History is a systematic account of the events that influence a nation, an institution, Science and Art. Its purpose is to unveil the truth of the past events through which a human being can learn many novel and useful things and step further with all confidence to make his life meaningful.

It is defined that the history combines in itself not only an account of past events, but also many important instructions or advices on the four goals of life, such as Dharma, Artha, Kāma and Mokṣa.


Thus, it is evident that the history contributes a lot to the upliftment of society or nation.

History to Indians is just a means through which the inculcation in posterity of the fourfold object of life is to be attempted. That, the Europeans blaming Indians as
totally lacking historical sense, is unreasonable. There have been māraśamsiś, the seeds of historical writing even in the earliest literature. The real cause that prevented the growth of strictly historical literature in Sanskrit, is the peculiar attitude of Indians towards life as a whole.

We can collect rich historical elements of different periods from the Vedic literature. This epic poem, the Madhurāvijayām has been a standing proof of the historical facts relating to the ancestors and descendents of the Sangama dynasty. The Epics, the Purāṇas, the inscriptions coins, monuments, secular literature and the accounts of foreign travellers also help us towards this end. But the history that we find here is generally mixed with myths and legends peculiar to India. The Madhurāvijayām occupies an important place in the field of historical Sanskrit Mahākāvyas. The historical facts are found to be well supported by the grants and inscriptions of the reigns of different kings of the period.

The contents of the Madhurāvijayām are of great importance for the first hand knowledge of Vijayanagar Empire. A short time after its foundation, it throws light
on some facts not known before Kampana, the prince of Vijayanagar. The delimitation of history in the Madhurāvijayam begins with the description of the Empire of Bukkarāya, an younger brother of Harihara. Either Harihara or his empire is not described; rather he is referred to as younger brother of Bukkarāya.3

The evidence of Bitragunte grant4 of Sangama II dated 1350 A.D. records that Sangama I, the Father of Harihara I, had five sons. Harihara being eldest, Kampana and Bukka were second and third respectively. But this leaves the question that why did not Kampana succeed Harihara I, through rightful successor? and 'why' historians refer to Bukka as the next successor? This question has been attempted in various ways by many historians. But proper solution is not found out to supply the reason for Bukka's succession to throne. It is said that Kampana the second brother of Harihar I, was holding the Government of the province of Udayagirirāja, under the title and designation of the Lord of the Eastern and the Western oceans. This fact is well corroborated by the colophon at the end of the Madhaviya Dhatuvṛtti.5 According to B.S.Row, the said Kampana must have been content with his administration in Nellore and probably he was not
fully qualified for the post. However it is expressed by Gopinath Rao in his introduction to the Madhurāvijayam. Confirms that Kampana had died even before the death of Harihar in Saka 1268-69 and it gave accession for Bukka I, if he had not died, it would have been difficult for Bukka-I to mount the throne. In view of above controversy, it is not possible to arrive at conclusion concerning Bukka's succession. But, so far as the Madhurāvijayam is concerned, there is no scope for controversy in the fact that Bukka was the real successor. (M.V.I.26).

In A.D.1356, Bukka succeeded his brother Harihar I, to the throne of Vijayanagar. Already, he had been well acquainted with the problems of the new kingdom. In fact, he was an efficient ruler in the administration of different regions of the Kingdom. After obtaining the crown, he set himself to the task of getting rid of the hostile elements and consolidating the new Kingdom. He was a Kṣatriya. This is borne out by the propriety of various descriptions in this Kāvya. He is the most renowned of all the Kings of Vijayanagar. Some inscriptions clearly say that Bukka had enjoyed a great honour of having various titles like Mahāmandalesa, Arirāya, Vibhāda, Rājādhirāja,
Rajaparameswara, Suraträpa etc.. He has adorned the crown of fame which is described as, the lord of Eastern and Western oceans as may be seen from another inscription. He is compared with Arjuna and described as He drove out the enemies from many royal cities and ruled over an empire perfect in seven parts.

The King Bukka as stated in the Madhurävijayam has three sons by his queen, Deväyi viz., Kampana, Kampana and Sangama.

Gangadevi in her Madhurävijayam has added a new information to the stock of southern history. The two sons of Bukka I, having the same name, have produced great confusion and difficulty in the already confused state of genealogy of the first Vijayanagar dynasty. The name Kampana is addressed to both the sons of Bukka I. However from the inscriptions available from Madras presidency and Mysore...
state, it is understood that elder was called as Hiriya and younger was called Chikka. However, some of the epigraphists of Madras assign that Kumara Kampana, Chikka Kampana, Virabukkaraya Kampana and all those in which the prefix Hiriya etc., is used before the name Kampana, are assigned to his paternal uncle, Kampana (Intro pp 30-31). According to T.A. Gopinatha Rao, second brother of Harihara I, is presumed to have died before saka 1268 or 1346 A.D. Now, the inscriptions that belong to a date later than this one, and having the name Hiriya Kampana, should be ascribed to the elder son of Bukka I, and those which give the name of the prince as Chikka Kampana should be assigned to the reign of the younger son Kampana. Anyhow, the conclusion derived can be that Bukka I, had two sons having the same name (Intro. pp. 30-31).

Kampana II, son of Bukka I bore the titles of Mahāmaṇḍaleswara. Subduer of hostile Kings and lord of the four oceans. His influence had extended from Mysore in the North to Ramananda in the south.

The Madhurvilajayam states that Bukka I named his first son Kampana, because after his birth, the enemies of
Vijayanagar began to shake with fear. This description of Kampana's greatness in fact is not an empty praise of the king. It is corroborated by epigraphical evidence also. An inscription from Kolar, praises Kampana in the following words: "A Sun in unbounded valour, a moon incarnate inserenity, a unique treasure of music, a tree of paradise to the learned, intent upon establishing Dharma, Lord of the Goddess of Sovereignty with a name renowned among kings, was Vīra Kumāra Kampana." (Epigraphia Carnatica, Vol. X. Kolar No.222, dated 8th Feb. 1356) Kampana was entrusted by his father with the task of extending the Vijayanagara rule in the Tamil country. Kumara Kampana's main achievements are two; one, the conquest of the Sambhuvarāya territory and the annihilation of the Sultanate of Madhura. For the discussion of these two achievements, the Madhuravijayam and the epigraphical evidences engraved during the period of Kampana's conquest and his rule in the Tamil country.

As stated by Gaṅgādevī, Bukka I advised his son Kumāra Kampana to march against the Shambhuvarāya chieftain of Padaṇīdu in Tondaimandalam to defeat him in the battle and then to establish himself at Kanchi. The Sambhuvarāya is the leader of Vannīyas and he is preparing for war. If the
Vanniya ruler is subdued, it would be easier to break the power of the Muslims at Madhura. The Sultan of Madhura is ruling like the Rākṣasas of Laṅka. Just as Rāma destroyed the Rākṣasas including their leader Rāvaṇa, so too you have to destroy the Muslims. (Madhurāvijayam. III 41-43). The fourth canto of the Madhurāvijayam deals with in detail, Kampana’s marching against the forces of the Sambhuvar. The ending portion of this fourth can-to states that Kumara Kampana arriving with his army at Vīrinchipuram attached the forces of Sambhuvarāya which were then completely defeated and the leader took refuge in the hill fortress called Rājagambhiramāla. But the fortress was besieged.

Being unable to stand the siege for a long time, Sambhuvarāya came out of the fort with sword in hand. Then duel took place between them. At last, King Kampana despatched the Sambhuvarāya as a guest to Indra’s city. Having thus reduced the Sambhuvarāya in the field of battle, King Kampana received the decree of his father that he should rule the territory thus conquered, with the fame of his victory duly established in Kanchi, he inaugurated a just and prosperous rule over Tundiramanḍalam destroying all conclusion in castes and religious orders. (Madhurāvijayam
At this juncture, it should not be forgotten that the history of the Tamil Country refers to two great Sambhuvaraya ruler - Venrumankonda Sambhuvaraya (C.1321-1339) and his son Rajanarayana Sambhuvaraya (C.1339-1363). Here, a doubt arises as to who was the Sambhuvaraya that came into conflict with and defeated by Kampana of Vijayanagar. It has been an admitted fact that Kampana's conquests over different territories took place after A.D. 1340. Venrumankonda Sambhuvaraya flourished before the reign of Kampana. And the date of Rajanarayana Sambhuvaraya goes well with that of Kampana. A Krishnaswami asserts - "the inscription from Madampakkam dated A.D. 1363 simply mentions that Gandaaguli Marayya Nayaka, the general of Kumara Kampana captured one 'Venrumankonda Sambhuvaraya as prisoner and occupied Rajagambhiramalai. Does this name Venrumankonda Sambhuvaraya in any way suggest that he was the son and successor of Rajanarayana? The fact seems to be that Rajanarayan himself is referred to in the record as "Venrumankondan" which was the title assumed by his father. Therefore it was Rajanarayan Sambhuvaraya who was defeated by Kumara Kampana. But the above inscriptional evidence disproves the statement.
of Gangādevī that the Sambhuvaṇya was killed in a duel with Kumāra Kampana.

However, Gangādevī gives no date of the conquest of Tondaimandalam ruled over by Rājanārayana Sambhuvaṇya, by Kumāra Kampana. For this, one should rely on the inscriptive evidence. It is already known that Rājanārayana Sambhuvaṇya ruled over Tondaimandalam from A.D.1336 and lived up to 1363. His last regnal record from Ukkal (N.A.Dt.) bears the date of Saka 1284, Subritu. It refers to the 26th year of Rājanārayana's rule and yields the correct date of 30th March 1362. No inscription of Rājanārayana Sambhuvaṇya mentioning him as a ruler, after that date, is so far available. Two other inscriptions of Kumāra Kampana enable us to determine the date of the conquest with some accuracy. They are available from Serkadu in North Arcot district and both of them are dated 3rd January 1363. They registered the free colonisation of the temple precinctly the people and the order of Kumāra Kampana that the taxes collected from them should be utilised for worship in and repairs to the temple of Serkadu. This was done at the instance of Mahāpradhāni Somappa Udaiyav for the continuity of Kampana's rule. It is clear from these two
records that Kampana's rule was established in the Sambhuvarāya's territory before 3rd in January 1363. Hence the nearest approximate date of the conquest may be fixed between October and December 1362.19

In course of his expeditions, Kampana crossed the borders of the Karnataka and reached the Kantakanana.20. Kampana's army commanded by eminent Generals moved on to the banks of river Kṣīratarāṅgini and entered Virincipuram. Kampana made Virincipuram to be the base of his military operations. As soon as the army of Kampana was seen at Virincipuram, Champarāja or Sambhuvarāya opposed it and a fierce battle took place at Virincipuram. Campa's army suffered defeat at the hands of the powerful army of Kampana and being driven by it, fled towards the capital.21 Kampana pushed Campa to his Capital. (अभ तत्त्व कृष्णेक सिल्ल). King Camparaja with some selected solidiers took to the strong fortress on the hill Rajasambutra which was surrounded by the enemy.22 A fierce battle took place between the armies of Kampana and Campa.23 At last Campa came out to fight personally in a single combat. King Campa of Kanchi was killed by Kampana.24 The Madhurāvijayam is the only work stating that the Dravida King Camparaya was killed by
Kampana. After conquering the Dravida King, prince Kampana proceeded to Kanchi. Then he began to rule at Tundiramandala.

An inscription of Kampana dated 1287 found in Tirupputkuli near Kanchi records that Bukkannaudaiyara's son Kampana Udayair became established on the throne after taking possession of the Rajagambhirarāja. When he was returning from Kancipuram he was described as a Samrat' (Emperor). He won the hearts of the people there, it also indicates the same that is a part of the scheme as mentioned in sloka 42. in sarga 3. of the Madhuravijayam.

His subjects had considered him as another incarnation of Viṣṇu and his fame spread far and wide after establishing himself at Kanchi.

The concluding canto i.e., the ninth one of the Madhurāvijayam describes at full length the battle between the forces of Kumara Kampana and the Sultan of Madhura. "Where there resounded once the joyous sound of the Mrdaṇgām (South Indian Musical Instrument) there is heard at present the howl of the Jackal, that has made it its abode, the river
Kāverī that had been regulated by proper dams and flowed into regular channels has began to flow in all directions. In the Agrahāras where the Yāgadhūma was largely visible and the sound of the chanting of the Vedas was everywhere available, we have now the offensive smelling smoke issuing from the roasting of flesh by the Muslims and their harsh voice alone is hear, the beautiful coconut trees which were gracing the gardens surrounding the city Madhūra, have been cut down and in their place we see plenty of Sulas, with garlands made by stringing human heads together resembling in a remote manner, the coconut trees. The waters of the river Tamraparnī which used to be white with sandal paste rubbed away from the breasts of the young and beautiful maidens, who were bathing in it, is now flowing red with the blood of Brahmīns and cows slaughtered by the Muslims.

After having described the pitiable conditions of the Tamil Country as above, the mysterious lady was said to have presented Kumara Kampana with a divine sword and ordered him to proceed against the sultan of Madhura who was the enemy of the World. This description of the condition of the temples and the people, though poetic in character, cannot be regarded as opposed to facts of history. Ibn-Batuta and the
Hindu Chronicles paint equally horrible pictures of the rule of the sultans of Madura and difficulties which the people had to experience. At the end, it is described, "Seated on his agile horse, King Kampana who was the glory of Karnataka race, avoiding the sword blow aimed by Yavana, cut off in an instant the head of the latter. The head of the Suratrāṇa (Sultān) fell on the ground, the head that never knew the art of cajoling servant-like, the head that had borne the royal burden of the Turushka Samrajya and had not bowed down even to Gods."

King Kampana being a pious Hindu must have had a holy bath at Ramesvaram after his victory over Madhura and made some gifts to the temple. The earliest of these inscriptions is dated Virodhikritu samvatsara, 8th vaikāsi, which is equivalent to 4th June 1371. Hence the battle of Madhura may be considered to have taken place in April or May 1371. The Madhuravijayam does not refer to the name of the Sultan of Madhura, who was defeated by Kampana. Yet the history of the Tamilnadu does throw a light on the identification of the Sultan of Madhura who was defeated by Kampana.

Despite the chronological list of sultans of Madhura,
opinion differs from historian to historian. Yet the coins discovered in South India would be of much help to identify the sultan of Madhura conquered by Kampana. The existence of coins cannot be denied as an imaginary one. Those coins mention three sultans: (1) Adil Shah, (2) Fakhruddin Mubarak Shah and (3) Allauddin Sikhandar Shah. Of these three sultans, who could be the person defeated by Kumara Kampana? As has already been maintained the date of the conquest of Madhura by Kampana to be the April or May 1371, it may be decided whether it was Fakhruddin Mubarak Shah for whom there are number of coins dated A.H. 761 to 770 i.e., 1359 to 1370 A.D. If the numismatic evidence is to be believed, the sultan defeated by Kampana must be Fakhruddin Mubarak Shah. Because the coins of his successor are dated upto A.D. 1378, when Kumara Kampana was not alive. Thus it was Fakhruddin Mubarak Shah who was defeated by Kampana in A.D. 1371.

In fine, it may be undoubtedly taken for granted that Fakhruddin Mubarak Shah was the Sultan defeated by Kumara Kampana and took the possession of Madhura.
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In spite of the conclusion above, some scholars like S. Tiruvenkatatachar, N. Venkataramanayya hold the similar view that it was Qurbat Hasan Kangu, the Sultan of Madhura, flourished during 1353-1371, and defeated by Kampana by the following arguments:

1. According to inscriptional evidences, Princes Savana Udaiyar and Kampana Udaiyair invaded Madhura and tried to outset Qurbas Hasan Kangu from power about A.D. 1352-53 though it cannot be asserted that the Sultan suffered defeat.

2. Bukkan, an enemy who was on the frontiers of Mabar with a large army and powerful elephants, invaded Mabar, defeated Qurbat Hasan and killed him. Then he took possession of the city of Madhura.

Because, the first argument mentioned above says that it was joint invasion of Kampana and Savana Udaiyar during
A.D. 1352-53. But, it is crystal clean from the Madhuravijayam that Kampana alone invaded Madhura and Savana Udaiyar did not take part in the campaign against Madhura undertaken by Kampana.

The second argument clearly says that Qurbat Hasan was defeated by Bukkan and not by Kampana. It is said, Bukka had been sent against Madhura during the reign of Harihara I. Anyway, both the arguments above are insufficient to maintain the view that it was Qurbat Hasan who was defeated by Kampana.