, as the most important epoch in their history was the Battle that made the time and territory as immensely interesting; the Battle was the result of disputed succession after his death. The epic-ballad, *Palanāṭivīra Charitra*, comes to our help in studying the history of the Haihayas of Palanādu, from his period of rule, providing detailed descriptions of personalities and events. Its standard version commences the narration with the account of pilgrimage of Anugurāja, alternately giving his name as Alugurāja, son of *Vīra-Kāmāndra*, born in the lineage of Kārtavīry-Ārjuna and that he was ruling over Madhyadeśa, as Pālamācāpurī as his capital. But, the epic-ballad is more legendary in its subject-content and treating it mythologically, presenting large amount of divergences, from one version to another. A divergent account as an example is found in the *Palanāṭivīra Bhāratam* of Mudigonda Vīrabhadra-kavi, which gives him as grandson of *Vīra-Kāmāndra* and son of *Sundaracakravarti*, who had his capital at Jambhanāpurī, in Madhyadeśa. These details are clearly legendary and poetical concoctions on their very face, but Sewell appears to have believed them as historical, as he suggested the identification of Jambhanāpurī, with the modern city of Jabulpore, in Madhya Pradesh. Pundit Akkiraju Umakantam, the earliest native scholar to study the history of the dynasty was convinced with the statement and its interpretation by Sewell, but suggested an alternate identification of the town with Sambhalpur in Orissa.

V. Yasoda Devi preferred the account of *Palanāṭivīra Caritrā* in this context, to *Palanāṭivīra Bhāgavatam* and took Vīrakāma to be the father of Anugurāja, as the standard version gives. She pointed out that the epic-ballad gives that the latter's son, Nalagāma, was also called Vīrakāma at some places, but it has been explained above that Vīrakāma was an alternate name to Anugum-gāma, the eldest son of Beta I, obviously after the name of his grandfather. As such, *Palanāṭivīra Bhāgavatam* is acceptable in this context, as gives Vīrakāma as the
name of the grandfather of Anugurāja, though it gives the name of the latter’s father in a legendary manner. Thus, *Palanāṭivṛa Caritra* applying the name Virakāma to Nalagāma was only a poetical device of qualifying the original name of the king, ‘Kāma’, by prefixing the adjective, ‘vīra’, meaning valourous, for the sake of a variety of expression, which need not be taken serious.

The epic-ballad describing Anugurāja as alien to Andhradesa and entered the country in the course of his pilgrimage, was not more than a poetical fancy and it has been clearly established above, that he ruled Palanādu, succeeding his father Bētabhūpa I or Cāgi Bēta, in A.D. 1113. Pingali Lakshmikantam had pointed out that the names of generals and ministers, said to have accompanied him during the course of his pilgrimage, were all Telugu names, who could not be expected to have been in his service, if he was ruling somewhere in Madhyadesa. The narration in the epic-ballad goes like the king anointed his brother Birudurāja (Artharāju according to some manuscripts) on the throne, when he left Pālamācāpurī on the mission of pilgrimage. Though, it was another literary technique but not a historical fact, as Anugurāja had, in fact, no kingdom at the time, but he certainly had a younger brother, by name Biridurāju, who was reported in the inscription on the Nāgastambhā at Mācerlā. The king at the time was in the political asylum at Pālamācāpurī, under the Kandūruḍūdas and probably left the town in the latter’s army of to take part in the battle of Gōdāvarī, but he did not return back, after the event.

T.V.L. Narasimharao has been right in his suggestion that the pilgrimage of Anugurāja was an expedition *incognito*, with the aim of conquering back his kingdom of Palanādu that was lost to his cousin, Bētabhūpa II, surnamed Birudāṅkarudra-Bēta, about the year A.D. 1118. The description of his pilgrimage goes as the king was accompanied by his queen, Vīravidyaladēvī, minister Doddānāyudu, the latter’s sons, Peddanāyudu, Brahmanāyudu and Pērināyudu, Teppalināyudu, the commander of armed forces along with a large body of militia, consisting of infantry, cavalry, the cattle-herds and also taking the establishment of his tutelary deity, Lord Cennakēśava along. The description clearly suggests that the purpose of their leaving Pālamācāpurī was clearly, once
for all and not to return back and thus its aim was more than pilgrimage. It was obviously an expedition and as explained above, to participate in the battle of Gōdāvari, in support of Sōmēśvara III, the Western Cālukyan emperor.

Leaving the incredible details of his visiting sacred places in Himalayas and on the banks of the rivers, Ganges and Yamunā, the significant event in the course of pilgrimage was his marriage with Bhūramādevī, when he reached Gayā. She is said to have been the daughter of Bhūramrāju, the king of the place, who is said to have heard about the greatness of Anugurāja and was glad to receive him and offered his daughter in marriage to him. A king of the Telugu name ruling at Gayā is simply a thing of fun and T. V. L. Narasimharao, who viewed Anugurāja’s pilgrimage, more or less similarly, suggested that he probably started at Gaṅgāpuram, in the present day Mahabubnagar district, which had alternate name as Matsyapurī in local traditions, current in medieval times. He suggested that its variant might have been Mācāpurī, identical with Pālamācāpurī and that the town was in the region, which was at the time, under the rule of Kandūrucōḍa king Bhīmarāja. The learned scholar had explained that the king was the elder brother of Gōkarṣa and that he was surnamed as Gayā-Bhīmarāja, who is famous by the name, Eruva Bhīma, son of Eruva Toḍaya, the Kandūrucōḍa king. He seems to be right in these suggestions, but the recorded tradition for the name Matsyapurī is not available so as to establish its identity with Pālamācāpurī and renders his hypothesis infirm. However, his suggestion about the relation between Anugurāja and Eruva Bhīma appears somewhat probable to accept, but his further suggestion, Bhūramādevī, was an alternate name to Mailamādevī, or Mailalādevī and that she was the mother of Nalagāmarāja and Narasimharāja, is somewhat curious.

But the oral version does not, which gives on the other hand that she was a queen of the king at the time of his leaving Pālamācāpurī, but it reports only that the king and his associates traveled for three months and reached Gayā, where they stayed for three months. It gives a large amount of mythological details of worshipping a local goddess, called Gayakālā, during the period, with several
incredible details which have no historical significance, either from political or cultural points of view.

The standard version gives that the king and party arrived in the next step, at Bezawādā (modern city of Vijayawada), the abode of the goddess Kanakadurgā, where they reportedly worshipped her, but the oral version gives that Perināyuddu alone went to Bezawada to obtain the grace of the goddess, to obtain jasmine flowers of Heaven, to worship Gayākāla. Leaving away these legends concerning the folk gods and goddesses, there could have been some factual truth in the Haihaya king and his followers arriving at Vijayawada. His visit to Simhācalam and Pañcadhārala were ostensibly included so as to trace his route from Gayā, to present a make-believe story of pilgrimage.

Leaving aside several such elements of poetical fancies and imagination, the description of the march of Anugurāja, has to be taken to have started from the battle field on the banks of Gödāvari, in the year A.D. 1132. The standard version brings him to Mōṭupallī, in coastal Āṇdhra-deśa, where the king is said to have been able to wash off the blemishes of sin, by taking bath in the sea, at the town. But the oral version speaks neither of the sin and the king going on pilgrimage to wash it off, and thus these incidents do not come across in it. It gives the heroes of Palanadu were moving across the city, visiting several sacred places and finally the king and his retinue thought of returning back to their home town with a lot of frustration. However, on the way, they stopped for a sufficiently long time Dhraṇīkōṭa-Amarāvaṭī, where they came into conflict with Vūra Bhumāraju, defeated and killed him and continued their pilgrimage to the south as far as Śrīraṅgam, turned back in frustration, before they reached Palanāḍu. These details are fanciful on their very face and have to be discredited for the purpose of historical study. But what could be trustworthy, out of the data, is that the king and his retinue, reached Dhraṇīkōṭa-Amarāvaṭī, which was the capital of the Köṭa chiefs, who were ruling over the region of Natavaḍī, which extended on a wide area on either side of the river Kṛishṇā. They were one of the important ruling powers in the country, at the time, south of the river, and one of the principal associates of the Velanāṭpōdas.
It is tempting to suggest in this context that the poetic description of Anugurāja’s pilgrimage was probably the outcome of faint memories of the expedition, led by Bētarāja I and his associate Mandādi Rēvināyaka, in founding the Haihaya power in Palanādu, sometime earlier. They too must have reached Dākṣārāma, in the train of the early expeditions of Vikramāditya VI, the Western Cājukyan emperor, who arrived at Bezwādā and Amarāvatī on the plains of Kṛiṣṇā valley. The fact that Rēvināyaka is described in the Satrasāla inscription as a devotee of Kākolani Kēśavadēva, in other words Lord Kṛiṣṇa at Śrīkākulam on the left bank of the river Kṛiṣṇā. It supports the hypothesis that he and his overlord, Bētarāja I, were in the Western Cājukyan expedition, which moved over the plains of Kṛiṣṇā valley, stopped for sometime at Śrīkākulam, on the other bank of the river; crossed it probably at Bezwādā and reached Palanādu, through the region of Amarāvatī.

However, curiously enough, Anugurāja did not think of returning back to his kingdom, even after getting cleansed from sins, according to the standard version and desired to stay in the country for some more time. In the meanwhile, his officers picked up quarrel with a local chief, by name Pēramara of Vurakoṭā and thereon, with ‘prithviśvara’ of Candolu. The latter was undoubtedly the Velanāṭi king, Cōḍa II, or his son Rājendracōḍa II, whose capital was Tsandavōlū, or Candōlū. T.V.L. Narasimha Rao suggests that Vurakoṭā was probably the same as Tumrukōṭa, in the north-west corner of Palanādu, situated close to the river Kṛiṣṇā, but the oral version gives him as Vūra Bhimaraṇa and that he was the ruler of Dharanikōṭa. The standard version suggests that the king was probably a subordinate of the king of Candolū and invaded the camp of Anugurāja, for the latter’s offence of defeating and killing Pēramraju. The oral version seems to present a better factual truth in this context, as the name Bhimaraṇa appears frequently among the Kōṭa chiefs of Dharanikōṭa, who were one of the principal political associates of the Velanātičōḍas. They might have probably opposed the progress of Anugurāja, resulting in a conflict with him, and later on, the Velanātičōḍas might have crossed swords with the Haihaya king. The standard version of the epic-ballad, narrates the events of Anugurāja.
defeating the king of Candōlū, in other words, the Velanāṭicōda king and latter giving his daughter, Mailamā, in marriage to him, in the process of making peace, but the oral version does not hint at any war between them and that the king of Candōlū, married his daughter to Anugurāja and presented the territory of Palanādu as dowry to her. Thus, Anugurāja came to rule a part of the country of Palanādu from Gurazālā as its chief town.

B.S.L. Hanumantharao supposed that the power and prestige of the Velanāṭicōdas at the time was greatly reduced in their longstanding and devastating wars with the Western Čālukyas and thus, Goṅka II must have been looking for peace in the country; thought it wise not only to restore the Haihaya king to his former position but also to consolidate the political alliance, by marrying his daughter to him. But, the overlordship of the Velanāṭicōdas was not so weak at the time as he supposed, but there had been political alliance between the Velanāṭicōda king, Goṅka II, and Anugurāja, for mutual benefit and mainly because of the former's political sagacity, as will be explained below.

Further, B.S.L. Hanumantharao supposed, ostensibly on the basis some version, neither the standard nor the oral version of the epic-ballad that Doddānāyudu and his sons, Bādānāyudu and Brahmanāyudu, were originally in the service of the Velanāṭi king at Candōlū, whom the king sent to Gurazālā along with the princess, Mailamā, as a condition to the marriage. He sought to argue that it was with a dual motive, at the first instance, apparently to assist Anugurāja in administration as well as to keep watch on him; and secondly to get rid of their undesirable presence at Candōlū. He cited some incidents of Doddānāyudu and his sons to have been growing in power and prominence, more than their size and becoming a source of anxiety to the Velanāṭi kingdom by their disobedience and evil influence at the court. He cited the examples for their unruly behaviour—that Brahmanāyudu used not to salute the king and that the father and son killed pigeons against the orders of the king. The learned Professor innocently imagined the King of Candōlū to have been a Buddhist and prohibited killing of birds out of his Buddhist disposition, but Doddānāyudu and his sons disobeyed his command. The argument is neither supported by evidence, nor logically convincing.
At the first place, it has to be noted that the Velanāṭi-codas during the time of Goṅka II and his son Rājēndracōda II were at their height of power and prestige but not so much exhausted as to eagerly look for peace with the Haihayas of Palanāḍu, as if they were so much powerful that could support them at their odds. The former became the unchallenged overlords of coastal Āndhradēśa, by virtue of the victory scored by Rājēndracōda II, successfully leading the Velanāṭi armies in the battle of Gōdvārī. The Velanāṭi prince could command loyal assistance of a number of other powerful chieftains of coastal Āndhradēśa, in the battle and put an end, once and for all, to the menace of Western Cālkukyan invasions over the country, by vanquishing no less than emperor Sōmēsvara III, along with a number of his vassal powers, such as the Kandurucōdas, with whom the Haihayas also associated, and came to the battle, in his support. They might have exhausted in the decisive battle, no doubt, but not to the extent as the learned scholar supposed, so as to desperately look for allies, even from week and meek.

Secondly, as it has been explained above, Palanāḍu at the time was under the rule of Birudāṅkarudra-Bēta, who was pronouncedly inimical to Velanāṭi-codas and inspite of the defeat and heavy loss of power and prestige that he sustained in the battle of Gōdvārī. Eventhough, he was deprived of a large part of his kingdom by the Velanāṭi-codas, still holding some parts of Palanāḍu under his dominions. On the other hand, eventhough, Anugurāja participated on the side of the Western Cālkukyan emperor in the battle of Gōdvārī; he did not sustain much loss, as he had no kingdom at the time, to be wrested by the victorious power and moreover, seems to have impressed the Velanāṭi-coda prince, Rājēndracōda. While Anugurāja was determined to conquer back Palanāḍu, from his agnate rival Birudāṅkarudra-Bētarāja, the Velanāṭi prince must have sympathized with his aspiration, as it was coinciding with his own purpose of putting down the latter’s power. As such, as a shrewd statesman, Goṅka II wisely thought of making Anugurāja his associate, by restoring him to the kingdom of Palanāḍu apposite to Birudāṅkarudra-Bēta II.

Thirdly, his suggestion that Goṅka II sent Doddānāyudu and his sons, to Palanāḍu along with Mailamā, is not supported by either by the standard, or oral
version of *Palanāṭivīra Caritrā* as both of them are very clear in their narration that Doddānāyuḍu and his sons were in the service of Anugurāja, since the time of his rule in Madhyāḍeśa and to have started on pilgrimage, along with the king from Pālamācāpurī. However, the Kāremūḍī version of the *Viravidyāpiṭham* in other words, the one on which Roghair relied upon, mentions the event of the Heroes of Palanāḍu, Bādānāyuḍu and others to have killed pigeons with iron beaks, let loose by the hooligans in the service of the king of Candōlū, to harass Brāhmaṇs of the town. They had reportedly appealed to the Heroes of Palanāḍu, who were probably camping at Dharāṇikōṭā at the time, to protect them from the menace of pigeons and the matter appeared to lead to a war with the king. But, as the oral version gives, there did not take place any war and the king of Candōlū concluded peace with Anugurāja and his marriage with Mailamā took place. This episode is totally silent about the supposed Buddhist disposition of the king of Candōlū, his kind-heartedness to birds, Doddānāyuḍu and his sons causing displeasure to him, being in his court, etc. Thus, no historical fact could be made out of such fantastic description of events, by supplementing with imagination and further Goṅka II would not have sent such arrogant and discourteous people to Palanāḍu, who proved a source of anxiety to him in his own capital. It is simply ridiculous to imagine that they would serve his cause in the court of Gurazālā, which is plainly unintelligible to any sane thinking, when the Velanāṭi king had not yet formed confidence in the loyalty of Anugurāja, that he would have sent avowedly disloyal courtiers to keep watch on him. No intelligent statesman would think of two persons of doubtful conduct, to come closer and work in unison.

Undoubtedly, Goṅka II must have believed that Anugurāju would remain loyal to him, assigned the kingdom of Palanadu to him, for which he was fighting with Birudāṅkarudra-Bēta. He must have hoped that it would act as a check on the latter, who was till then a faithful subordinate to the Western Cāḻukyas and a source of anxiety to his kingdom from that vulnerable side. As such, Goṅka II must have thought of the marriage of Mailamā with Anugurāja and to strengthen the political alliance with familial ties, in which he might have also hoped that a
line of kings, descending through her progeny, would come to rule the kingdom of Palanāḍu, remaining permanently loyal to the Velanāṭi overlordship.

T.V.L. Narasimharao argued that it would be incongruous to suppose that Goṇka II would have given his daughter in marriage to a king, who was a Western Cālukyan subordinate. He was joined by Roghair in supposing similarly, that the Western Calukyas held the reins of suzerainty over coastal Āndhradēsa till A.D. 1137 and it was in that year Anugurāja appear to have occupied Palanāḍu, which fact is attested by epigraphical evidence. Be that it may, they should note that following the victory of Velanāṭi Goṇka II on the banks of Gōdāvarī, in the year A.D. 1132, the country was comparatively free from the Western Cālukyan imperialism and the chieftains, who formerly loyal to them, must have aligned with Velanāṭi chiefs, in the changed political scenario. Anugurāja would not have been as foolish as unable to understand the situation, especially when his rival, Birudāṅkarudra-Bēta, was branded as a Western Cālukyan ally and thus an enemy to the Velanāṭi overlordship, which was rising to its zenith. As such, there is no logic in supposing that Goṇka II would have conservatively thought Anugurāja was still an ally of the Western Cālukyas, as he exhibited his tact and diplomacy, in the political and marital alliance with Anugurāju.

From this point of view, notwithstanding loyalty of Cāgi Bēta to the Western Cālukyas, his son and successor, Vīrakāma II, or Anugukāma, or Anugurāja, cannot be said to have continued to be loyal to the Western Cālukyas; the imperial generals, who invaded the country about the year, A.D. 1118, supported his agnate rival, Bētabhūpa II, to defeat and expel him from Palanāḍu, obviously because of his disloyalty to suzerain power. This event must have contributed to his further estrangement with the Western Cālukyas. In the event of securing allies, he might have joined with the Kandūruโคḍas for sometime and thereby served the Imperial power, marched along with them to the battle of Gōdāvārī in the year. Thus, Anugurāja was in need of a powerful supporter in his mission of conquering back his kingdom in Palanāḍu, after the battle of Gōdāvarī in the year, A.D. 1132. It was all his bidding for favourable time, which came to him in the
form of the utter discomfiture of the Western Cāḷukya emperor, Bhūlākamalla Sōmēśvara and his allies, especially Bētabhūpa II.

However, before Anugurāja could secure political alliance of Velanāticōdas, he seems to have proceeded on his own, to secure the kingdom of Palanādu, and resorted to wars with some of the kings around the region, ostensibly the latter’s vassals. His war with the king of Vūrakōṭā, described in the standard version of the ballad might have been one such event, which is given in the oral version, as it was fought with the ruler of Dharaṇikōṭā. Notwithstanding the fanciful exaggerations, together with wide diversity of narration in various versions, it could have been a small skirmish with an insignificant chief. A fugitive prince with a small force, as Anugurāja, cannot be expected to have fought so much tumultuous a war, as the epic-ballad describes. In all probability, the chief that fought with Anugurāja and was defeated by him, was an ally of Bēta II and the former’s victory might have further convinced Gonka II, to extend his helping hand to the former, in his conquest of Palanādu, by assigning that part of the country under their occupation as dowry to their princess, Mailamā, giving her in marriage to Anugurāja.

Tangirala Venkata Subbarao pointed out that Anugurāja is known from an inscription, dated A.D. 1134, as to have been ruling over Palanādu, from Gurazāla, which fact had been attested by G. H. Roghair in recent times. Thus, the restoration of Anuguraja, following his marriage with Mailamā, appears to have taken place by the year, shortly after the battle of Gōḍāvarī, in the year A.D. 1132. In order to consolidate his authority over the region, Gonka II must have extended his political and military support to him in his war at Āraṇagaṇḍāla, when a combination of local chiefs opposed him, in which Bētarāja II might have been a prominent member. The narration in the epic-ballad, that Anugurāja thought of going back to his kingdom in Madhyadesa, after the battle of Āraṇagaṇḍāla, but his tutelary deity, Cennakēśava dissuaded him, was obviously a poetical twist to the historical fact that the king could secure his kingdom and his tutelary deity was installed in a temple, in his capital.
5. Death of Anugurāju and Disputed Succession:

Historians in the past\textsuperscript{76} banked on the account of Anugurāju having adopted Peddanāyudū or Bādānāyudū, the eldest son of his minister, Doddānāyudū,\textsuperscript{77} as he had no children for a long time, which is not supported by the standard version. It simply narrates that the queens of Anugurāju (specifying Vīravidyaladēvī) worshipped the god Cennakēśava with devotion and had children born to her. However, T.V.L. Narasimharao\textsuperscript{78} also subscribed to the conventional view, based on the oral version of the \textit{Viravidyāpiṭham}, that the king had no children for a long time to succeed him; his queen, Bhūramādēvī, created an occasion to play dice with Sīlamā, the wife of Doddānāyudū, on condition of the loser surrendering her son to the other; that the latter lost the game and surrendered her eldest son Bādānāyudū. As such, he rejected the concept of adoption, and gave his verdict that a boy outside the \textit{gōtra} cannot be adopted. But, he had not seen the impropriety of two childless women, playing dice on the wager of the loser surrendering her son, about whose birth none of them were sure, without even the knowledge if not permission of their husbands. Whichever version may report the episode, it lacks both propriety and probability and thus acceptability in the context of historical studies on scientific lines.

That the permissibility of adopting a boy that belongs to some other \textit{gōtra}, is the botheration of middle class Brāhmaṇ families, but not of ruling families and even the former’s case, it was desirable to have a boy of the same \textit{gōtra}, but boys of other \textit{gōtras} are barred from adoption. In ruling families, undoubtedly, boys were adopted and girls were married, more on grounds of political expediency rather than permissibility of \textit{dharmaśāstras} or any other consideration such as making ideal match in terms of ages and appearances of the bride and bridegroom. As such, his conclusion that there was no adoption, of Bādānāyudū, either by Anugurāja, or by any one of his queens is quite plausible, but not on the causal factors on which he had drawn the conclusion, that the boy did not belong to the same \textit{gōtra} as of the king.
But, B.S.L. Hanumantharao was firm in his belief that Anugurāja adopted Bādanāyudu as his son, obviously to bequeath his kingdom after him, constructed a further hypothesis that the latter's marriage with Mukta Lāvāmbā, the daughter of Kṛishṇa Gandharva, who was a Kṣatriya ruler of Pedakancerla, further strengthened his prospects of succession. He argues that it was all to ensure Velama succession on the throne of Palanādu, for which the Velanāṭi princess, Mailamā would have tacitly approved. It has to be pointed out at the first instance, the hypothesis lacks support either from the standard or oral version of the epic-ballad, the standard does not at all refer to the birth and brought up of Peddana alias Bādarāju, while the latter gives that Viravidyaladēvi, happily took care of the boy and brought him up. But there were no dicing with wager or adoption of the boy, even in the oral version. As such, there is certainly no warrant of his succession, in other words the Velama succession to the Haihaya throne of Palanādu. The Velanāṭi chiefs and the princess Mailamā cannot be confidently said to have belonged to Velama, to attribute them the Velama bias and to plan to secure Velama succession on the throne of Palanādu. As such, his hypothesis, as it is not supported by evidence, lacks convincing logic as well and cannot be accepted. Of course, there is logic in his argument that the Velanati Gonka II to have probably expected that progeny of Mailamā would rule Palanādu and the kingdom remain perpetually subordinate to Velanāṭi overlordship; and in all probability, even the princess would also have hoped similarly; and thus, his suggestion that she might have tacitly approved, in other words connived with Doddānāyudu, to secure Velama succession to the throne of Palanadu becomes his self-contradiction. Obviously, she would not have been mad enough to work against her own wishes and of her father, as well the interests of her own progeny, with her stamp of approval for the succession of Bādanāyudu alias Peddanāyudu on the throne of Palanādu.

The episode of playing dice between two women, even if they belong to royal household, with the wager of the loser surrendering her son to the winner; without the permission of, and even the knowledge of, their respective husbands, is absurd on its very face. It does not make even a fanciful folk tale, much less to believe as
a political strategy and deserves no serious consideration in a scientific historical study. More significant is that one of the women had, of course, a son to fulfill the condition, if it comes necessary, while the other had no issue till then!

B.S.L. Hanumantharao supposed, rather baselessly, that the marriage of Bādānāyudū with the daughter of Kṛiṣhṇa Gandharva, the ruler of Peda Kañcerlā, strengthened his claim to the throne of Palanādu, obviously that he could obtain political support and even military assistance to realize his ambition. But, the oral version of the epic-ballad gives a different picture altogether, of his relation with the ruling family of Peda Kañcerlā, that he was looked down, insulted and had even to wage wars with them for his own life. To speak in terms of reality, the stories of his birth, marriage and other details, as the oral version presents have little connection with the main theme of epic-ballad, except for fanciful enjoyment of innocent rural folk, but deserving no serious consideration for historical element.

Neither the standard nor the oral version, give that Doddānāyudū or his sons, had ever seriously tried for the succession of Bādānāyudū and simply narrate that Nalagāma peacefully succeeded his father Anugurāju, being his eldest son; and that Brahmana placed him on the throne, respecting the last wish of the king. Thus, the inquiries into the supposed attempts for the succession of Bādānāyudū and for searching for its supporting points are quite unwarranted.

The earlier historians, B.V. Krishnarao and others, believed that Mailama, the Velanāti princess was the chief queen of Anugurāju and that she gave birth to Nalagāma, or Virakāma and his brother Narasimharāja; that Viravidyaladēvi, another queen gave birth to three sons, Pedamallidēva, Chinamallidēva and Bālamallidēva, and that Bhūramādēvi, another queen of the king gave birth to four sons, Erakāma, Narasimha, Perumājarāja and Jhaṭṭiperumājarāja. They supposed that birth of these sons to the king caused dissensions between him and his minister, Doddānāyudu and that the latter resigned his position in favour of his second son, Brahmana, or Brahmanāyudu. Does it mean that by his resignation to his ministerial position in favour of his second son, Doddānāyudu was still hopeful of his eldest son, Bādānāyudu becoming king? They point out that the
epic-ballad depicts the minister and his sons abused their power and positions; that Brahmana murdered Anugurāja at the first instance and his own father at the next, the events that are not found either in the standard or oral version of it. They might have been described in some other less known version, probably available to Sewell, about two hundred years ago, but not to any one subsequently. It gives only confused reading and raise doubts as to their factual probability, rather than helping in understanding their course and nature.

The standard edition is clear that Anugurāju died of some ulcer in his back and Doddānāyudu felt very much for the plight of the king because of it, and he too pined and dead. The oral version gives that Anugurāja developed the deadly ulcer, as he received obeisance of Brahmana, the incarnation of Viṣṇu, while himself sitting on the throne and the latter standing before him. As such, none of them speaks of the double murder by Brahmanāyudu, though their accounts are too fanciful to be trustworthy. Again, both the versions give that at the time of his death, Anugurāja placed his sons under the care of Brahmana, instructing him to place Nalagāma on the throne of Gurazālā and to guide him in the administration of the kingdom. As such, the aim or the plan, of Brahmana supposedly murdering the king and his own father along with, are impossible to understand—if at all he did, his further actions would have vindicated them—but, neither is reported to have seized the kingdom for himself, nor offered to his brother Bādanāyudu. As such, what could have been his motive for his supposed regicide and patricide along with, can be assessed by sane thinking and thus cannot be subscribed.

However, T.V.L. Narasimharao appears to have found some supporting evidence to this questionable act of Brahmana’s double murder, from an oral tradition of the ballad, maintained by the Viravidyāpītham, which seems to be somewhat variant of the one collected and used by Roghair. He suggests that Brahmana might have grown impatient with his elder brother losing chance of becoming the king of Palanādu, because of the marriage of Anugurāja with the Velanāṭi princess, Malamā, as her progeny was destined to ascend the throne. Thus, he stopped greeting Anugurāju, with royal etiquette, for which Doddānāyudu chided him and that it made Brahmana to outburst emotionally and
threw the stick in his hands on his father. But, it struck the king, quite accidentally, causing a fatal wound on him and Doddānāyuḍu was deeply pained in his heart at these developments and died shortly after the death of Anugurāju. Thus, the scholar characterized Brahmana, as a valiant hero in battles, a shrewd politician and diplomat, and above all a partisan of dharma, but at the same time, as susceptible to human weaknesses such as arrogance, jealousy, egoism and emotional imbalance. This course of events, if they are reported in the version of the epic-ballad, which is supposed to be the most standard being the precious possession of the Viravidyāpītham, presents Brahmana in much diluted colour. Notwithstanding his being “a valiant hero in battles, a shrewd politician and diplomat, and above all a partisan of dharma,” Brahmana deserves condemnation for his susceptibility to “human weaknesses such as arrogance, jealousy, egoism and emotional imbalance.” The oral version collected by Roghair also presents him more, as a treacherous and selfish, cunningly planned for several heroes, either with the view of eliminating equals, or out of his animosity to rājus, in the process of elevating the Velamas and these factors form blots on his personality.

Another curious matter in the reading of the epic, by the above mentioned scholars is that Doddānāyuḍu nominating his second son, Brahmana to replace him in the position of the minister. Of course, he could resign his position at his free will, but it is inexplicable, by which power and authority he could nominate his successor to the position on his own accord, and that too his own son being his nominee. It can be explained only by inferring that ministers were probably not appointed by the king, but they used to style themselves by virtue of their own political power and position, accrued to them by the economic resources at their command. The extent of their dominions, yielding taxes and dues as well as incomes from their own personal estates must have enabled them to maintain sufficient armed forces that enabled them to style themselves as ministers and not alone by the royal appointment. This was not, of course, an impossibility as the characteristic of feudal order of society and polity, prevailing in medieval times, but it requires substantiating evidence from other parallel examples. Especially, Nāgammā or the Nāyakurālu, obtaining her position of a minister, by impressing
the king Anugurāja and his son Nalagāma, which is testified by almost all the versions of the ballad as well as the later day literary works, goes against such an inference.

The description that Anugurāju had no children for a long time could be nothing more than a conventional literary technique, often employed in poetical works by scholar-poets as well as in folklore, in the context of describing the birth of important characters in them, especially the heroes and heroines. Thus, they narrate the kings and queens, being childless, to have performed arduous penance, or worshipping their tutelary deities by observing austerities, or some other means of pious deeds in order to obtain their sons, or daughters. These accounts were useful to uphold their personalities as gifts of gods, or even divine personalities, and impress the readers, or audiences. The standard version gives, in consonance with these conventions of romantic literature, that the three wives of the king propitiated the god Cennakēśava and gave birth to sons in quick succession, whereas the oral version gives such unnatural and incredible accounts of birth, for Bādānāyudu, Brahmanāyudu and Bālacandra, to elevate the outstanding Velama personalities to sublimity. Obviously, the purpose of the composition of different versions of the epic-ballad, by different poets, appears to have been with different purposes and they had totally destroyed the historical facts.

Almost all the versions of the ballad give that Anugurāju had two wives even before he married Mailamādevi, the Velanāti princess and that her son, Nalagāma, was the eldest of all and thus, considered as the rightful heir to the throne. It is somewhat surprising that other two wives of the king could not have sons till then, as if they waited for the third to get her son, at first, and then to follow her! The standard version invariably refers to Nalagāma as the son of Mailamādevi, who is unquestionably taken as the Velanāti princess by authors of various versions of the ballad as well as the poets at the later time, who refined it, such as Śrīnātha. They had not only recognized Nalagāma as the right claimant to the throne, being the son of the Velanāti princess, but also that he was the eldest of the sons of Anugurāju and thus, succeeded to the throne in accordance with the generally prevailing Law of Primogeniture. But, the kingdom legally belonged to
Mailamā, being bestowed on her as dowry at the time of her marriage and as such, her son was entitled to the throne, can be easily understood, but describing him as the eldest of the sons of Anugurāja seems to be a confusing twist.

T.V.L. Narasimharao examined the prevailing confusion among the ballad writers as well as the historians from time to time, as to the names and number of wives and sons of Anugurāja. Ostensibly, he followed Roghair, but in addition, the former made some novel suggestions that seem to solve the confusion in this context, because of the divergence in various versions of the epic-ballad and conclusions of different scholars in the past, worse confounding the confusion. The first of them is that Vīravidyaladēvi was a sister, but not one of the wives of Anugurāja and second is that the first wife of the king, Bhūramādēvi, was also known as Mailamā. He substantiated his interpretation giving that the name, Mailamā, is a combination of two terms, “Mahî” and “Lamā”, the former meaning earth, and a synonym of “Bhū” while the latter was an alternate form of the term, “Ramā”, meaning Lakṣmī. Thus the Telugu name, Mailamā, as he explains, is plainly a synonym of Bhūramā in Sanskrit and thus he suggested that she was the mother of Nalagāma and Narasimharāja. Then, he explained that Mailamā, the Velanāṭi princess, was the mother of Peda Mallidēva and his brothers and interpreted the names of the princes, Erakāma, or Erukukāma and Jhaṭṭiperumāḷarāju, said to be the sons of Bhūramādēvi, were only alternate names of Nalagāma and Narasimharāja, but not two other sons of Anugurāja.

The hypothesis is based exclusively on a linguistic and lexicographical analysis, making twisted reading for a round-about argument. Even though, he tried to cite some evidence for the Bhūramā being called also as Mailamā, it is more in the form of hearsay and less as a concrete literary or epigraphical source and cannot be taken as evidence at all, in historical research on scientific lines. But what he had brought forth is a far-reaching contribution to the history of the Haihayas of Palanādu, which will be discussed in the following paragraphs and substantiated on historical grounds.

There need not be any doubt that the Velanāṭi princess was second or third, wife of the king, as all the versions give that she was married by the king later
than the remaining. Roghair also noted that the oral tradition mentions that the king of Candolo married his daughter to be the second wife of the king and thus Anuguraju had only two wives and not three.

T.V.L. Narasimharao made a reference to a manuscript of Palanajivira Caritra, which was brought to the notice of scholars by Tangirala Venkata Subbarao, from Allurupadu in Nellore district, gives that Mailama, the Velanathi princess, committed sati on the death of Anuguraju. Her sons, Peda Malideva and his brothers were said to have been young children at the time and that they were brought up by Vravidyaladevi and they were not her sons in true sense. But she appears to say that the boys were her sons, only out of her affectionate attachment to them as foster mother. As such, he argued that the ballad-singers could not distinguish between the two queens of Anuguraju, named similarly as Mailama on one hand, and mistook on the other hand, Vravidyaladevi to be another queen of the king and the mother of the children, whose mother was in fact Mailama, the Velanati princess. He explains that these mistakes of the ballad-singers came to remain permanent in the story and the scholar-poets like Srinatha adopted them in their works.

From this analysis, the disputed succession to the throne of Palanadu, after the death of Anuguraja, one of the potential causes of the Battle appears to have arisen between the sons of Mailama alias Bhuramadevi and those of Mailama, the Velanathi princess. The above analysis suggests thus, that Anuguraja instructed Brahmana to place Nalagama on the throne, obviously because he was the eldest as well as the eldest son of the chief queen, Mailama alias Bhuramadevi, and he did accordingly. Thus, the king Anuguraja and his minister, Brahmana, sowed the seeds for the dissensions in the house and step-brothers fighting for kingdom. The king should have kept in mind that he obtained Palanadu, as dowry to his wife and thus her eldest son should ascend the throne, speaking legally, and also that the Velanaticoda king at the time, Rajendra-coda II, would surely support the claims of his nephew, and that he would be inviting the latter's enmity by disobeying his command. It is interesting to note in this context that the standard version mentions Nalagama was the nephew of the king of Candolu and sent
armies to fight the Battle in his support. Is it simply an example to the confusion, to which the bardic-poets were subjected to and their transferring it to the readers and audiences of the epic, or Anugurāju was succeeded on the throne by the son of the Velāṇāji princess, Mailamā—cannot be decided in the midst of confusion created by the novel suggestion of the learned scholar. For the present context, it is logical conclude that Anugurāju desired Nalagāma to be his successor, whether or not the latter was eldest of his sons, notwithstanding the confused narrations of various versions of the epic-ballad.

The *Palanāṭivīra Caritā* states that Anugurāju had a long period of rule of forty years, but absolute reliance on its statement is quite unwarranted in view of the proven unreliability of the epic-ballad, of any version. He was probably restored to the throne of Palanāḍu, about the year A.D. 1135\(^2\). It was shortly after the battle of Gōdāvāri, which was fought about the year A.D. 1132, as mentioned above and there is inscriptive evidence to his rule over the region, of the year A.D. 1137. Thus, his fortieth year of rule would fall in the year A.D. 1174, and his agnate rival, Bēthabhūpa II, whose rule is attested by his inscription, of the year A.D. 1165, was still exercising his power over a part of Palanāḍu. He might have begun his attempts to conquer back the kingdom about A.D. 1128, probably married Bhūramādevi, about the year in order to secure the help of Kandūrucōḍa king Bhiṃa and finally restored by the Velāṇāji king, Cōḍa II, by marrying his daughter Mailamā about the year A.D. 1135.

There are a few inscriptions issued by kings, named Anugukāmarāju and Mailaladēvi Kāmarāju, whose identity has been a matter of controversy among scholars. An inscription at Mācerlā\(^3\), dated Śaka 1064 (A.D. 1042), issued by Śrīman-Mahāmaṇḍalēśvara Anugum-gāmarāju, who could be identified without any doubt, with Anugurāja, surnamed Viṃakāma II, which must have been issued shortly after his restoration to the kingdom, in the year A.D. 1135. Similarly, Mahāmaṇḍalēśvara Kāmarāju, known to have issued an inscription found at the village, Pinnalī in Palanāḍu\(^4\), in Śaka year 1069 (A.D. 1147), might also be taken identical with Anugurāju, but, V. Yasodadevi\(^5\) identified him with Nalagāma and suggested that the latter ascended throne in the year. The reign of Anugurāja in
such a case has to be reckoned from A.D. 1113, the date of the Nāgastambhā inscription at Mācerlā and he has to be assigned the period of rule 34 years, which includes the period of his exile to a greater extent.

But, an inscription from Pinnali in Palanādu, appears to have been issued by Śrī-Mahāmanḍalēśvara Mailamādevi Kāmarāju, dated in Śaka year 1085 (A.D. 1163), whose identity has been a matter of controversy. B.V. Krishnarao, identified the king with Nalagāmarāja as “Mailamādevi-Kāmarāju”, means ‘Kāmarāju son of Mailamādevi’, the Velanāti princess and suggested that he probably ascended throne by the year but Pingali Lakshmikantam suggested that Mailamādevi-Kāmarāju could as well be identified with Anugurāja and interpreted the expression as to mean, that Anugurāja was at the time ruling over the kingdom that originally belonged to Mailamādevi. But the interpretation is quite unlikely as there is no parallel example to support and such expressions generally stand for sons but not to husbands, even if the kingdom originally belongs to her. The legal provisions and customary usages do not permit woman to rule kingdoms, even when they happen to be the legal heirs and the ruling power devolves to their husbands. Thus, the expression under reference cannot be applied to Anugurāja and applies only to Nalagāma. Moreover, the inscription gives the king, in ll. 3-4, as Mailādevi-Kāmarāju-kōduku, which literally means, the son of Mailādevi-Kāmarāju, in other words, the grandson of the queen, by her son; and in ll. 10-11, that the ruling king, who issued the inscription was Śrīman-Mahāmanḍalēśvara Anumgu-Gāmarāju. If it has to be simply understood, the record was issued by a king, named Kāmarāju, son of Anugurāju and that the latter was son of Mailādevi, in which case he could be identified with Nalagāma. It has been noted above that Anugurāja alias Virakāma II, was also the son of a Mailamādevi, and thus the interpretation can be justified. If not, it has to be taken in the sense of an Anugukāma and that he was the son of Nalagāma, who was himself the son of Mailamādevi, the Velanāti princess. A son of Mailādevi-Kāmarāju, in other words, the grandson of Mailaladevi, as to have been ruling over the kingdom in the middle of the twelfth century, if the queen is taken as the Velanāti princess, cannot be possible. As such, the donor-king has to be
identified with Anugurāju, as Pingali Lakshmikantam has suggested and found to be less convincing. The only way of getting out of the confusion seems to be taking the king as identical with Nalagāma, that he must have been referred to as Anugumgāma, meaning son of Anugurāju, as well as Mailaladēvi-koduku, meaning son of Mailaladēvi, whether the queen was identical with the Velanāṭi princess, or Bhūramāṭi, who is also known to have the cognomen, as Mailamadēvi. Whatever might be the identity of the queen, the expression, Mailadēvi-Kāmarāju-koduku, in the inscription, misleading towards a grandson of the queen has to be ignored, as it is obviously, a scribal error, for Mailadēvi-koduku-Kāmarāju. Mention of mother’s or father’s name as a qualifying epithet, in inscriptions was a normal procedure when the king was in need of legitimization of his claims to throne, by way of emphasizing his line of succession. Such was not the need of Anugurāju at the time and hence the king who issued the Pinnall inscription cannot be identified with him, but only with a king, who aspired to emphasize his claims to throne by way of invoking the names of his father and mother and could undoubtedly be Nalagāma. In the context of disputed succession, he must have aspired to emphasize his claims to throne, as the son of Anugurāju as well as his mother, Mailaladēvi100. As such, Yasodadevi101 was right in the identification of the donor-king of this Pinnall inscription with Nalagāmarāju, but her suggestion that the year A.D. 1165 as the last regnal year of the king, which is most unlikely, as will be shown below at its appropriate place.

An inscription from Pedakodamagundla supplies information that is utmost important in the present context, which has not been properly evaluated by historians in the past. It was issued by Īśasanapeggada, the mudiseli, of Velanāṭicōda king Kulottuṅgacōda Goṅkarāja, or Goṅka II, in the year Śaka 1069, equivalent to A.D. 1147. It gives Kāmadēvarājula-Mallidēvarāju, as the name of the reigning king, who has to be identified obviously with Pedamallidēva, son of Anugukāmarāja. Thus, it provides information that the eldest sons of the two wives of the king, namely Nalagāma and Pedamallidēva, had divided the kingdom as early as A.D. 1147. As such, the donor-king of the Pinnall inscription has to be
identified with Nalagāmarāja, irrespective of the way he was described it. The kingdom of Mācerlā, under the rule of Peda Mallidēva had already come into existence, as early as A.D. 1147 and Anugurāja was no more by the year.

As such, the accounts in *Palanāṭivīra Caritra*, that Anugurāja ruled for forty years; that Brahmana placed Nalagāma on throne of Palanāḍu, in respect to the last wish of the king, do not seem to hold complete truth. On the other hand, the eldest sons of the two queens of Anugurāja were conscious of their claims to the whole kingdom of Palanāḍu—Nalagāma being the eldest son of the senior queen, Bhūramādevī, alias Mailamādevī while Peda Mallidēva feeling that the kingdom belongs to him, being the dowry to his mother. Undoubtedly, the ministers in their respective courts, Brahmana in the service of Peda Mallidēva and Nāgammā alias Nāyakurālu in the court of Nalagāma fanned their rivalries, leading to the fateful Battle.

V. Yasodadevi suggested an undated inscription from Kottapalle, issued by *Mahāmandalēśvara* Anumgudēva Mahārāja and another undated record from Drōṇadulā, issued by a *Pallināṭivīra-Anugudēva* Mahārāja, as to have been issued by Anugurāja alias Virakama II. Undated records are hardly helpful in historical study, if they do not refer to any significant event, whose date can be ascertained by means of some other point of evidence. The Haihayas of Palanadu are not usually known to have held the suffix ‘dēva’ in their personal names, at least before the Battle. Again, the latter record speaks that the king extended his sway over Kammanāḍu, which could not have been possible to Anugurāja and hence he cannot be identified with the king of the same name, of the period under study. The region of Kammanāḍu at the time was hub of the kingdom of Velanaticōdas over which Anugurāja could hardly have exercised his power, without an open conflict with them. The explanation of V. Yasodadevi that the king could claim lordship over the region, by virtue of his marriage with Mailamā, the Velanāṭi princess, hardly makes logical sense. The identity of the king, of these undated inscriptions, requires some more analysis of evidence, mostly circumstantial as palpable evidence is not forthcoming.
Roghair\textsuperscript{106} supposed that Anugurāja was a Western Cālukyan feudatory, till their decline about the year A.D. 1137, and later he became a subordinate of the Velanāṭi Goṅkarāja II. It has been shown above, beyond any doubt, that he had not been a Western Cālukyan feudatory, at least from the year A.D. 1118 and similarly, he cannot be said to have become a subordinate of Velanāṭi Goṅkarāja II, for he had not accepted the Cālukya-Cōja suzerainty as the latter did, and fought the wars on behalf of Kulōttuṅga II, following him, as V. Yasodadevi\textsuperscript{107} supposed. The marriage of the king with the Velanāṭi princess, sometime before A.D. 1135, would have been impossible, had he been still a Western Cālukyan subordinate, as Roghair supposed.

It has to be noted that both the empires were fast reaching their end at that time, while their erstwhile subordinates, of considerable power and resources, were ascending in political prominence to proclaim their independence. Thus, the Velanāṭicōda king, Rājendracōda II, the strongest of Cālukya-Cōja subordinates in coastal Āndhradēśa and Prola II of the Kākatīyas emerged virtually independent, without any formal proclamation. Thus, the Velanāṭi king was in his own interest of consolidating his power and position, thought of befriending Anugurāja, but the latter does not seem to have been a subordinate vassal of the king. His epithet Mahāmaṇḍalēśvara without referring to the Velanāṭi overlordship in his records, clearly suggests that he felt himself independent of any external suzerainty. Moreover, he seems to have not relished Velanāṭicōdas assigning him the kingdom of Palanāḍu, in the form of dowry to his wife, as mark of their benignity and favour\textsuperscript{108}. His aspiration for independence might have led him to instruct Brahmanāyudu to place Nalagāma, son of Bhūramā alias Mailamā, on the throne following him and to look after the welfare of his other children—ostensibly having foreseen the dispute in succession to the throne. As such, Anugurāja appears to have been more responsible to the civil war in the Haihaya family of Palanāḍu than any other, in his own way, just like Dhṛitarāṣṭhāra in the great epic, \textit{Mahābhārata}.

\textbf{Nalagāma and the Battle of Palanāḍu:}
Nalakama (or Virakama III, as he may also be referred to, as the standard version of epic-ballad often refers to him by the name) probably ascended throne of Palanadu in the year A.D. 1146 and supposed to have ruled for fifteen years, before the Battle, but he must have had quite a longer period, as the epic-ballad, *Palanāṭivīra Caritrā* suggests. It refers to him frequently as Mailama-Kama, signifying that he was the son of Mailamā and as mentioned above, there is inscriptive reference to show that he called himself by such cognomen. Naturally, historians and scholars in the past, who depended mostly on the epic-ballad, for the history of Palanadu under Haihayas, implicitly took that his mother, Mailamā, was none other than the Velanāṭi princess and that he was the eldest among the sons of Anugurāju. But these hypotheses are disproved by the historical analysis made above, as he was no doubt the son of Mailamā, who was better known as Bhūramādēvi and not the Velanāṭi princess of the same name. As such, Nalagama and would have been elder than all other sons of Anugurāju, especially than the sons of Mailamā, the Velanati princess, and was probably born even before she was married to his father. The minister, Brahmanāyudu, who is praised for his commitment to dharma or righteousness, had reportedly carried on the wish of the king on death bed and placed Nalagama on the throne, obviously overlooking the right to throne of Peda Malideva, the eldest son of the Velanāṭi princess, Mailamā.

B.S.L. Hanumantharao pointed out that *Palanāṭivīra Bhāgavatam* often asserts that Narasimharaja, the son of Bhūramādēvi, was the rightful heir to the throne, and that the local Reddi community supported his claims. Ostensibly, he was under the impression Narasimharaja was the eldest son of the principal queen of Anugurāja, but neither the standard nor oral version of the epic-ballad give, anywhere, that he was the eldest son of the queen, nor suggests even remotely that he was a claimant to the throne. As a matter of fact, the epic-ballad, of any version or its classical renderings are found unworthy for any serious reliance in historical research and their information has to be adopted so far as supported by epigraphical evidence, and by pragmatically understanding things and situations.
The present analysis of evidence yields the conclusion that Bhūramādevī was no doubt, the principal queen of Anugurāja and her eldest son, Nalagāma, ascended throne, but Narasimharāja never appears to have claimed throne. As such, there is no point in the local Reddi community supporting his claims, even if some version of the epic-ballad that has yet to come to limelight may give such an account. His association with Nāgammā, the minister of Nalagāmarāja, in her political machinations should not mislead any one to the conclusion, for she never appears to have supported his claims to throne at any time and both of them worked in unison for strengthening the position of Nalagāma. Obviously, the learned scholar was under the impression that Nalagāma ascended throne, being the son of the Velanāti princess, setting aside the claims of the sons of Bhūramādevī, the chief queen of Anugurāja, and thus Narasimharāja had to satisfy with the position of the formers commander of armies, inspite of being her son.

But, a genuine doubt arises, when Anugurāja instructed Brahmana to place Nalagāma on the throne of Gurazālā, was he totally unmindful of the fact that the kingdom of Palanādu was the dowry to Velanāti Mailamā; and thus her son, Peda Mallidēva, was rightful claimant to the throne, at least on par with Nalagāma. He must also have foreseen the possibility of conflict with Velanāti Rājendracōda, who would surely exert pressure on behalf of the rights of his nephew to throne, if he would pass on the kingdom exclusively to Nalagāma, especially when the former had stationed his officers in Palanādu, who were functioning to promote his interests. As such, there is reason to suppose that the king might have envisaged the division of the kingdom between Nalagāma and Peda Mallidēva, but instructed Brahmana to place the former on the throne, because the latter and his brothers were still young. But, he committed all of his sons to the care of the minister and commanded him to look after them carefully, obviously implying to place Peda Mallidēva on the throne, of a part of the kingdom, when comes of proper age. But, Mailamā, the Velanāti princess, having performed satī, as known from the Allūrupādū version of the epic-ballad, and her brother, Velanāti Rājendracōda II having grown too old to press for the claims of his nephew, Peda
Mallidēva and his brothers had to remain helpless, obviously having no active supporters to their cause. Nāgammā, in the meanwhile, grew too powerfully influential in the court as rival to Brahmana and possibly she must have instigated the king, Nalagāma, to ignore the rights of Peda Mallidēva and the king was very much happy with her counsel and contemplated actions, as his lust for power corrupted him. In all probability, Brahmana would have consented his ambition, had he not a rival in the court, in Nāgammā, but he began to press for the rights of Peda Mallidēva and mounted pressure on the king Nalagāma for division of the kingdom, between the latter and his step-brother. It was more his own need to outwit the machinations of Nāgammā, and to strengthen his own position as minister, than his partisanship for dharma, or out of affection to Peda Mallidēva and his brothers.

B.V. Krishnarao\textsuperscript{114} supposed that Brahmana had fallen apart from the king Nalagāma, in course of time, as he tried to take advantage of the latter being young and inexperienced, misused his office for private purposes—to propagate and even forcing his socio-religious ideology on people. Following several other earlier historians like Chilukuri Virabhadra Rao, Akkiraju Umakantam, and others, he believed that the primary cause for the Battle of Palanādu was the socio-religious upheaval in the country, envisaged and executed by Brahmana. He compared the movement of Brahmana, to that of Basava in Karṇataka, which was more or less contemporary, in respect of bringing about social equality by eradicating the caste-system based on varṇā concept, but for the difference that Basava emphasized a militant form of Śaivism, whereas Brahmana chose Vaiṣṇavism.

It has been mentioned above that the Kṛdābhīramam, which was composed more or less about the same time as Palanāśivīra Caritra, by Śrīnātha, also states that cāpakūḍu, or interdining with disregard to caste distinctions, was one of the potent causes for the Battle of Palanādu. Thus, the historians compared the movement started by Brahmana with the Vīraśaiva movement of Basava about the same time in Karṇataka and to have brought about more or less the same political convulsions in the country. Basava utilized his official powers and position to
further his movement and brought about crisis to the Kaṭacuri kingdom at Kalvaṇa and Brahman also was considered to have done the same in Palanāḍū. B.S.L. Hanumantharao had in recent times further substantiated the statement in *Kṛdābhīrāmam* that ḍāpakaḍū was an important cause for the Battle, added that uccīṣṭha-bhōjana (partaking the remnant of food eaten) of Brahmana, and veneration to his person as dikṣāguru, or initiator into the creed, were also responsible for the outbreak of the war. Following the view of B.V. Krishnarao, he supposed that king Nalagāma and his minister, Nāgammā, could not tolerate his conduct and misusing his office and public funds for social and religious revolution. Apposite to the supposedly radical socio-religious movement of Brahmana, with Vaiṣṇavite leanings, scholars visualized Nāgammā to have led a counter movement with Śaivite leanings.

However, the point that has to be noted in this context is that, the epic-ballad, either the standard or oral version, does not deal with the socio-religious movement of Brahmana, in such a way as to impress upon the readers that it was a powerful factor that precipitated matters, leading to the war. There is neither such a radical social reform as disregarding caste distinctions and founding a caste-less society in the activities of either Brahmana or Nāgammā, whose machinations and manipulations were purely political.

The opponent of Brahmana, namely Nāgammā, surnamed Nāyakurālu, as the standard version of the epic-ballad gives, belonged to a Reddi family of Paṇṭā clan and hailed from Jīṭṭagāmālapādū. But her family background and early life are reported variously in various versions of the epic-ballad—the standard version giving her as the daughter of Jaggāreddi and the niece of Mēkapōṭulareddī, while the *Palanāṭvīra Bhāgavatam* states that she was adopted daughter of one Poṭṭi Nāgireddi. However, both the works state unanimously that she belonged to the Paṇṭareddi community and the daughter-in-law of Āravellī family. However, Akkiraju Umakantam found the name of her father as Caudhari Ramireddi and her uncle was Mēkapōṭu Singareddi, obviously in a manuscript that seems to have been closer to the oral version. Roghair, in his recent studies, based exclusively on the oral version gives these details exactly as Umakantam had given. It is
interesting to note the first part of her father’s name, ‘Caudhari’, probably suggesting him to be a ‘Kamma’ by caste, as people of Kamma community of modern times wear the suffix in their personal names, but he was no doubt a Reddi, as the suffix in his name suggests. These conflicting points suggest that the caste characterizations of most of the personalities, in the ballad-epic, including Brahmanayudu and NAYakuralu-Nagamma, were probably the works of bardic singers and scholar-poets, of later day, rather than contemporary so as to command historical validity.

The dissensions between the king, Nalakama, and his minister, Brahmana, took serious dimensions within a short time of Nagamma entering the scene, as the latter’s rival. Having been appointed as minister, side-by-side Brahmana, she is said to have exposed grave misappropriation of royal revenues, by the latter and that he and his supporters were prospering by way of pilfering state exchequer. The literature, classical as well as bardic, presents her as a highly ambitious lady and utterly unscrupulous in fulfilling her designs and evil motives. She is believed to have lost her husband quite early in her life, in the battle of Aranagapdla, in the hands of the generals of Anuguraju and developed unbounded hatred towards the king and his family that prompted her to take silent vow to destroy the Haihaya dynasty of Palanadu. She is supposed to have started her education after the calamity in which she lost her husband, learnt not only the arts of peace but also martial arts and using different weapons, but none of these details are found in either the standard or oral versions of the epic-ballad. Leaving away the fantastic accounts of her winning favour of the kings, Anuguraja and Nalagama, usually coming across frequently in fairy tales and folk stories, she was undoubtedly a highly intelligent and courageous woman, able to successfully carrying on her tricks and treacheries to grow in power and subdue her rivals. She was usually referred to as “Nayakuralu,” meaning the lady-leader, obviously of the king and the kingdom.

Brahmana, who appears as “the embodiment of dharma” to majority of scholars and historians seem to have become aware of the right on the throne of Peda Mallidéva, when his ministerial position in the court of Nalagama was about
to be uprooted by the machinations of Nāgammā. The standard version of the epic-ballad gives that the boys were the sons of Viṣṇu Viḍyālaḍēvī but the analysis made in the preceding section of the chapter demonstrates that they were the sons of Mailamā, the Velanāṭi princess, probably cared and brought up by the former. Leaving the fanciful details about the estrangement between the king Nalagāma and these boys, who were his step-brothers119, it is important to note that Peda Mallidēva was ruling a part of the kingdom of Palanāḍu, side by side Nalagāma, as early as A.D. 1147. His claims to throne must have been upheld by Velanāṭi Rajendraçōda II, and probably some of the latter’s officers were assisting him in the administration of his realms. As such, the role of Brahmana in supporting the prince and bringing division of the kingdom, notwithstanding the explicit narrations in the epic-ballad, of almost all versions, has to be reassessed by a pragmatic analysis. Ostensibly, he might have gone over to the side of Peda Mallidēva, when his position in Gurazāla became shaky and infirm, the rivalry between the two ministers came to be transferred to be the rivalry between the two kingdoms, the Gurazāla and Mācerlā.

The standard version of the epic-ballad gives that Brahmana compelled Nalagāma by sending an expedition on Gurazāla, under Kannama, to assign Peda Mallidēva the share of the kingdom due to him. Nalagāma is said to have complied with the demand, out of respect to Brahmana and the prince moved to the banks of the river Candravahka along with his people. Brahmana relinquished his position as minister in the service of Nalagāma and followed Peda Mallidēva to serve as his minister. His grandiose personality, equivalent to lord Viṣṇu and reincarnation of lord Kṛṣṇa, was venerated and his command was honoured as that of the divine ordinance, in the kingdom of Peda Mallidēva and thus he was not only minister to the king but also his philosopher and guide as well, in all matters in material as well as moral. He is described to have found a place suitable for constructing the capital city for Peda Mallidēva, planned the city of Mācerlā and got it built.

The oral version has a different story to tell on these aspects—that Brahmana was overlord of a dominion, consisting of ninety villages; his mother Śīlamā
instructed him to take care of the young princes, Peda Mallidēva and his brothers, who were being harassed and victimized to ill-reputation by Nāgammā and finally made them jailed by Nalagāma, believing the reports that she gave about them—Brahmana secured their release and made Peda Mallidēva the king of the ninety villages under his own charge. Thus, it does not say about the division of the kingdom, but Peda Mallidēva was bestowed nominal kingship over a territory that originally belonged to Brahmana. It narrates the story of construction of the city of Mācerlā, by Brahmana, when Anugurāju was on his return journey to Pālamācāpurī, in the course of his pilgrimage and entered the valley of Nāgulēru; that Brahmana was very much impressed with picturesque beauty of the country and suggested the king to stay away there; planned and constructed the city, to be his capital. But, historically the town existed before the supposed pilgrimage of Anugurāju; it was his chief-town, wherefrom he was displaced by his agnate rival; his inscription in the name Vīrakāma II and another one that refers to his father as Cāgi Bēta, have been referred to above. The diversity of narration in different versions of the epic-ballad reduces their reliability in search of historical fact whereas the epigraphical sources point out the role the Velanāṭicōḍa king in the division of the kingdom in clear terms.

As the narration of the *Palanāṭivūra Caritā* goes, the kingdom of Peda Mallidēva was prospering under the guidance of Brahmana and the latter thought of getting the prince married and contacted Vīrāsōma, the king of Kālyāṅa\(^\text{120}\) to give his daughter in marriage to him. After some initial hurdles, the marriage took place and at the time, Brahmana came to know of the physical strength and valour of the *gollabōyas*, or *gollabanfus* in the service of Vīrāsōma and forced the princess of Kālyāṅa, the newly wedded wife of Peda Mallidēva, to ask for the cowherds under the care of *gollabōyas*, as her marital dowry. He is said to have threatened her to divert the mind of her husband from her and contract another marriage to him, if she did not comply with his advice. She asked accordingly and brought them to Palanāḍu together with the cattle-herds under their management. The addition of cattle-herds that the princess brought from Karṇāṭaka must have further augmented economic power of the kingdom of
Mācerlā under Peda Mallidēva and his mentor, Brahmana. In the matrimonial alliance with Kalyāṇa, which was hostile to the kingdom of Candōlū under the Velanaṭicōdas, B.S.L. Hanumantharao had seen political design of Brahmana, strengthening Velama power in Palanadu, against the latter’s opposition. He was under the impression that the Western Cāḷukyas were still in power at Kalyāṇa, and they were strong enough to face the Velanaṭicōdas. The Western Cāḷukyas were, by the time, replaced by the Kalacuris, of course, they were not friendly disposed to the Velanaṭicōdas and involved in wars for their survival against the revival of the Western Cāḷukyas.

Nevertheless, Nāgammā presented the news of the increasing prosperity and growing political power of the kingdom of Mācerlā, before the king Nalagāma and further impressed him with a strong fear of insecurity, as a result of the marriage of Peda Mallidēva with the princess of Kalyāṇa. She could convince the king that Brahmana was always an enemy to the kingdom of Gurazālā, and at any time he could invade the kingdom with the help of Kāḷacuris and set him aside\textsuperscript{121}, in favour of Peda Mallidēva and thus the king had to take immediate steps to suppress the kingdom of Mācerlā, by any means. Nalagāma gave her free hand to do all that was necessary, to avert the danger from the kingdom of Mācerlā to his own kingdom of Gurazālā. She sent bands of robbers and encouraged Cēncus, the fierce hill-tribe in the region of Palanādu to plunder the town of Mācerlā and the villages around, but the forces of Peda Mallidēva, under the leadership of Kannamadāsa\textsuperscript{122}, repelled the unruly bands.

The narration of this course of events in the epic-ballad, is more or less similar in both standard and oral versions, seems to have omitted some of the events in between and thus much confusion is created for historians. As it has been pointed out, both Nalagāma and his step-brother, Peda Mallidēva, were ruling over their respective divisions of the kingdom, as early as A.D. 1147, and the latter was supported and assisted by the Velanaṭicōdas. Gradually, the entry of Nāgammā in the politics and administration of the kingdom of Gurazālā created troubles to Brahmanāyudu, making his position thorny. He must have felt it difficult to stay there, relinquished his position and joined with Peda Malidēva
at Mācerlā—irrespective of his role in sponsoring the latter’s case and bringing about the division of the kingdom of Palanādu, whether it was his favour or not. But he was undoubtedly a man of selfishness to the core and aimed at self aggrandizement, as the oral version well attests, and will be explained in the course of discussion. Thus, he must have resented the presence of officials of Velanāṭiśīcōdas and their political influence on Peda Malidēva and with the view of eliminating the elements of Velanāṭi overlordship on the kingdom from Mācerlā and contracted matrimonial alliance of Peda Malidēva with the princess of ruling house of Kālyāṇā that was hostile to Velanāṭiśīcōdas, to serve as offensive and defensive alliance from the political point of view.

The epic-ballad, both the standard as well as oral versions attest to the fact that king of Kālyāṇā at the time was, Vītrasōma, who was the same as Sōmeśvara, alias Rāyamurāri Sōvidēva. He was one of the sons of Kājacurī Bijjala, who usurped imperial position the Western Cāḷukyas, about the year A.D. 1156 and abdicated throne, in favour of the former about the year A.D. 1168. But, Vītrasōma and his brothers seem to have ruled over different parts of the erstwhile imperial dominions, involved in warfare for mutual elimination on one hand and for their existence on the other, with the rising powers of the Hoyasājas in south and Yādavas in the north, former feudatories Western Cāḷukyas, who tried to take advantage of the decline of the suzerain power. Besides, the remnants of the imperial house of Western Cāḷukyas, Jagadēkamalla and Sōmeśvara IV were waging severe warfare to regain their lost power and by the year A.D. 1183, the latter could expel the Kājacuris and re-establish the Western Cāḷkyan Empire, of course, only as the last flicker. One of the generals of the Kājacurī king, Sōmeśvara, alias Rāyamurāri Sōvidēva, named Kāvapayya, rendered remarkable service to him, in his incessant wars with enemies all around and won the epithet, Kalcurya-rājya-sam=uddharaṇa, the one “who had upraised the sovereignty of the Kājacuris.” What is interesting in the present context is that an inscription from Honnali credits the general with victories over several enemies of the Kājacurī king, mentioning the Velanāṭiśīcōda king among them. The latter could probably be Gōṅka III, the son and successor of Rājendracōda II, eventhough the
exact causal background to the war between two kings, whose realms were separated by long distance, is not clearly known. However, the enmity between the two kingdoms is beyond doubt and it must have well-suited for the purpose of Brahmana, as explained above.

Even the Western Cālukyan king Sōmeśvara IV, was described in one of his inscriptions of the year A.D. 1184, as to have had the kings of Cōḷa, Lāla, Gauḍa, Malaiyāḷa, Teluṅga, Kaḷiṅga, Vaṅga, Pāṇcāla, Turuṅkha, Gūjrāja, Jajhauṭi, Māḷava, and Koṇkaṇa kingdoms were at his beck and call\textsuperscript{126}. Eventhough, this description is a glaring exaggeration, the kings of Cōḷa and Teluṅga in the list, probably signify the kingdoms of Kandūruḍās some principalities of the Telugu-speaking country in the neighbourhood, on the borders of Karpāṭakā, who might have accepted his suzerainty. There were three generals in his service, with name Brahma, though none of them can be identified with Brahmanāyudū, on sure grounds of evidence, the affinity of his name tempts to suggest that one of them could have been the Velama hero of Palaṇādu. The narrations of the epic-ballad of both versions, though divergent from each other, give the events of war that Brahmana fought for Vīra Sōma, which supports the conjecture. The statement in the epic-ballad that his family came from Kuntaladēśsa, lends support to the supposition. Any way, Brahmana must have sought to tie up the kingdom of Mācerlā with the ruling house of Kaḷyāṇā, as an antidote to the influence of Velanāṭicōḍas and thereby sought to strengthen his position.

As a matter of fact, the kingdom of Gurazāḷā, since the time of Anugurāja, does not seem to have secured friendly neighbours, from whom military assistance in times of need can be expected. Even their political and dynastic relations with Velanāṭicōḍas would have been strained, because of his aspiration for independence and ignoring the rights of succession, of the sons of their princess, Mailamā. As such, notwithstanding the narration of the epic-ballad, both the oral as well as the standard version, that the Velanāṭicōḍā king was the uncle of Nalaṅgāma and that he would come to the latter’s help, historical reality seems to be different. Probably, the Velanāṭicōḍa king was not on amicable terms
even with the kingdom of Mācerlā, because of the crooked politics of Brahmana, though he was not totally apathetic to the problems of Peda Mallidēva.

The epic-ballad gives that Brahmana came to Gurazālā to remonstrate with Nalagāma upon his wanton wickedness because of evil advisers; the king received him with respect and assured that such things will not recur in future, but, Nāgamā did not like to leave the occasion without utilizing for her advantage. She created a situation in which Brahmana was provoked to take up challenge for a cock-fight, with the condition of the losing party to leave the kingdom and spend seven years of exile. The cock-fight was arranged, but ended in disaster for the kingdom of Gurazālā; Peda Malidēva had to leave the kingdom in accordance with the conditions of wager, together with Brahmana and the Heroes of Palanādu under his leadership, along with families and female folk as well as cattle herds, to live in exile. They crossed the river Kṛishṇa and built a town called Maṇḍādī, where they lived for three years, during which time the popularity of Brahmana and prosperity of the kingdom continued to increase. Nāgamā continued her machinations to suppress the progress of the kingdom of Peda Mallidēva, for which she dispatched a band of robbers to plunder the cattle and the town of Maṇḍādī, led by a desperado, named Vīdhula Palinīdu.

B. V. Krishnarao supposed that “Brahmana could not oppose the raiders in open battle for apparently his master, Nalakāma, was powerful and enjoyed the support of Velanāṭi Rājendracōda II, the most powerful king of the Āndhra country at that time, who was the maternal uncle of the king.” He cited in support of his supposition, the episode of the raid on Maṇḍādi in the Palanāṭivīra Caritrā describing Velanāṭicōda, apparently the Rājendracōda II, as one of the rulers in Dakṣiṇapathā and south, to have been one of the bitter enemies of Peda Mallideva. But this supposition cannot be accepted, at the first instance, the standard version of the epic-ballad does not name the Velanāṭicōda among the enemies of Peda Mallidēva and secondly, that he was Peda Mallidēva and not Nalagāma, who was the nephew of the king, as concluded in the analysis made above. It has been amply made clear that the bardic composers and folk singers of the epic were under confusion between the queens and sons of Anugurāja; they
mistook them and created confusion among the readers and audience of the epic-ballad. However, the Velanāṭiçaṇḍa king does not appear to have come to the rescue of his nephew, Peda Mallidēva, because of the latter was under the spell of machinations of Brahmana, as a result of which, married a Kaḷacurī princess. Brahmana must have obviously expected the Kaḷacurī king Vīrasōma, alias Rāyamuāri Sōvidēva, could come to help his son-in-law, Peda Mallidēva, when he contracted the latter’s marriage with the former’s daughter; but the king himself, was in the midst of calamitous troubles at the time and resorted to the protection of his son-in-law. Thus, Brahmana decided to shift his camp from Maṇḍāṭi, for the safety of female folk and children in the families of heroes of Palanāḍu and of the cattle wealth. He crossed the river Kṛiṣhhā and proceed southwards towards Tripurāṇtakam, where he is said to have built a town called Mēḍapī, where they spent the remaining period of exile.

After the expiry of the period of exile, Brahmanāyuḍu demanded the return of the kingdom to Peda Mallidēva and sent the prince Rācamalla, alias Alarāja, to the court of Nalagāma, as emissary to plead the case. Rācamalla was the son of Kommarāja and grandson of the Kaḷacurī king, Vīrasōma and son-in-law of Nalagāma, by marrying the latter’s daughter Pērāmbā129. Nalakāma rejected the demand and Rācamalla angrily left Gurazāla, back to Mēḍapī, but he was poisoned to death by the contrivance of Nāgamāma and Narasimharāja. Brahmana was very much enraged with the wicked deed, the murder of Alarāja, and decided in favour of war with Nalagāma, with the duel purpose of taking back the kingdom of Peda Mallidēva as well as to take revenge of the death Alarāja. He marched at the head of the heroes of Palanāḍu to invade Gurazāla and thus the Battle of Palanāḍu became imminent.

But the oral version suggests in a relative degree of clarity that Brahmana had intentionally sent Alarāja to the court of Nalagāma, having fully known that he was going surely to be killed there; thereby he would have no competitor to his unquestioned power and authority in the kingdom of Peda Mallidēva. As it has been explained above, Brahmana was a man of egoism and self-aggrandizement to highest degree, who would not tolerate any rival in his way of exercising power.
and influence over the king Peda Mallideva. He was a Velama, feeling superior even to the rājus, in other words, the traditional ruling families from the past, who were supposed to be Kṣhatriyas.

7. The Battle and Its Outcome:

_Palanāṭivīra Caritrā_ gives that Nalagāma made elaborate preparations for war, by summoning all types of his armed forces and inviting a number of rulers of different kingdoms in the country, to come to his help with their armies. The Chapter, called “Kallu Pratiṣṭhāḥ”, in the standard version gives a long list of kings and kingdoms, conventionally referring to them as countries¹³⁰, implying that they fought the Battle on his side¹³¹. This is one of the similarities of composition of the epic-ballad, with the style of composition of the classical epics, especially the _Mahābhārata_. The great epic gives that all the kings of Jambūdvīpā took part in the Great Bharata War, on one or other side of the contenting parties, and the lists of kings and kingdoms appear at the beginning of every _parvan_, of the five battle-parvans, running into several hundreds of verses. Similarly, the epic-ballad, _Palanāṭivīra Caritrā_ gives a long list of kings and kingdoms in the context, scattered over the entire subcontinent, which appears on its very face as merely conventional, modeled on the basis of similar descriptions in the epics. There cannot be any doubt that the bardic poets would have had no knowledge of those countries, except by overhearing the epic-purānic discourses from exponents, usually in temples in the villages. The folk poets inflated the lists beyond limits of propriety, out of their fanciful exaggeration by including chieftains that were fictitious, besides several others of the time, who were not related with Āndhradēśa at all, not to speak of the Haihayas of Palanādu. Yet, some of them were historical personalities, whose periods of rule are taken to determine the date of the Battle.

B.S.L. Hanumantharao¹³², ostensibly believing the lists to have been historically factual, drew conclusion that the fact Nalagāma and Nāgammā could enlist support from so large a number of contemporary kings, whereas Peda
Mallidēva and Brahmana could not, undoubtedly because of the socio-religious reform that Brahmana started. He suggested that most of the ruling powers of the time must have felt it an insult, for it had undermined their prestige by equating all castes and all castes with the ruling Kṣatriya caste. Further, he suggested that the political support that they could enlist points out Brahmana but not Nāgammma, the arch villain of Palanadu and the embittered feelings of contemporary powers alienated them from the kingdom of Mācherlā.

But even those that are supposedly come in support of Nalagāma hardly appear to have been really interested in the king and his minister, Nāgammma. They cannot be said even bitterly opposed to the religious movement of Brahmana, but they had their own ambitious designs of conquest and extension of power into the region, for which they appear to have found the event as the opportune moment. For example, the Kākatiyas were, under Prōla II and his son Rudrādeva I, making unsuccessful inroads into the Vēngī country under the Velanāṭīcōdas, for the last three decades, in order to extend their dominions into coastal plains. As such, the Battle of Palanāḍu and the appeal of Nalagāma for military assistance in its context must have been a heaven sent opportunity to Rudrādeva (A.D. 1155-95), who is said to have readily responded to his appeal and sent nine thousands of infantry and a thousand cavalry. He seems to have invaded the kingdom of Dharaṇikōṭa, about the year A.D. 1181, which was under the rule of Bhīmarāja, or Dōdabhīma, one of the kings that came in support of Nalagāma, responding to his call. The Kākatiya king, Rudrādeva I, defeated and killed Bhīmarāja and placed his son, Kēta II on the throne, by which he was able to remove one of the most important subordinate vassals of the Velanāṭis and could take them under his suzerainty. Thus, he got the doorway to coastal Āndhradēśa kept opened for his further conquests, at his own time. By the year A.D. 1185, Rudrādeva appears to have acquired suzerainty over the entire region of Palanāḍu, the western part of the modern Guntur district—from Koḍḍapallī in the vicinity of Vijayawada, in northwest to Tripurāṇtakam in southwest, as attested by his inscriptions.
Another king, who was reportedly came in support of Nalagāma was Virabhallāṇa, who is taken identical with the Hōyasala king, Viraballāḷa II (A.D. 1173-1220), who was nursing ambitions of territorial expansion towards East Coast. The Hōyasalas were one of the feudatories of the Western Cālukya Empire, like the Kākatīyas, they too probably felt to have been entitled to the overlordship of entire domain of their erstwhile suzerain and sought to extend their hegemony over southern part of Āndradēśa. It has to be noted that Kākatīyas, who began to extend their imperial authority over the coastal and southern Āndradēśa, following the Battle of Palanāḍu, but especially under Gaṇapatidēva, had to wage wars with the Hōyasalas, in southern Āndradēśa. The battle must have provided them the opportunity, for their initial policy of expansionism. Kētarāja of Dharaṇikōṭā was one among the chiefs, who is said to have led emissary to Brahmana, sent by Nāyakurālu, who is taken identical with Kētarāja II, son of Bhīmarāja II, referred to above. He was placed on the throne of the Kōṭa kingdom of Dharaṇikōṭā by the Kākatīya king Rudradēva II. Since the father and son in the Kōṭa line of kings are mentioned, the Battle is considered as to have taken place in the year A.D. 1181.

Another contemporary king was Rayamurari Sovideva, alias Somēśvara, the king of Kalyāṇa, who gave his daughter in marriage to Peda Malidēva, who is known to have ruled in the period A.D. 1167-77. Probably, he was not alive at the time and his son Kommana participated in the Battle, as the commander of forces of Peda Mallidēva, on the third day of the Battle.

Both the armies met at Kārempūḍi, on the bank of Nāgulērū, for the final showdown, but curiously enough, Nāgammā alias Nāyakurālu is said to have sent a diplomatic mission, under the leadership of Kētarāja of Dharaṇikōṭā to negotiate for a peace settlement. It seems rather incongruous for her to send the mission for peace talks, after carefully working for precipitation of matters for years of time, leading to battle. It cannot be said that she was probably afraid of the army, led by Brahmana, as she used to say time and again that it consisted after all sixty six heroes and thus, no match to the formidable armies Nalagāma. As it appears, it could not be more than a poetical technique, on the model of similar mission,
described in the epics, before the Great Wars and ended in failure. But undoubtedly, the usage of technique shows immaturity of thinking and imperfectness in treatment, of the bardic poets. The diplomatic missions in the epics were described to have been sent by the party of heroes to the courts of their opponents to convince that wars are disastrous and amicable settlement was always for the good of the people as well as the ruling powers. But in the present context, it was sent by the party of opponents to the court of the heroes, with the proposal of returning back the kingdom of Mācererā as well as surrendering Narasimharāja to Brahmana so that he could punish him in whatever manner he would like, for managing the assassination of Alarācammallu. When the negotiations were progressing to the satisfaction of both the parties, Bālacandra is said to have plunged in the midst of the army camp on his horse-back, rebuked the heroes of Palanādu for their meekness and timidity as they were inclined for peace at the time, forgetting all the wrongs committed by Nāgamnā for years and especially, contriving the murder of Alarācammallu. The heroes of Palanādu are said to have rose in unbounded spirits of war and vengeance, unheeded the warnings of Brahmana to keep restraint and thus the Battle is said to have begun.

The Palanāṭivīra Caritrā of both versions give that the Battle lasted for three days; Bālacandra led the armies of Mācererā during the first two days while the armies of Gurazālā were led by Narasimharāja and both died on the second day, the former killing the latter and himself having succumbed to injuries. Kajacuri Kommana, son of Sōvidēva, and father of Alarācammallu, took the place of Bālacandra while the Gurazālā army seems to have been led by Nāgamnā herself on the third day of the Battle. All the kith and kin of Nalakāma as well as Brahmanāyuddu fell on the battlefield, the tradition recorded in Krīdābhirānam136, giving the number of warriors fell was sixty-five on the side of Gurazālā, that is to say all except Brahmana and on the other side, only the king and his minister, Nāgamnā.

The standard version of Palanāṭivīra Caritrā gives that Brahmana won the war, and that Nāgamnā, or the Nāyakurālu fled away from the battlefield137, but she was brought before him and she had chivalrously spared her life and pardoned
her wrongs. But, he himself was greatly smitten with grief and horror at the death of his beloved kinsmen, especially his son Bālacandra and the king Peda Mallidēva, left politics of Palanādu to conduct penance in the caverns at Guttikopda. He is further said to have anointed Nalagāma to the kingdom of Palanādu, instructed him all the virtuous and meritorious ways of ruling the kingdom and left for Guttikopda. But this conclusion of the epic-ballad was only to keep consonance with the epic-tradition, of ending the story with victory of the virtue on evil and in all probability could have been even otherwise. Some historians had noted different traditions, ostensibly recorded in some other versions of the epic-ballad, that even Brahmanāyudu was also killed on the battlefield.

Leaving the legendary accounts in the epic-ballad, mentioned above, purely from historical point of view, Nalakāma won the war; as the standard version gives that he was placed on the throne by Brahmana himself. It was, in other words, Brahmana admitting his defeat rather than exhibiting his magnanimity and superhuman personality. It was mainly because, Peda Mallidēva, on whose side Brahmana was manipulating the events towards the war, resorted to prayopavēśā or the austere way of leaving life, having been disgusted with the loss of his kith and kin in the Battle. While some versions explicitly narrate the event of Nalagāma winning the war and compelling the recalcitrant Brahmanāyudu and his followers to sue for peace, this is a mystical justification of the latter’s defeat, adopted in the standard version.

Notes and References

1 V. Yasodadevi, JAHRS., XIX, p. 1, pointed out that a number of ruling powers in several parts of Deccan and Central India, between the rivers Ganges and Kāvērī, claimed descent from the Haihayas.
2 For example, the Nāgastambhā inscription at Gurazālā (SII., X, 27) gives the eulogy of the kings, as: Samadhigata-paṇcu-mahāśabda|Maha-maturdaykṣvara|Anēk-āṭṭunga-taraṅga-samghatā-lāvan=ōdadi-vēlā-valayita-Gaṅgā-paryantā-Madhyadēṣa-ādhīśvara|Māhiśmati-pura-var=ēśvara|Ahihaya-vanā=ōdbhava|Āṭṛayagōtra|Ātyugra-nara-śirōdarpaṇa-dhvaṭa... .. .. .. ghōṣṭhāya|Sahasrabāhu-pratāpa-vīrya-

For example, the inscriptions of the Cālukyas of Kalyāṇa as well as Vēṅgī, give a number of stories about the origin of the dynasty from fabricated mythologies as well as tracing their descent from the celebrated Kṣatriya dynasties of epic and puranic tradition. Some of the inscriptions trace their origin to the lunar Kṣatriya dynasty of the Bharatas and at the same time some other trace from the solar Kṣatriya dynasty of Ikṣvakus of Ayodhya. But the early Cālukyas of Bādami and their Āndhra branch did not take interest in such fabricated stories of their origin, which can be said to have commenced from about ninth century onwards. Correspondingly about the time, the inscriptions of the Pallavas begin to describe that they were descendants of Aṣvathāma, son of Drūg-ācārya, one of the Brāhmaṇa heroes in the great epic *Mahābhārata*, notwithstanding the fact that he was a bachelor. The composers of the inscriptions concocted suitable legends to show that Aṣvathāma who was undoubtedly a bachelor, had a son even without his knowledge, on an *apsaras*, by name Madani. The legends give that the boy, called Cūta-Pallava, was progenitor of the Pallava dynasty.

A number of local chieftains in coastal Āndhradēśa, especially in the territory under study claim that they were descendants of Trinayana, or Trilōcana Pallava, thereby claim that they were descendants of Pallavas, while some other trace their descendants of Karikālacōla. Both the kings were mythical personalities, whose historicity is not yet satisfactorily established, but the inscriptions of the local chieftains describe the greatness of those distant ancestors in greater length than their own. It was obviously, seeking legitimacy for their political power from the pretensions, to project themselves as holders of political power from a distant past, as it was undoubtedly one of the factors for legitimization of political authority and making it acceptable to people. Even though, their pretensions need not be brushed aside, for some of their ancestors might have served some Pallava or Cūḷa king and thus they boasted descent from the mythical kings of past, there can be no doubt about that the chieftains essentially belonged to the local peasantry.

The Nāgastambha inscription at Mācerlā describes the kings as belonged to the lineage of the Śitāmśu, in other words, Moon.

V. Sundara Rama Sastry, *"A Study of Socio-Cultural Dynamics in the Emergence of the Andhras", PAPHC, XX, pp. 31 ff.*, is a trend setting study in recent times about the mobility of peoples in ancient times, including the Cēdi-Haihayas, in the metamorphic process of making of Andhras and their culture. It had highlighted on settlements of the Cēdi-Haihaya, also known as Aīra-Mahāmēghavāhans, to have came up on either side of the river Kṛiśnā, about the beginning of the Christian era, as revealed by inscriptive and numismatic evidence. He pointed out that they rose up as a sequel of the invasion of the Mahāmēghavāhana king, Kharavela, on Āndhradēśa, challenging a Sātvāhana king, Sātakarnī. The Hathigumpha inscription of king, Epi. Ind., XX, pp. 71 ff., describing him as Cēdiraja-vasa-vadhana line 1, p. 79, (Cēdiraja-vamsa-vardhana in Sanskrit) means that he was born in the lineage of the king of Cēdi,
which was the name of an ancient tribe, celebrated in epics and purāṇas, synonymous to Haihaya.

An inscription from Satrasāla in Palanādu, cited by T.V.L. Narasimharao, gives the reading as Haihaya, obviously a scribal error for Haihaya and another inscription from the same place gives the reading, Ahihaya, which is found in the Nāgastambha inscription at Gurazālā as well, SII, X, No. 27, line 28, and an inscription from Kodamagundā, SII, X, No. 119 gives the reading in compound of words as Māhiśmati-puravarēśvaraihaya-vamś=ōdbhavan-Ātreyagōtira, etc. The syllable ‘na’ in the ‘naihaya’ and n-Ātreyagōtira was the last syllable of the preceding words, indicating nominative case in Kannada and thus plainly the terms are ‘Aihaya’ and ‘Ātreyā’. The former, the dynastic cognomen, is undoubtedly a corruption of the word Haihaya, which was the correct form found in the literary works in Sanskrit.

V. Yasodadevi, JAHRS., XIX, pp. 28-29, suggested that the Haihayas of Palanādu might have been a branch of the Haihayas of the Kōnāmaṇḍala.


The Kājācuri-Cēdi king invaded Vēṅgī kingdom during the rule of Vijayāditya VII about the last quarter of the eleventh century, but the event does not seem to have left any lasting impression on the history of the region. However, it may not be improbable to suppose that some of his military officers to have stayed back in Andhradēsa and eventually founded their own power and fortune at some places. But, it is quite significant to note that the Kājācuri king was ruling over Jubbalpore region in Central India, the region wherefrom Anugurāja is described in some of the versions of Palanāṭī Vītra Caritra. See below, for details of the discussion on the original home of the Haihayas of Palanādu.


The record expressly gives Rēvināyaka was a feudatory of Bētarāja, in the expression as ‘tann=ēlina-dora, meaning the lord that rules over him.

The term raffadi means the lord of a rāṣṭra, being the corrupted and shortened form of the Sanskrit term, rāṣṭrā=ādhi(pati). Thus the statement literally means the lord of Māhiśmati-dēsa, in other words, Madhyadēsa with Māhiśmati as its capital. It is true that the term, in its further linguistic transformation, eventually became “Reddi”, a caste connotation, which is now held as a suffix in personal names of an economically and politically powerful agricultural community in modern Andhra Pradesh. But it is absolutely baseless to suppose Mandādi Rēvināyaka, was a Reddi by caste, because of the epithet, raffadi, as he was specifically mentioned as the raffadi or reddi of Mallavēripurā, obviously meaning that he was the headman of the town, Mallavēri. The suffixes in personal names such as ‘nāyaka’ and ‘reddi’ cannot be said to have manifested into caste designations, by the time, as B.S.L. Hanumantharao Rao, (Social Mobility in Medieval Andhradesa,) supposed. Vide infra, for a detailed discussion on the caste conflict, of Kamma-Reddi-Velama, as one of the potential causes for the Battle of Palanādu, as he sought to make out.
Prof. B. S. L. Hanumantharao, *Social Mobility in Medieval Andhradesa*, p. 111, viewed that the geographical position of Palanadu, on the borders of the Western Cālukyan and Cālukya-Cōḷā empires and that it was subjected to the repeated invasions of the former and consequently to changing political fortunes in the course of their warfare. As such, the Professor suggested that the Haihayas of Palanadu were wisely changing loyalties between the two, as and when the times demanded. But, it appears more logical that, under the prevailing political condition of the country, that the Haihayas were the feudatories of the former, from the beginning, and never changed to the side of the Cālukya-Cōḷā, before Anuguraja married the princess of the Velanāṭiṃḍās, by which time the Cālukya-Cōḷā empire remained namesake.

The Sōmaśīla inscription of the Haihaya king Sarasvatidēva is almost in Kannada, while other records from Palanadu also show Kannada influence, in the 'n'-endings of nominative cases. For example ...mandalēśvaran-anēk=ōittuṅga; puravaran-aihaya-vamṣ=ōdbhava-Aśrāya-gōṭra-pavitrāṇ-ētyugra, etc. in the Pedakodamagundla inscription, *SII.*, X, 199. Also note no. 7 above.

Inscriptions of the Velanāṭi chief, RājēndracSda II, often refers to his victories over the armies of Kuntalā, which term stood for the Western Chalukyan kingdom. The country of Kuntalā corresponded with the northern part of the modern Karṇāṭaka State, the Raichur, Bidar and Gulbarga districts with surrounding regions.

But the prefix “Cāgī” in his name is intriguing, as it stands for altogether a different royal line that ruled over the country, on the north of the river Kṛṣṇā, apposite to Palanadu in the modern Guntur district, contemporaneously and contiguously. What made the Haihaya chief to call himself as of Cāgī cannot be explained nor the earlier scholars attempted to do it.

The names Anugum-Gāma and Birudum-Gāma are plainly Anugu-Kāma and Birudu-Kāma, respectively, being the results of *sandhi* rules in Telugu Grammar. Scholars have noted that the name, “Kāma” appears customary in the Haihaya family of Palanadu, as most of the kings held it as a part of their name.

Thus, the verse seems to equate the king with Lord Viṣṇu, whose consort was Lākṣmī and who was also the lord of the earth-goddesses, truly in accordance with the concept of monarchy in classical tradition, as well as Arthaśāstra literature. It is well known that since the time of the Cālukyas of Bādami, who styled themselves as Śrī-prithvi-vallabha, meaning the lords of the goddesses of earth and wealth, it has become customary to describe the kings, in such terms, in the inscriptional as well as poetical compositions.

The verse describes the greatness of the mothers who gave birth to the said divinities, *viś-ā-vis* the king, and has to be understood as, just like Aditi gave birth to Viṣṇu, by Kaśyapa and Anāśyā gave birth to the Moon, by Atri, Dārumā gave birth to Bēṭkāṃpatī, by Virakāma.

The inscription describes the king in two verses, first of them reading, 


It means that Rājarāja was born in the lunar dynasty, the husband of the fair damsel of victory, the lord of Madhyadesa, the capable of protecting the whole world, being adept in the knowledge that is suitable to a king; who was virtually the god of love in handsomeness and conqueror of the whole world by means of his fame. Next verse reads as, 

Tasmdt-samjatd-Birudankarudra-SrTBetabhupatih-k}itip-agragaJ}yah\ which means, of him (that is of Rājarāja) was born Birudānka-Rudra who is counted at first among the kings.

Their inscriptions register the gifts, made by them, to some of the famous temples that were already standing, but none of them report of their construction of any new temple.

These generals invaded coastal Andhradesa about the year A.D. 1118, which coincides with the coup carried on by Birudānka Rudra on Mācariā under the rule of his cousin, Anugu-kāma.

It is extremely difficult to subscribe to the view, for the feudatories in medieval Andhra were neither basically loyal nor disloyal to their suzerain powers, but were always cautious and tactful so as to take advantage of the situation and exploit opportunities. They remained loyal if it was advantageous for them, or revolted and proclaimed their independence, when they thought that they were powerful enough. Especially when the ballad is clearly repeating the celebrated story in the purāṇas, that took place in hoary past as the cause of sin, there appears no sincerity and seriousness of purpose in the pilgrimage of Anugurāja; and the attempts of historians to extract historical facts out of it, relevant to the time, is not logical.
The term mudiseli is synonymous to Mahāpradhāna, as it appears in some other inscriptions in the latter sense.

List of Historical Antiquities, I, App-A, p. 2.


JAHRS., XIX, p. 31.

Palanāṭṭivīra Caritrā, Introduction, p. xi.


The Kandurucoda chiefs Bhimadeva and Gōkarṇa were referred to in the thousand pillar inscription of Rudradēva, of the Kākaṭyā dynasty, that the latter was an opponent of the chief and his father, Prōla II, implying that the former was their friend and ally.


Ibid., ll., 313-17.


T. V. L. Narasimharao (op. cit., p. 10) on the other hand, writes that the itinerary of Anugūrāja had not included any sacred spot of north India, but speaks of his visit to Koṇḍavēdu, Cīrāla, Pērāla, Cīnagājām and Pēdāgājām, Tirupati, Śrīraṅγam, Kāṇči, Kājaḥastī, Ahōbilam, Mahānandī and Parvatam, that is Śrīśailam, etc., most of them being within the Telugu-speaking country. The standard version of the epic does not report all these names, but oral tradition, recorded by G. H. Rougher, refer to them, The Epic of Palanadu, p. 188.


T.V.L. Narasimharao, opp. cit., p. 26, suggested that Vūrakōṭā is identical with Tumrukōṭā in the northwest corner of Palanāḍu but the place and the name, as the epic-ballad refer to, seems to be imaginary and not realities.


T.V.L. Narasimharao has not noted this event, as his studies are based more on the oral traditions of the Viravidyāṭīham.

The Epic of Palanadu, Opp. cit., p. 47.
Opp. cit., p. 73.

The Epic of Palanadu, Opp. cit., p. 163.

The Epic of Palanadu, p. 73.

Standard edition of the epic-ballad gives that Uttara, the son of Pēramāḷa, the king of Vūrakōṭṭa, who was defeated and killed by the armies of Anugurāju, gathered a number of chieftains in the neighbourhood and marched on the latter, to avenge the death of his father in his hands. Oral version also gives the details of the war, but differs in the names of persons as well as the course of the war. T. V. L. Narasimharao, opp. cit., p. 66, suggests that Arāgāṇḍāḷ is situated 15 Km southeast of Mācarlā, but his suggestion that Anugurāja would not have drawn political and military support from the Velanāṭis, in the context of the war, cannot be accepted in the light of analysis, made in the present study. The standard edition of Palanāṭivīra Caritrā states the king married Mailama earlier than the event, in which case, he must have been helped by the Velanāṭicōḍa king in the battle.

Ibid., ll. 595-604.

B. V. Krishnarao, History of the Chalukyas of Vengi, pp. 570-574 and B. S. L. Hanumantharao, opp. cit., pp. 116-17. Palanāṭivīra Bhagavatam, of Mudigonda Virabhadrakavi, I, 64, narrates the event.

B.V. Krishnarao, opp. cit., p. 570, note 2, explains further that there was nothing new in a Kṣatriya king adopting a Śūdrā as his son, and cited the example of the Cāḷukya-Cōḍa emperor, Kulottuṅga Cōḍa I adopting Velanāṭi Rājendrācōḍa I, but nowhere the former had proclaimed to have adopted the latter as his own son. It is found in the inscriptions of Velanāṭicōḍas, with the aim of boasting their loyalty to the suzerain and to exaggerate their relations with him, but the historian had literally understood the statement and believed as factual truth and thus cited it as an example in the context. As such, it did not involve legal provisions, as there was in fact no adoption. It is quite often found in the inscriptions medieval Andhradeśa, some chieftains as to have called themselves as the sons of their suzerain lords. It is interesting to note that another chieftain of the same name, Rājendrācōḍa II, of the Haihaya family of Kōṇa country was also said to have been adopted by Kulottuṅga Cōḍa I, in their inscriptions. As a matter of fact, the emperor Kulottuṅga Cōḍa I, had a number of his own sons, who succeeded him on the throne and thus he would not have at all adopted Velanāṭi Rājendrācōḍa II as his own son. These are only political expediencies with absolutely no social significance.

The case of Anugurāja adopting Bāḍānāyyudhu is not at all supported by the standard version of Palanāṭivīra Caritrā, and the oral version suggests that it was more a fanciful understanding between the two women, Śīlāmā and Vīravīdayalādevī, with no political significance. Thus, neither the explanation of B. V. Krishnarao, nor the argument of B. S. L. Hanumantharao (op. cit.) following it, is acceptable on logical grounds. Similarly, T. V. L. Narasimharao (op. cit., p. 36) observing that there would not have been adoption actually, since a boy of other gōtra, than that of the family, would not take place—does not make a sound historical argument. A Kṣatriya king adopting a boy from a Śūdrā family may surprise the caste-ridden modern mind and meet with disapproval, but not to a politically sagacious medieval aristocrat. It has been made clear above, that the term Kṣatriya was never a caste-cognomen to have phenomenal existence, but only a vārya, generally misunderstood to be a caste.
180
78 Palanăți Viragăthâ (Telugu),opp. cit., p. 36. However, his analysis leading to the conclusion that there was actually no adoption, because a Kṣatriya king adopting a boy from a Śūdra family may surprise the caste-ridden modern mind and be disapproved, but not to a politically sagacious medieval king. It has been made clear above, that the term Kṣatriya was never a caste-cognomen, but only a varya, and had no phenomenal existence as a caste.


In fact, this theory was promulgated first, by Sewell, Antiquities, I, App. A. p. 3, on the basis of some oral version as well as the narration in the Palanățiivăra Bhāgavatam, of Mudigonda Virabhadrakavi. Maddlapalli Gurubrahma Sarma, who edited the poetical work, had cited an inscription in his editorial introduction to his edition, which has been reproduced by T.V.L. Narasimharao, in the Appendix to his work, p. 121, and assigned it to A.D. 1159. Apparently the latter seems to have subscribed to the theory and thus reproduced it, but the record does no seem bear any such historical information. The actual course of events that followed the marriage of Badaraju with the princess of Peda Kancerla, as they have been narrated in the oral version, collected by Roghair, does not give even slightest hint to the political support he must have drawn from the latter house, as explained below.

81 Prof. Hanumantharao sought to make out some crucial socio-political developments out of the supposed adoption of Bādanāyudu, by Anugurāju, which are worthy of a critical analysis, to accept or to reject. At the first instance, his suggestion that Doddānāyudu and Teppalānāyudu were appointed respectively as prime minister and commander-in-chief, in accordance with the conditions at the time of Anugurāja’s marriage with Mailamadēvi, and that it was with the tacit aim of, Velama predomination in the politics of Palanădū. But, it is not borne from the evidence of the epic-ballad of any version and there is neither any logic in his conclusion that the Velamas reduced the king, Anugurāja, to a figure head. More curious is his corollary that the development must have had the tacit approval of Mailamadēvi, to make the succession of Bādanāyudu to the throne of Palanădū peacefully and legally valid. The argument lacks acceptability, for having no satisfactory answer to the doubt—what could have been the Velanăti interest in Velama community in promoting its predominance in Palanădū, were they Velamas, first of all? As the adoption is not referred to either in the standard or the oral version, so much conjecture as to the political expediency, in favour of the Velamas, is quite unwarranted and his characterization of the adoption as “admixture of Kṣatriya and Śūdra communities” hardly needs a critical examination, for he had equated varya with caste and came out in confusion.

82 Nalakama, with his surname ‘Virakama’, comes to be the third king to bear the name among the Haihayas of Palanădū, the second being Anugurāja himself, as explained above.

83 Book-I, ll. 958-964. The oral version, presented by Roghair, The Epic of Palanadu, p. 216, gives that “Alugurāja had three wives, Mailamā Devī, Bhūramā Devī and Vīra Vidyāla Devī. Vīra Vidyāla Devī was the first wife; Bhūramā Devī was the second; Mailamā Devī was the third. One wife had several sons. They were Nalagama Rāju, Narasīhga Rāju, Jatīṣṭa Māḷā Rāju, Gaṭṭiṣṭa Māḷā Rāju and Kāma Rāju. She had five sons. One mother had three Malīdēva Rājus: Cinna Malīdēva Rāju, Peda Malīdēva Rāju and Bāla Malīdēva Rāju.” He had further added an explanatory note,
note no. 1, p. 239, that Bhūramā Devī had no sons, Mailamā Devī had several sons and Vīra Vidyala Devī had three Malidēva Rājus. But in the course of narration of the Story no. 9, The Cock Fight, Roghair had presented that Alugurāja, while committing his sons to the cares of Brahmana, said that Vīra Vidyaladēvi had no sons and Bhūramādēvi had five sons and Mailamā had three. This fact clearly exemplifies that the various composers of the ballad and subsequent poets as well as scholars had no clear idea about the number of wives and sons of Anugurāju and the entire riddle lies in the divergences among various versions.

84 Standard Edition, p. 36, ll. 958-960. B.S.L. Hanumantharao, opp. cit., p. 120, gives a brief account of the even, probably in accordance with narration in the Palanāṭi Viragātha of Mudigopda Vīrabhadraṇa, that Brahmana refused to pay even the formal obeisance to Anugurāju after he was appointed as minister. But, the latter insisted the former to salute him, as he was advised by the other minister, Nāgammā. Because of the supernatural powers of Brahmana, a carbuncle sprang up instantaneously on the back of the king, which was unbearably painful and he asked the former to relieve him from the painful state. He did it by dispatching the king from the world and along with him, his own father, Doddānayudu. Oral version, collected and presented by Roghair, p. 219, gives more or less similar course of events that led to the death of Anugurāju and proclaiming the superhuman nature of Brahmana.

85 Palanāṭi Viragātha, Opp. cit. p. 69.

86 Ibid., p. 107.

87 Ibid., pp. 28-32.

88 Palanāṭi Viragātha, Opp. cit. pp. 33 ff. He explained that the name Mailamā was a combination of Mayī and Lamā both being the corrupt forms of Sanskrit terms, ‘Mahī’, meaning the Goddess of Earth and ‘Ramā’, meaning the Goddess of Wealth and thus synonymous to the name of the queen, Bhūramā. Sanskrit grammar permits the alternate usage of ‘ra’ and ‘īla’ (Ra-lay=or-abhēdāh) and thus the explanation is acceptable. B.S.L. Hanumantharao, opp. cit., p. 117, had also similarly explained the term, but curiously suggested that it implies her to have been the daughter of some less significant local chieftain! How the name of the princess would suggest that her father was an insignificant local chief, is not clear, for the names of princesses like Mailama were quite often in several ruling families of the time.

It can be understood, just by applying commonsense, that a prince in a ruling family would normally marry a princess from another family of equal political status, often with an eye on political advantage but, certainly not an ordinary girl from an ordinary family. Marriage alliances in ruling families were usually aspects of politics and diplomacy, with little consideration to caste status, or the boy and girl ideally matching each other, etc. It would have been a contribution to the understanding of the history of the Haihayas, if the learned Professor had pointed out the name of her father, rather than suggesting vaguely that he would have been an insignificant local chieftain.

89 Supra note no. 83.

90 Palanāṭi Viragātha, Opp. cit. p. 29
The restoration of Anuguraja to the kingdom, following his marriage with the Velanati princess would not have been long after Rajendracoda II fought the successful battle of Godavari, in the year A.D. 1132.

It has been included in the list of inscriptions, concerned with the Haihayas of Palanadu, by T.V.L. Narasimharao, *op. cit.*, in the Appendix-I, as inscription no. 9, which seems to have been first brought to light by Maddulapalli Gurubrahma Sarma, in his introduction to *Palanayivira Bhagavatam*, of Mudigonda Virbahadrakavi, but it does not seem to have been published by the Departments of Archaeology, officially in their journals.

It has been explained above that scholars in the past had not noticed that mother of Anuguraja was also named Mejam, or Mejambika, which was only a variant of Mezhambika or Mailama, and thus he could as well be called as Mailamadeva-Kamaraju. However, the identification of the king in the inscription with Anuguraja, as will be shown below, is unlikely and thus the interpretation is unwarranted.

The queen seems to be identical with Bhuramadevi, and not the Velanaji princess, as it will be shown below.

Ísanapeggada was minister of Rajendracoda II, who issued the Pedakodamagupdi inscription in the year A.D. 1147, referring to the rule of Mahamayalasvara Kamanivarajula Mallidivaraju, who could have been none other than Peda Mallideva, son of Anugu-kama, or Anuguraja. As such, the inscription suggests that the Velanajicoda overlordship continued all through the reign of Anuguraju and thus they must have supported Peda Malliderva, against the rule of Nalagama from Gurazalla.

V. Yasodadevi, *JAHRS.*, XIX, pp. 32-33, assigned his rule from A.D. 1147 to 1165, for fifteen years, at the same time noting that traditional accounts assign him a longer period of rule. She seems to have been quite reasonable in suggesting that the Battle of Palanadu took place sometime between A.D. 1175 and 1185 but had not noted this date of the battle goes against her suggested rule of Nalagama for only fifteen years, from A.D. 1147 and 1165.
Written by Mudigopda Virabhadrakavi in Classical style, in the middle of the eighteenth century and thus unsuited to be the source for studying the history of the Haihayas. Vide supra, Chapter-II, for analysis of source material and rejecting the work as unsuitable for the purpose of historical study.

It may be alternately argued that Anugurāja wanted Peda Mallidēva to succeed him, but instructed Brahmana to place Nalagāma on the throne, at the first instance, as the prince and his brothers were quite young. Eventhough, none of the versions of the epic is explicit on this point, the idea behind Anugurāja committing all his sons to the care of Brahmana and instructing him to see the interests of Peda Mallidēva and his brothers, was probably to pacify them so that they would not be prejudiced against Nalagāma ascending throne. But the fact, that he styled in his inscriptions as Mahāmanḍalēśvara, without reference to the Velanāṭcōḍa suzerainty, has to be kept in mind before making any hypothesis.

The standard edition does not give the course of events that led to the estrangement of Nalagāma and his step-brothers, obviously because of non-availability of relevant manuscript. On the other hand, its extant part of the second book, gives only that Nāgammā convinced the king about the misappropriation of state revenues and illegal accumulation of wealth by Brahmana and his supporters, p, 41, ll. 20-39. Then it gives rather abruptly that the king imprisoned Peda Malidēva and his brothers and Brahmana invaded Guraṇžālā in order to release them from prison, got them released and built Mācerlā to be his capital. On the other hand, the oral version, collected by Roghair gives that Nāgammā encouraged the young princes, Peda Malidēva and his brothers to do mischiefous deeds, as if encouraged their heroism and depicted their playful acts as wanton offences before the king, because of which he was enraged and ordered to imprison them. Further, it gives that Brahman selected the site for the construction of the city of Mācerlā, long back, as early as the itinerary of Anuguraju on his mission of pilgrimage, The Epic of Palanadu .

He is identified with Sōmēśvara alias Rayamurāri Sōvidēva, the Kalacuri king of Kalyāṇā (1167-76), one of the sons of Kalacuri Bijjula, who carried on the coup de état against the Western Cālukyan emperor, Sōmēśvara III and occupied the imperial throne. He might have extended help to Pedamalidēva during the latter’s exile, to occupy the region of Dēvarakonḍā, and to build the town of Maṇḍādi. But the Kalacuris were already in declining condition and in the year A.D. 1177, Sōmēśvara IV of the Western Cālukyas supplanted their authority and revived the imperial authority of his house, though for a short time and very feebly, but, the Kalacuri king appears to have sought asylum with Pedamalidēva, having lost his kingdom.}

There is good reason in the suggestion of T.V.L. Narasimharao, opp. cit., pp. 107-08, that Brahmanāyudu hailed from the region of Kollāpūr in Mahbubnagar district, whereto Anugurāju repaired after losing the kingdom of Palanādu. The king seems to
have gathered his followers from the region, when he decided to take up the conquest of his kingdom once again. Doddānāyudū, Teppalināyudū and the former sons, Bādānāyudū, Brahmanāyudū, Pērinādū, among others were important among the associates of the king, joined his service at that time. Rougher, *opp. cit.*, p. 297, refers to the oral version stating that these chiefs hailed from Kuntalā and the standard version, gives that Brahmana and Kommarāja, the brother-in-law of Peda Mallidēva had intimate relations for a long time in the past, which would not be possible unless both of them hailed from the same region, Kuntalā. As such, Brahmana could harm the kingdom of Nalakāma, if he had such an idea, but his selfishness and egoism and his ambition to be the sole powerful with no rival, prompted him to ruin the Kaḷa الكرCURIS of Kaḻyāṉa as well, as he ruined the Haihaya house of Palanādu, by means of his treacherous politics.

122 He was an outcaste, adopted by Brahmana as his own son, initiating him into his new church of Viṟavaiṉavism and was an implicit follower of the latter, in all his political and socio-religious activities. Thus, he too attained celebrity as one of the divine heroes in the ballad and a temple was erected for him at Kāṟēmpūḍi, in which he is still worshipped.

123 It gives the king of Kaḻyāṉa was Gaḻapati Sōmadevā, obviously because the bardic poets were totally ignorant of history of the country. Kaḻyāṉa was never under the rule of Gaḻapati kings, who appear as rulers of Kaḻingā, two centuries later. As such, these episodes in the epic-ballad, little connected with the main theme, the Battle of Palanādu, were obviously incorporated into it, sometime in the fifteenth century, when the region of modern Guntur district as well as the adjoining areas in Telingāṉa, passed under the rule of Gaḻapati kings and thereby the bardic poets came to know about them.


125 *Epigraphia Carnatica*, VII, H1.50.


127 Almost all scholars and historians took this town as identical with a village, which is presently about twenty miles south-west of Gurazāḷa, but T.V.L. Narasimharao has, on the other hand, rightly suggested that it is identical with the village of same name, presently in the Mīryalagūḍa taluk of Nalgonda district. The standard version of epic-ballad is very clear in its narration that Brahmana and his party arrived at the place, after crossing the river Kṛiṣhṇā, which is unnecessary if it was the same as first mentioned, on the south-west of Gurazāḷa. Thus, Brahmana led the exiled king, once again to the region where the Anugurāja had repaired in the past, under more or less similar circumstances. This could have been possible only when Brahmana was very much familiar with the country and was sure of comfortable shelter in the region. This is another supporting point to the fact that Brahmanāyudū and other Heroes hailed from Kuntalā, before they came to Palanādu.


129 B. S. L. Hanumantarao, *opp. cit.*, p. 137, viewed that Brahmana got Peda Mallidēva married to the daughter of the Kaḻacuri king, Somēśvara, *alias* Viṟasōma, to strengthen his own hold on the Haihaya kingdom and to increase the Velama
influence to the detriment of Velanāṭicōḍa overlordship. It was, of course, probable as it has been explained above, but his observation that Doddāṇāyuddha and his sons were always defiant to the Velanāṭicōḍa king, even while they were at Candolū, is not borne by the narration of the epic, either the oral or the standard version, as they were never in the service of the Velanāṭicōḍa king. An interesting fact is that the Kājacuris had similar familial relations with Nalagāma as well, because of Ala Racamallu, *alias* Alāraṇā, having married the latter’s daughter, Pērāṃbā, which may probably suggest that the matrimonial relations with them took place before the beginning of rivalry among the sons of Anugurāja and the rivalries were the result of conflicting interests of the ministers, Nāgammā *alias* Nāyakurālu and Brahmāṇyuddha.

130 II. 1104-1123

Among others, who were reportedly invited by Nalagāma, to take part in the Battle were Kēṭārāja, the Kōṭī chief of Dharanikōṭā, the son and successor of Bhīma II; the Kākātiya king Rudradēva II, who placed the former on the throne of Dharanikōṭā, having killed the latter in the battle. Another king was Uragaśēṇa, the ruler of Gōlaṇḍī, about whom there is no other source of information and even the existence of the territory appears more a fiction than fact, who might be a Nāga chief, as his personal name suggests. Another was Erukkāma, who was said to be the ruler of seven Mādes and the kings of Ponnāḷā and Pōdillē. The expression, seven Mādes, or the *Sapta-Mādes*, is a conventional territorial name that comes across in the Western Cāḷukyan inscriptions, suggesting the expansion of their imperial sway over the seven divisions of Māḷa (whose corrupt form was Māde) traditionally described and it was undoubtedly a conventionalized adaptation by the bardic poets, without knowing its import. The next was Kāṭaṇ═ādhipati, named Baladeva Puruṣottama, who was obviously the ruler of Kalinga, but the name comes across among the Gajapati kings of the country, who had not yet come into existence. The next name, Kājavarāya of Dēvāḍrī, was probably a variant of Kāḍavarāya, might have been a scion of Telugu Pallava prince, but the location of his kingdom indefinite. The kings Pedabāhu, Bhīmaśēṇa and the Cōḷa prince Sūryakumāra, Jayadeva, and Jayasinga, the ruler of Candrāṇḍrī, were all apparently fictitious, or at least their identities are not known. Of Vīraballāja and Aravasinga, the rulers of Karṇāṭā and Baṅgāḷā and Sāgi Pōtārāja of Gudimeḷṭā, the first mentioned was probably the Hoyasaḷa king, Baḷḷāla and the last was the ruler of a small kingdom, on the other side of the river Krishnā, who was of the same status as Nalagāma and thus he could have taken part in the Battle, on the invitation of the king.

132 Social Mobility in Medieval Andhra, *opp. cit*, p. 133.


134 *Text ll. 1106-07, Dharanikōṭa-puriki-dakṣhud-ainṭṭi | Bhīmedēvupn̄d-anu pṛthvīśunakunu...*]

135 *SII*, X, 241.

136 Verse 65

137 B.V. Krishnaraṇa, *opp. cit*, p.578.
The *Palanāṭīvīra Bhāgavatam* of Mudigōḍa Vīrabhadra Kavi gives the name of the king of Candōlu as Dhavajaśāṅkha, clearly a poetical fiction. The term ‘prithviśvara’, in the standard version of *Palanāṭīvīra Caritra*, was simply a poetical technique of using synonym to a king, in general sense, and does not seem to have been intended to specify Prithviśvara, the last of the Velanāṭi kings, in which case it would be a gross anachronism.