CHAPTER VIII

THE CHÔLAS OF NELLORE

Origin

The Chôlas of Nellore occupy an important place in the history of Andhra Pradesh. The family gets the name as the Chôlas of Nellore because of their association with Nellore in Nellore district. The inscriptions introduce them with the charana-saröruha praśasti which is common to both the Pottapi and Konidena Chôlas. Like the other Telugu Chôlas, these Chôlas also claim their descent from Karikäla and to have belonged to the solar race and Kâsyapa gòtra.

Though there is a lot of information, epigraphical and literary, attesting to their power and importance, their history poses certain difficulties because of the confusing nature of the source material. The difficult nature of their history is acknowledged by stalwarts like V.Venkayya, Alan Butterworth and V.Venugopaul Chetty, the editors of the Nellore District Inscriptions, and K.A.Nilakanta Sastri.
N. Venkataramanayya is of the view that they came from the Raichur and Gulbarga area.\footnote{1} The characteristic Kannada designations such as arasa and heggade borne by them and their subordinates respectively are perhaps the basis for his surmise.

There is a large number of inscriptions of these rulers. For example, Chingleput district in Tamil Nadu itself presents over two hundred inscriptions, followed by Mellore with about a hundred, North Arcot with over twenty, Chittoor with eighteen, Cuddapah with fourteen, Gurtur with six and Kurnool with three. To have a complete picture of this family, a study of the inscriptions found in outside southern Andhra, i.e., Chingleput and North Arcot districts of Tamil Nadu also has to be undertaken. Reference to these Cholas is also found in epigraphs of their contemporaries in other dynasties such as the imperial Cholas, the Kākatiyas, the Pānḍyas and the Hoysalas. Literary works like Tikkana's Mirvachanottara Rāmāyanam and Kētana's Daṇakumāra Charitra also throw some light on them.
The Territory of the Nellore Cholas

Between 1160 and 1205 A.D., i.e., for nearly forty-five years the rule of the Nellore Telugu Cholas was confined to three districts, namely, Nellore, Gudapah and Chittoor. The places from where the inscriptions of this period came reveal that their sway extended over a compact and contiguous territory. It was confined to the taluks of Proddatur, Siddhavatam and Rajampet in Gudapah district, the taluks of Rapur, Kovur, Nellore, Gudapah and Venkatagiri in Nellore district and the taluk of Srikalahasti in Chittoor district. Only one record of Nallasidhi, which falls within this period, comes from Tiruppalsivanam in Chingleput district.

Nallasidhi ruled from Vallurapura over Renadu 70, Kanne 300 and other districts in 1192 A.D. He also conquered Pottapi and ruled over it. If the inscriptions so far noticed are of any indication, their first territorial acquisition in the south seems to be in Ponneri taluk of Chingleput district wherein an epigraph dated 1195 A.D., of Kulottunga III records a gift of money by Nungamadevi, wife of Madhuranthaka Pottapi Chola Siddharaisar,
for maintaining a lamp in the temple at the place. After this, inscriptions of 1207 A.D., of the Nellore Telugu Chōlas have come to light in Conjeeveram, Saidapet, Sriperumbuduru and Tiruvalluru taluks of Chingleput district and Tiruttani taluk formerly in Chittoor district but now transferred to Tamil Nadu. During the same year, Kowali taluk, which was to the north of their kingdom, seems to have been conquered. Their records start appearing in Kandukur taluk in Prakasam district and Atmakur taluk in Nellore district from 1210 and 1212 A.D. respectively. By the time Manumasiddhi II came to occupy the throne, i.e., 1248 A.D., almost the whole of the undivided Nellore district, Siddhavatam, Prodatur and Rajaspet taluks of Cuddapah district, Srikalahasti and Tiruttani taluks of undivided Chittoor district, Ponneri, Conjeeveram, Saidapet, Sriperumbuduru, Tiruvallur and Chingleput taluks of Chingleput district, and Cheyyar, Walajapet, Arkonam and Tiruvannamalai taluks of North Arcot district seem to have passed under their rule. Inscriptions of the Nellore Chōlas came to light in Markapur (1263 A.D.) and Podili (1289 A.D.) taluks of Prakasam district, Narasaraopet (1291 A.D.) taluk of Guntur district and Chandragiri taluk of Chittoor district in Andhra Pradesh, and Gudiyattam (1252 A.D.) and Vellore.
(1267 A.D.) taluks of North Arcot district in Tamil Nadu for the first time. Thus tentatively the jurisdiction of the Telugu Cholas of Nellore extended over an area covering the present day parts of Nellore, Prakasam, Cuddapah and Chittoor districts in Andhra Pradesh, and Chingleput and North Arcot districts in Tamil Nadu.

**Capital of the Nellore Cholas**

The capital of the Nellore Cholas was Nellore. It finds mention for the first time in an epigraph of 1160 A.D., at Dongaisani in Cuddapah district. It was also known as Nelluru, Nellyuru, Nelluru, Nallaoru, Nellurupattana, Vikramasimhakanagaram, Vikramasimhanagara and Vikramasingsapura and Dhanyapuri. Fanciful explanations have been offered of the name Nellore. For example, it is connected with the Nelli tree (*Premna latifolia*) which are said to have been in abundance in the region. According to another version, it is connected with the lions keeping watch over the place. Now there are neither Nelli trees nor lions anywhere near the vicinity. It is possible that the name has a Tamil origin. Much of this area was under Tamil influence from very early days from twelfth century. In
Tamil Nēllū means paddy and ṛu means village, i.e., a place where paddy grew in plenty. This is the situation today also. Dhānypūrī thus seems to be the Sanskrit version of Nellūru. The other names indicate that it slowly developed into a pāṭṭāna, or nāgarā, or pura, the last of which finds mention in many inscriptions. Wellore was also known as Bilawar.¹⁹

Genealogy of the Nellore Chōlas

As can be seen from the charts enclosed good number of inscriptions give the names of some generations of the family, the first four among them being fuller than the others. An attempt is made here to coordinate all these names and try to prepare a cogent genealogy as far as possible.

As in the case of the other Telugu Chōlas this family also claims descent from the ancient Karikīla, the supposed founder of the imperial Chōla dynasty. While Nos. 1, 2, 3, 8, 9 and 10 mention this fact, others, especially No.4, do not mention it, though it is one of the inscriptions giving a fairly big genealogy. The first historical personality of this family appears to
be Madhurantaka Pottapi Chōla who is stated to have been born in the family of Karikāla. The next chief to find a mention is Betta who is said to have been born in the family of Madhurantaka Pottapi Chōla. But he does not find mention in any other inscription. But we cannot doubt the historicity of this person on the ground that he is not mentioned in other inscriptions because all of them skip some names or the other at some stage or the other. The fourth chief we come across is Bījana who is variously known as Tiluhga Vidya, Tiluṅga Bīja and Vijjana. He is also stated to have been born in the family of his predecessor without specifying any relationship. It his family were born, according to Nos. 2 and 4, two brothers, Siddhi and Betta. The latter is to be called Betta II to distinguish him from the earlier member of the same name. From here the genealogy seems to run smoothly with the specification of proper relationships. No. 4 mentions three sons for Betta, namely Dāyabhīma, Nallasiddhi and Errasiddhi. No. 2 omits Nallasiddhi, while No. 3 omits Dāyabhīma. It is to be noted here that in No. 1 there is a change in the order. It mentions Dāyabhīma and places Betta as his son and Errasiddhi as the son of the latter. But we know from two other inscriptions, i.e., No. 2 and 4
that Dayabhima and Errasiddhi were brothers. Further, in No. 1 instead of Nallasiddhi, Betta is put after Dayabhima. Here either Betta is one more member of the family or is to be identified with Nallasiddhi. At any rate, the order given in this inscription is a clear mistake. A similar mistake appears to have occurred in No. 10 also. Nos. 2, 3 and 4 agree to the effect that Errasiddhi had three sons, Manumasiddhi, Betta (i.e., Betta III) and Tammasiddhi. No. 1 omits this Betta. This Betta seems to have had another name, i.e., Nallasiddhi. No. 7 mentions only Manumasiddhi as the son of Errasiddhi. No. 8 skips all the names after Bijja and mentions Manumasiddhi only. Similarly, No. 9 also skips all the names between Karikala and Manumasiddhi. No. 10 also mentions only one son, i.e., Manumasiddhi for Errasiddhi. No. 6 mentions Tirukkāllattidēva as the son of Manumasiddhi. This is confirmed by No. 7. Tikkanripati, Tikka and Tikkanripa mentioned in Nos. 8, 9 and 10 respectively appear to be the same as this Tirukkāllattidēva. Since other Tikkas appear in the sequence, this Tirukkāllattidēva or Tikka may be called Tikka I. Nos. 8, 9 and 10 mention Manumasiddhi as the son of Tikka I. This Manumasiddhi is naturally Manumasiddhi II.
No. 10 appears to mention another son of Tikka whose name is, however, not given. No. 11 seems to carry forward the genealogy by two more generations. It states that Tikka had a son (name not given) who, in turn, had a son Nallasiddhi. Nallasiddhi's son was Manumangaṭagopāla. No. 14 mentions two Tirukalidēvas as father and son, one of whom we have already identified with Tikka I. It means that the son also was named Tirukalidēva. Though this is unusual, the inscription in question is very clear in this effect. It states that Tirukalidēva Mahārāja made grants for the beatitude of his father (āśo ṛa) and mother (āśo ṛa). We may identify him with the unnamed son mentioned in No. 12.

The above analysis is put in the tabular form as below.
| 5 | Conjeeveram           |
|   | inscription          |
|   | Nallasiddharasa      |
|   | Peddarasar           |
|   | (1207 A.D.)          |

| 6 | Mandalur            |
|   | inscription         |
|   | Manamasittarasa     |
|   | Tirukkalattidēva    |
|   | (1209 A.D.)         |

<p>| 7 | Conjeeveram           |
|   | inscription          |
|   | Karikāla             |
|   | Vijjana              |
|   | Erasiddhi            |
|   | Manmasiddhi          |
|   | (m.Sridēvi)          |
|   | Tirukkalattidēvan    |
|   | (1230 A.D.)          |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 8    | Mirvachanottara  
Namayananam |
|      | Karikala  
Bijjana (in the family of)  
Manumasidhi  
Tikkanripati  
Manumashitipati |
| 9    | Dasakumara  
Charitra  
Karakala  
Bijjana (built in)  
Manumasidhi  
Tikka  
Manumasidhi |
| 10   | Nandalur  
inscription  
Dasakumara  
Charitra  
Karakala  
Bijjana (built in)  
Manumasidhi  
Tikka  
Manumasidhi  
Erasiddhi  
Rajendra Manmasiddha  
Tikkanripa  
Unnamed son (1259 A.D.) |
Tirukalideva
Manumagandagopala
(1297 A.D.)

Babblepalle
inscription

Narasaraopet
inscription

Tirukalidēva
Tirukalidēva

Nallasiddhi

Manumaganḍagopala
(1297 A.D.)
The statement of the chronology of these rulers is beset with difficulties. On the one hand we do not know if all the rulers mentioned in the table ruled at all and, if they did, for which period. On the other hand there is so much of overlapping of the dates of these different chiefs that it is impossible to arrive at a cogent chronology. For only few of them we have inscriptions and on that basis we tried to fix the tentative chronology of each. It is needless to say that this procedure is mostly conjectural and, of course, in the absence of clearer evidence this is the only alternative left.

So far as the first four members are concerned no period can be fixed for them because each successive one is said to have been born in the family of the predecessor and it is impossible to decide as to how many men were there in between. The actual relationship starts with Siddhi and Betta II (Nos. 5 and 6 in the table) who are said to be brothers. We can thus fix the dates only from this Siddhi downwards.
The earliest inscription we have for these chiefs is dated in 1160 A.D., and it belongs to Hallasiddhi (No. 8). On the basis of this we may place Siddhi, Betta II and Dāyabhīma (Nos. 5, 6 and 7) between 1050 and 1150 A.D. The situation of overlapping dates is indeed bewildering. For example, Hallasiddhi's dates go up to 1217 A.D. For Errasiddhi (No. 9) we have dates from 1207 to 1227 A.D. The dates of Errasiddhi's son Tammusiddhi fall within the dates of both the above chiefs and they are between 1204 and 1207 A.D. For Manumasiddhi I (No. 10) there is only one date in 1214 A.D. This sort of situation defies all explanation unless we think that each one of them was wielding power simultaneously and issued his own inscriptions. However, this is highly unusual. Either there is some mistake in the system of dating itself or we will have to present as noted just now that each one of them issued his own inscriptions independently even during the time of his predecessor's rule. In a political condition which was highly flexible due to the mutual conflicts between the ruling powers like the Chālukyas, the Sūnas, the Kākiṭyas and the Chōlas such a situation is not unlikely. We, therefore, mention here the dates of different rulers as found through the inscriptions.
In addition to these chiefs, we come across three more names like Vijaya Gandagopala, Vīra Gandagopala and Rāja Gandagopala. The relationship between these chiefs is also not indicated. These names are different from the ones mentioned in the table. Thus it may be suggested that they belonged to a separate branch of the Nellore Telugu Chōlas. It is worth noting in this context that majority of the inscriptions of these chiefs are found in Chingleput and North Arcot districts in Tamil Nadu. They indeed claim to be the rulers of Nellore but this claim appears to be more conventional than real. As it is, the following are the dates available for these chiefs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chief</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nallasiddhi I</td>
<td>1160 - 1217 A.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tammusiddhi</td>
<td>1204 - 1207 A.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Errasiddhi</td>
<td>1207 - 1227 A.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manumasiddhi I</td>
<td>1214 A.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tikka I</td>
<td>1208 - 1246 A.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manumasiddhi II</td>
<td>1238 - 1269 A.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tikka II</td>
<td>1265 - 1279 A.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manuma Gandagopala</td>
<td>1272 - 1294 A.D.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Vijaya Gandagopala 1249 - 1285 A.D.
Vīra Gandagopāla 1292 - 1301 A.D.
Rāja Gandagopāla 1296 - 1325 A.D.

The phenomenon of overlapping of dates is a feature of these chiefs also. Indeed it is really baffling.

Rule of the Telugu Chōlas of Nellore

The Early Chiefs

Though the names Madhurāntaka Pottapi Chōla, Betta and Bijjana, who are stated to have been born in the family of their respective predecessors in the ascending order, appear to be historical, no historical information can be gathered about them. As noted above the real genealogy with the specification of relationships starts with Siddhi and his brother Betta II. But no historical information can be gathered about these two as well as the latter's one son Dēyabhīma.

It may, however, be noted in this connection that an inscription from Naḍendla in Guntur district belonging
to the Velanāti chief Gonka II describes him as the subduer of Siddhi Bēta. On the basis of the date of this inscription, this Siddhi and Bēta can be identified tentatively with Siddhi and Bēta above. Similarly Gonka's predecessor Rājendra Chōda also claims to have defeated Siddhi Bēta, i.e., Siddhi and Bēta. Likewise, the Kōta chief Bhīma also is stated to have defeated a chief Siddhi Chōda who can be identified with the Siddhi above. These references only indicate that there were constant fights between these local chiefs with no decisive victory on any side. The conventional descriptions like Mrigārdula, i.e., one chief becoming a lion to another chief, a deer, does not help us to get at the historical facts.

The next chief Dāyabhīma, the first son of Betta II, is described in the Tiruvalangadu inscription as snatching away the prosperity from the enemies without ascribing him any expedition or victory.

Nallasidēhi

For Nallasidēhi, the next chief, the brother of
Dāyabhīma, we have as many as twenty inscriptions ranging in dates from 1160 to 1217 A.D. Most of these inscriptions record some grant or the other and hardly there is a reference to any political event. The earliest of his inscriptions, namely, the trilingual inscription from Dongalasani dated in 1160 A.D., gives him the title 'Kānchi puravānāhīśvara' and the Tiruppasur inscription of Tammusīddhi credits him with the conquest of Kānchi. This Nallasīddhi came into serious conflict with the Pottapi Chōla rulers Sōmēvara and Mallīdēva. As mentioned in an earliest context (chapter V) a battle was fought between the opposing forces near Dongalasani near the confluence of the Cheyyēru and Pennēr. According to the Dongalasani inscription, Nallasīddhi marched against the Pottapi Chōla chiefs Sōmēvara and Mallīdēva, and met them at Dongalasani. His general Rēvana Heggade killed Sōmēvara and eleven other princes, defeated Mallīdēva, put to death a thousand soldiers, wounded many and himself died in the end. His brother Pōtana Heggade collected a large force and won the battle. He then reported the success in the battle to his master Nallasīddhi.

The conquest of Pottapi seems to have brought
Nallasidhi into conflict with the Velanāti Chōlas who were granted the territory extending from the Mahāndra moutains in Śrīkakulam to Śrīkālaḥasti in Chittoor district. Gonka II invaded Pākanādu in 1160-61 A.D., and Kanṭabhūpati, a subordinate of his claimed victory over a king Siddhi who is identical with Nallasidhi. An inscription of 1160 A.D., from Bapati in Guntur district mentions that Gonka was ruling over the entire coastal region from Nakaram to Nellore. His son and successor Rājēndra Chōda II is stated to have appointed his sandhivigrahi Kommana as governor of Pākanādu which included this region. When the imperial Chōlas and their subordinates the Velanādu Chōlas were preoccupied with their own affairs, the Nellore Chōlas seem to have reconquered their territory. However, they continued to be the subordinates of the Chōlas. This is vouchsafed by the mention of the Chōla overlords in the inscriptions of Nallasidhi and the availability of the Chōla records in the region.

An inscription from Nandalur in Cuddapah district dated 1202 A.D., mentions a queen named Nākkamādevī. Another epigraph from Sahgām in Nellore district dated
1204 A.D., mentions Hallagāmaka as another queen of Nallasīdhi. Yet another inscription from Mallān in the same district dated 1205 A.D., mentions Mayilamādevī Pattarasa, son of Madhurāntaka Pottapibhūla alias Nallasiddharasa. This Nallasiddharasa is obviously the same Nallasidhi under discussion. Mayilamādevī Pattarasa may suggest Pattarasa, son of Mayilamādevī. Since Pattarasa is described as the son of Nallasidhi, Mayilamādevī may be considered as yet another queen of Nallasidhi. In that case, this inscription brings to light the name of a son of Nallasidhi as Pattarasa.

Errasiddhi

Though there are ten inscriptions belonging to his rule, they do not mention any event of historical nature. He had three sons, namely, Manusiddhi I, Betta III and Tammusiddhi. The last of them was born to Sridēvi. Attended and helped by them, he had shone like Trīṇētra (Śiva) for a long time. He had a brother-in-law named Siddharasa.
Manumasiddhi I

Errasiddhi was succeeded by his eldest son

Manumasiddhi I. K.A. Nilakanta Sastri says that

Manumasiddhi was another name of Nallasiddhi.\(^48\) whereas

Robert Sewell is of the opinion that Nallasiddhi was

another name of Beta II\(^49\) Tikkana, the author of the

*Nirvachanottara Rāmāyana*, and Kētana, the author of the

Daśakumāra Charitra, traced the genealogy of the family from

Manumasiddhi. They do not call Manumasiddhi even once by

mistake as Nallasiddhi. There is an epigraph\(^50\) dated

1209 A.D., of Kulottunga III at Mandalur in Cuddapah

district. It registers a gift of lamps by Madhurāntaka

Pottapi Chōla Tirukkālattidēva 'for the merit of his father

Manumasitārasan, and of Nallasiddharasa'. Though the

record mentions them as two different persons, K.A.

Nilakanta Sastri makes them appear as one by adding the

word 'alias' in between the two names.\(^51\) His

identification of Manumasiddhi and Nallasiddhi as one and

the same person is untenable. The Government Epigraphist

identifies Manmasiddhi, the eldest brother of Tammusiddhi,

with Manmasiddhi the first historical person mentioned in

the *Nirvachanottara Rāmāyana*.\(^52\)
Tikkana extols: the greatness of Manumasiddhi in the Nirvachanottara Rāmāyanam thus:

Śrī Bhūri - pratāpamūt vairi-madandhāramunā
kathanda dīpamuga-jeśi
charitamūt nikhila-bhū/jana nitya sūbane,
latakunā nālavaṃsāgama ājeśi
karuṇa dīnāṇatha/kavibandhujana dhakoraṃsulaṃ
ejandrā tapamuga ājeśi
kīrttijālamu drilō/kīśārikakā nabhī Rāma rājita
paṅjaramuga ājeśi

A Sundarījanamūt dendraṃbunakā dana nirūpaṃsā
maina/nērpukalini
natiprasiddhi ohēśi/yāśāriśāīlīsmai, barage
Manumasiddhi / dharaśi-vibhūgu.

The inscriptions of the next chief, the brother of Manumasiddhi I, are dated in 1204 A.D. But there are two inscriptions,53 one at Reddipalem Pantrangam and another at Dubagunta in Nellore district dated in the 36th year of Kūlottunga III and S.1136 respectively. The record at the former place registers that Sittarasan, the son of Mattimadēśam Rājarājapattai Pettarasan, presented a lamp...
to the temple of Pānduranga at the place on behalf of Paṇchahaldēvi or Bāchaladēvi, the consort of Madurantaka Pottapi Chōla alias Manumasītāṛasan, The epigraph at the latter place records a gift for the merit of Mahāmāṇḍalēvara Manma Siddhanēva Chōda Mahārāja. He bore, among others, the title "one who took tribute from Kānchī". These inscriptions reveal that he lived till 1214 A.D. If he had lived till then, he and his youngest brother must have ruled the kingdom conjointly for a certain period of time. Manumasiddhi had another queen Bāchaladēvi besides Šīrēvi who was the mother of Tikka I. Tammusiddhi claims that, on the death of Manumasiddhi, his elder brother Betta III being given to austerities and religious bent of mind, renounced his claim to the throne and conferred the government on him.\textsuperscript{54}

\textbf{Tammusiddhi}

\textit{As noted above the dates of Tammusiddhi fall within the dates of Nallasiddhi. While, as observed earlier, this phenomenon of overlapping dates, which is common to almost all the rulers of the family, cannot be explained satisfactorily. An inscription from Kavali in Nellore district dated 1207 A.D., seems to explain it by}
saying that even when Nallasiddhi was the ruler (abhishikta) Tammusiddhi was ruling the kingdom by his grace (tat katākahadēva rājyaṃ karoti).

As pointed out above Tammusiddhi got the throne to the exclusion of his elder brother Betta III who was not interested in ruling because of his saintly disposition of mind. The inscription from Kavali does not mention Betta at all and much less this explanation, one wonders if it was a usurpation by Tammusiddhi.

Tikka I

The next ruler of the Nellore Telugu Chōlas was Tikka or Tikka I. There are about a hundred inscriptions in all pertaining to his reign and these are spread over Chingleput, Nellore, Cuddapah, North Arcot and Chittoor districts. In these inscriptions he is variously referred to as Madhurantaka Pottapi Chōla Tirukkālattidēva, Tirukkālattidēva Chōda Mahārāja and the like. The name Tirukkālattidēva indeed stands for Sṛṅkālahastidēva which in course of time came to be abbreviated as Tikka. He bore the epithets, among others, Kīrtinārāyana,
Bhujabalavira, Mandalikadiśāpatta and Uraiyurpuravādhīśvara. The last one is obviously to associate him with the imperial Chōla family.

It is said of Tikka in an inscription from Kāṇchī dated 1231 A.D., that he acquired the kingdom in due succession. The inscriptions of Tikka I and his son Manumāsiddhi II as well as the literary works produced in the latter's court give a graphic picture of the events that took place in Tikka's period.

1. Gangaperuru inscription
   a) Victory over Prīthvīśvara,
   b) Conquest of the western region in the course of his digvījaya and
   c) Entry into Siddhavatn.

2. Conjeeveram inscription
   a) Cataclysmic fire to the ocean, viz., Kalyāṇapuri,
   b) Cut off the head of Prīthvīśvara,
   c) Crushed the pride of the Sēuna king.
3. Conjeeveram
   inscription
   a) Victory over the Sēunas.
4. Oguru inscription
   a) Kānchī-tripura-trinētra.
5. Jambai
   inscription
   a) Stabbed Vallāladēvan and
   b) Proceeded to Sāmbai.
6. Mandalur inscription
   a) Captor of Kānchī and
   b) Vanquisher of Sūmēsa at
   Manumasiddhi
7. Kīrvaṇamottara
   Nāśīyanam
   Tikkana
   a) Played ball with the head
   of Prithvīśvara while still
   in his youth,
   b) Captured the horse of
   Lakumāya when he invaded
   Gurumulāru,
   c) Fought against his dārādis
   and put them to flight,
   d) Ruled over the principalities
   of Sambḥurāja and other
   hostile rājās,
Dasakumāra
Charitra of
Kētana

8. Dasakumāra

a) Cut off the head of
Prithvīśvara,
b) Put down the pride of the
Sēuna Kataka gāmantaḥ,
c) Ruled over all the Eruva
mandalikas,
d) Established the Chōla on
his throne,
e) Curbed the arrogance of the
Karnāṭa king,
f) Levied tribute on the Pāncya,
g) Ruled over the manne chiefs
of Eruva and
h) Defeated the enemy warriors
at Āmalāru.

e) Joined Kānci and
Chēdimandalam and made
Kālavapati pay him tribute,
f) Crushed the arrogance of
Karnāṭa Sōmēśa and
established his own right, and
g) Set up the Chōla king and
acquired the title Chōla-
sthāpanāchārya.
All the events mentioned above can be consolidated and arranged as far as possible in chronological order in the following way.

1. Victory over Prithvīśvara.

2. a) Conquest of the western region in the course of his digvījaya, fought against his dāvādīg and put them to flight.  
b) Ruled over the manna chiefs of Eruva.

3. Cataclysmic fire to the ocean, viz., Kalyāṇapuri-victory over the Sēunas -captured the horse of Lakumaya when he invaded Gurumuluru- put down the pride of the Sēuna Kataka sāmantas.


5. Ruled over the principalities of Sambhrāja and other hostile rājas.

6. Made Kālavapatī to pay tribute.

7. Levied tribute on the Pāndya.
8. Set up the Chōla king on his throne and acquired the appellation Chōlasthāpanacharya.

9. Stabbed Vallalādeva—vanquished Śōmēśa at Champāpuri—crushed the arrogance of Karnāṭa Śōmēśa and established his own might.

A detailed study of these will take us to many intricate and as yet partly explained events of a period seething with trouble and political confusion. They reveal Tikka’s relations with almost all the imperial powers in the south, namely, the Kākatiyas, the Yadavas of Devagiri, the Chōlas, the Höysalas and the Pāṇdyas. To have a clear and complete picture we have to trace the circumstances leading to these events.

Tikka I and Prithvīśvara

As noted above, inscriptions speak of Tikka coming into a conflict with a Prithvīśvara. Prithvīśvara was the grandson of the Velanāṭi chief Kulōttunga Rājēndra Chōda II. After the latter’s death there was a war of succession in the Velanāḍu kingdom.
Though Prithvīśvara came out successful, he could hold sway only on a small extent of the kingdom in the northern region, i.e., between Drākhshārama and Srīkākulam. Taking advantage of the unsettled conditions in the Velanādu kingdom, Kākatiya Ganapati occupied Velanādu. In order to recover his lost possessions in Velanādu, Prithvīśvara launched a counter-attack in about 1206 or 1207 A.D. In this war, the Nellore Chōla ruler Tikka sided with Kākatiya Ganapati and helped the latter to win a victory, and assumed the title Prithvīśvara-girahandukavṛiddhī-vimāla indicating his subjugating Prithvīśvara.

Inscriptions of the Kākatiyas indicate that this victory boosted their power and slowly they were able to establish themselves as independent monarchs. But the Chōlas under Kulōttunga III claim to have thoroughly subdued the Kākatiyas and even entered their capital Warangal, if we rely on the opinion of K.A. Nilakanta Sastri. For example, the Pudukkottah inscriptions claim that Kulōttunga III subdued the Yadugus, i.e., the Telugus and entered the city of Urangai. Nilakanta Sastri thinks that Urangai is a Tamilised form of Warangal and that the passage refers to Kulōttunga's vanquishing the Kākatiyas.
Even if this identification is accepted, the interpretation is not corroborated by facts.

**Tikka I and his Dāvādis**

Tikka's siding with the Kākatiya king had its own rewards. It appears that, when Tikka was busy with his warfares, the other members of the royal family tried to dislodge him from his position. Tikka naturally sought the help of Ganapati to put down these chiefs who must be the dāvādis mentioned in inscriptions. This incident seems to have been indicated by an inscription from Chebrolu in Guntur district which claims that Kākatiya Ganapati put to flight the enemies of Tikka and installed him on throne. 67

As for his *pāśchima dīgvijaya*, no specific details are forthcoming. The western region, which has been referred to here, must have been under smaller chiefs belonging to the Telugu Chōla stock and Tikka obviously raided these territories in the process of expanding his authority. The reference to his subduing the Manne chiefs of Eruva also appears to have been a part of this western
expedition. It is, however, difficult to identify these chiefs and pinpoint the incident.

**Tikka I and the Seunas**

Inscriptions of Tikka make a pointed reference to his victory over the Seunas and his attack on Kalyānapura. This incident again seems to refer to the conflict between the Kākatīyas and the Seunas rather than an independent venture on the part of Tikka. This period, namely, the middle of the 12th century A.D., was a period of continuous struggle for supremacy between the major powers of the Deccan, viz., the Seunas, the Kākatīyas and the Hoysalas, all of whom rose from out of the ruins of the Chālukya empire. The Seuna king Singhana II was now able to establish himself in the northern parts of the erstwhile Chālukya empire and extended his sway as far as the Tungabhadra in the south. He was now trying to make inroads into the eastern direction where the Kākatīyas also were engaged in consolidating their power having already become independent after the extinction of the Chālukya power. Naturally, therefore, the two powers came into conflict with each other and this is referred to in both the Kākatīya and the Seuna records. It is in this
In the context that we have to look at Tikka's exploits with the Sēuna king who was Singhaṇa II. As noted above, the Hirvachanottara Rāmāvanam speaks of a battle of Gurumulūru or Kurumulūru where a Sēuna general Lakumaya attacked Kurumulūru but was repulsed by Tikka. Ketana's Daśakumāra Charitra also describes Tikka as a submarine fire. There are other inscriptions of Kākatīya Ganaṇati which also claim victory for him on the Sēuna king. These references indicate that these conflicts were a continued affair and no decisive victory appears to have been attained by either of the party. Obviously Tikka took a prominent role in these conflicts. The Sēuna general Lakumaya is identified with Lakshmideva Daṇḍanāyaka who figures in many inscriptions of Singhaṇa and who is credited with many victories in the latter's southern expeditions. The claim of the attack on Kalyānapuri was also a part of these continued conflicts. Kalyānapuri was the same as Kalyāna, the erstwhile capital of the Chālukyas which was now under the Sēuna occupation. It is, however, to be noted that this claim is a vain boast on the part of Tikka because no enemy army could penetrate as far north into the Sēuna kingdom as Kalyāna, now a small place of that name in Bidar district of Karnataka state. Further inscriptions of
Singhana II are found in Anantapur district and interestingly there are two inscriptions at Yeleswaram in Devarakonda taluk of Nalgonda district which bear an identical date, namely, 1250 A.D., though one of them belongs to Ganapati and the other to Singhana. This speaks of the unsettled conditions in this period.

The next achievement of Tikka was his conquest of Kanchi, overpowering the Sambhavarayas and Kadavarayas, levying tribute from the Pandyas and supporting the Cholas. These claims, though vague, appear to indicate that Tikka tried to exploit the existing political situation to his advantage. Though these claims are exaggerated, he appears to have fairly succeeded in establishing his superiority.

The political conditions in this period, viz., the first half of the 13th century, were highly disturbed. The Deccan, the whole of which was once held by the Chalukyas of Kalyana, was now divided into three portions to be ruled over by three families, the Sunas, the Kakatiyas and the Hoysalas. In the further south, the Chola power was on the decline and the Pandyas were raising their heads. The Hoysalas took this opportunity and extended their influence in the Chola region by helping the latter against
the Pāṇḍya attacks. It is at such a situation that Tikka tried to assert himself and even claiming to help the Chōlas. His Conjeeveram record makes a vague claim of subduing all the southern chiefs. The contemporary ruling Chōla king Kulōttunga was facing the enemies on all sides. Inside the kingdom, chiefs like the Sambūvarāyas and the Kādavarāyas who were revolting, and from the south the Pāṇḍyas were pressing. It is at such a juncture that Kulōttunga III sought the help of the Hoysala king Ballāla II who sent his son Narasimha to the rescue of Kulōttunga. It is quite likely that right at this time Tikka also stepped in at the behest of Kulōttunga who was at least technically his overlord. This explains the statement in the inscriptions that he ruled over the principalities of Samburūja and other hostile rulers and that he levied tribute from Kālavapati, i.e., Kādavarāya. The timely help of Hoysala Narasimha saved the Chōla king from the attacks of the Pāṇḍya king Māravarman Sundara Pāṇḍya. As a mark of this achievement the Hoysala king assumed the titles Chōla-rāja-pratiekthāpanāchārya and Pāṇḍya Gajakesari. Having participated in this warfare Tikka also assumed the title Chōla-sthāpanāchārya.
As for his claim to have subdued Kanchi it looks as though it refers to his overpowering the Kadavas and that too in association with the Hoysalas for just as Hoysala Narasimha bore the title Kanchi-Kanchana-Kalava-Kulantaka indicating his subduing the Kādava and Kānchi, the Nirvachanottara Rāmāyanam describes Tikka as reaching Kānchi and levying tribute from Kālavaṇḍa, i.e., the Kālavāṇḍyas. His three inscriptions in a general way speak of his capturing Kānchi.

**Tikka's conflict with Hoysala Sōmēśvara**

As seen above Tikka appears to have been in close collaboration with Hoysala Narasimha in restoring the Chōla power. But soon rift arose between them. This was due to the rift between Chōla Rājēndra and Hoysala Sōmēśvara because of the latter's overpowering position over the Chōla on the one hand and on the other improving relationship between the Chōlas and the Pāṇḍyas. In this rift Tikka obviously sided with the Chōlas and opposed Hoysala Sōmēśvara. That is how we find him in an inscription from Mandalur in Cuddapah district as the vanquisher of Karnāta Sōmēśa, i.e., the Hoysala king Sōmēśvara. It is not
unlikely that he received help from the Xākatiya side in his war with Sōmēśvara.

The above account shows that Tikka was the most prominent of all the Telugu Chōla chiefs of Nellore. The existing political conditions provided him an opportunity to assert himself as a powerful ally of the Chōlas and stood by the latter when they were in real difficulty. Tikka put down all the unruly subordinates in the Chōla kingdom and he collaborated with the Hoysalas in the latter’s attempts in restoring the Chōla power. But he stood by his master again and fought against even the mighty Hoysala king when there arose a difference between the two. One gets an impression from his numerous inscriptions that at one time without him the Chōla kingdom would not have survived. As observed by Nilakanta Sastrī the Chōla power could hold its own against its enemies due to the loyalty and cooperation of the Nellore Telugu Chōlas.71

A fighter as he was Tikka is also known for his patronage of letters. He is described as Kavisāvabhauma and Abhinava Bhōja. But we have no evidences of his concrete
contributions. It was during his period that poets like Peddayañ̃ỹya flourished. The latter is described as a rare genius and an instant composer in several languages. Tikka was a devotee of Varadarāja at Kānchi. He is said to have declared his faith in this deity thus: "The person who worships the pair of feet of the god Varadarāja is my mother, father, great treasure, son, preceptor and friend." He provided for a permanent service called Gandagopālan-sandī in the Varadarāja temple in 1231 A.D., after his name and cared very much for its proper conduct by granting villages such as Māvandūr, Vāyalaiyarrūr and Uludamangalām.

Inscriptions of Tikka mention quite a few of his subordinates. Some of the more prominent ones are Bhāmi Nāhīdū; Sānāngulām, the son of Śrīmān Dēva of Neḷḷūrīkōṭa; Dūmī Nāyakudū, son of Talāra Denimijā Nāyakudū; Patināyakundū; Kararu Mānmarūmūnį, the ruler of Murānapura; Kodarāma, the ruler of Murānapura; Tripurāntaka, Tikka’s minister; Nāla Sūrapa Nāhīdū, a servant of Mahāmandalēśvara Kāmayadēva Mahārāja of the Mukkanti Khāuvetti family; Aludidlayadēva Mahārāja and Gandavaram Prōli Reddi.
Manumasiddhi II

Manumasiddhi's inscriptions start occurring in 1238 A.D., itself when his father Tikka I was still in power. Though it is possible to suggest that Manumasiddhi was associated with the administration of the kingdom from his very early age, as pointed out above this overlapping of the dates is found not only here but in connection with all the rulers of this family.

It appears that at the time Manumasiddhi came to the throne he was confronted by two heroes Akkana and Bayyana who appear to have been his dāyādīs. This inference comes from the Siddhesvara Charitra of Kāse Sarwappa. The Pratṛparudra Charitra also confirms this information. This incident has been reflected in a tradition recorded in the Mackenzie Manuscripts. According to this record, Tikkana, the court poet of Manumasiddhi, went to Kākatiya Gaṇapati and sought his help for Manumasiddhi to regain his power. That Kākatiya Gaṇapati extended his help to Manumasiddhi is clear from an inscription at Wayanapalle in Guntur district which states that Gaṇapati protected the king of Nellore and killed his enemies Bayyana,
Tikkana and others, and that he received presents of elephants from the king of Nellore who was obviously Manumasiddhi himself. This inscription from Nayanipalle gives a graphic account of the positive role played by Gaṇapati in ousting the hostile chiefs from Nellore and restore the power to Manumasiddhi. It is indicated in an inscription from Nandalur in Cuddapah district that Manumasiddhi fought on behalf of Kākatiya Gaṇapati against the king of Kalinga in a battle on the banks of the Godavari. This gesture on Manumasiddhi's part must have been in return of Gaṇapati's help for himself.

In a vague way the Nīrvačanaottara Rāmāyanam of Tikkana speaks of Manumasiddhi as having achieved victories over the kings of Drāvīḍa and Karnāṭa countries, and a king Viṭāja. Though the Drāvīḍa and Karnāṭa kings can be identified with Chōla Rājendrā III and Hoysalā Somesvara, there are no specific evidences of his coming into conflict directly or indirectly with these rulers. At best it can be stated that these victories allude to his participation in the Kākatiya wars against these rulers. As for the king Viṭāja it is not unlikely that it was Viṭāja Gandagopāla who, we have suggested earlier, belonged to another branch of the Nellore Chōlas.
According to Tikkana, Manumasiddhi came into conflict with another chief called Rakkasa Ganga. The poet describes that Manumasiddhi vanquished this chief, wrested the royal insignia from him and bestowed it on Gangaya Sāhini. This Rakkasa Ganga was a Vaikūmba chief and Gangaya Sāhini is known from other records as a Kāyastha chief in the service of Kākatiya Ganapati. It may be surmised that Rakkasa Ganga was a powerful chief and he had usurped the area under Gangaya Sāhini. The poet Ketana also states that on an earlier occasion Manumasiddhi's father Tikka also had defeated this Rakkasa Ganga and had driven him out from the area of lower Mārāyapādi. It appears that Gangaya Sāhini, who was a subordinate of Tikka formerly, had obtained this area from him. After the death of Tikka, possibly Rakkasa Ganga overpowered Gangaya Sāhini and wrested the territory from him. This necessitated Manumasiddhi to interfere and restore the area to Gangaya Sāhini again by subduing Rakkasa Ganga.

The poet Tikkana also makes a pointed reference to Manumasiddhi's conquering a Mahārāṣṭra sāmanta Sāranga. The identification of this Sāranga is indeed difficult.

At Nāguluppalapādu in Prakasam district there is an
inscription of this period which mentions a Sarangadhara of the Chakranārayana family as ruling over the erstwhile Guntur region. It has been suggested that this chief was the adversary of Manumasiddhi named by Tikkana. Though the suggestion is not impossible, it does not explain the Mahārāṣṭra region associated with this Sāranga. The only other possibility is that it may refer to a chief in the northern part of the Sēna kingdom which covers the present day Mahārāṣṭra. But we do not know any chief of this name in that region.

About thirty-two ballads ascribed to very late period and known as Kātamarāju Kathalu, Yādavarāju Kathalu, Yādava Bhāratamu and Yadu Śāstramu eulogise Kātamarāju, who is supposed to have belonged to the Yadava family, from the time of his grandfather. These ballads are popular in Darsi, Kanigiri, Kandukur and Udayagiri areas of Prakasam and Guntur districts. According to them, Kātamarāju, the ruler of Donakonda, came into conflict with the Nellore Telugu Chōla ruler called Nallasidhi. As the story goes, this Kātamarāju seems to have been more interested in grazing cattle. When he was at Śrīnālā, there was a severe famine and he was forced to leave that place in search of pasturage. He went to the
Nellore Telugu Chōla kingdom with his cattle. There he came to an agreement with the ruler called Nallasiddhi. He agreed to pay the grazing tax (pullari) and also give away the bull calves born during his stay in the Nellore kingdom. After some time, famine spread to this area also where Kātamarāju was grazing his cattle. The cattle strayed into the lands cultivated by farmers. The latter went and reported the matter to the ruler who not only forbade Kātamarāju from grazing the crops but also advised the farmers to protect their crops. Kātamarāju and his followers, in order to protect their cattle, also hunted and killed the wild beasts in the nearby forests, thereby affecting the interests of the Bōyas. Yet another incident, which is said to have been responsible for aggravating the situation, was the killing of a parrot belonging to Kundamādevi of the Nellore Telugu Chōla ruling family. She incited the Bōyas to kill Kātamarāju’s cattle under the pretext of hunting animals found in forests. It resulted in a heavy loss to Kātamarāju.

When Kātamarāju stopped the payment of grazing tax, the ruler sent a Bhattu named Rāyasringāvalli as ambassador to collect taxes. He returned empty handed.
and conveyed the reply given by Kātamarāju. This led to a fierce war between the two sides, each claiming victory for his side. The battle was fought at Erragaddapālu. The participants on the side of the Nellore Telugu Chōlas were Errasiddhi, Pāpasiddhi, Gandagopāla, Kastūrīraju, Undavalli Virigopu, Guttī Bhīma, and Tirnāmula Tippayya. The opponents were Kariyavularāju, Bhattāvulanna, Aitamaraṇu, Munumayya, Nāčakullā nāyudu, Pōchayya and Kātamarāju. There was yet another person whose name is handed down to posterity as having distinguished himself in this war. He was Khaḍga Tikkana or Rana Tikkana, and he fought on the side of the Nellore Telugu Chōlas. His father Siddhana was the prime minister of Chōda Tikka, and his brother Bhāskara, besides being a minister, was also a commander of the latter. A story current about Khaḍga Tikkana is that he was defeated in the battle by Kātamarāju and driven back. When he returned home, his wife and mother arranged his bath in a secluded place with turmeric and all that were needed for bathing by women. Feeling humiliated and disgraced, Khaḍga Tikkana marched again to the battle-field with a huge army and wrought havoc in the enemy's ranks. Khaḍga Tikkana was a Brāhmaṇa by caste, and killing a Brāhmaṇa was considered a sin. So,
Katamaraju was in a fix not knowing what to do. Then Brahma Rudrayya, a Saivite Bráhman, who was in the service of Katamaraju, volunteered to fight with Khadga Tikkana. They fought with great courage and valour, and both perished in it. It is said that Khadga Tikkana died near Pattapurūṭi.

This story, more or less in the same form has been narrated in an inscription from Gundlapalem in the present Prakasam district. The date of the record here is Śaka 1170, Kālayukti. Similarly, the event is mentioned in the Local Records. Here this battle is said to have been fought in the year Chitrabhānu. There has been considerable controversy regarding the date of this war because of the incomplete and irregular dates. The inscription adds to the confusion by stating that Katamaraju died in the battle in the 3965 year of Kaliyuga which by normal standards is equated with 864 A.D. Different scholars ascribe different dates ranging from the 12th to the 17th century A.D. Thus the whole story as narrated in the Katha assumes the touch of a legend with many later interpolations. But since it appears to have had some historicity since it is mentioned in the Gundlapalem inscription of the 13th century A.D., we can conclude that
this was a major clash between Manumasiddhi and Katamaraju which assumed the form of a legendary story in the hands of the later bards.\textsuperscript{92}

Practically Manumasiddhi was the last of the Telugu Chōla rulers who ruled with a fairly independent status, though he acknowledged the suzerainty of the Chōlas. The accession of Jatāwarman Sundara Pāṇḍya I in 1251 A.D., changed the face of the political condition in South India. He overpowered the Chōlas and their Hoysala allies, and established a vast Pāṇḍya empire in the south. The Telugu Chōlas who were the traditional subordinates of the Chōlas naturally came under the attack of the Pāṇḍyas. Inscriptions indicate that Köpperunjinga, the Kādava chief under Sundara Pāṇḍya, took the lead in the expeditions of Sundara Pāṇḍya, and his inscriptions spread over in Chittoor, Cuddapah, Kurnool and East Godavari districts indicate that practically the major portions of Andhra were overrun by the Pāṇḍya army. Jatāwarman Sundara Pāṇḍya's inscriptions at Chidambaram claim victory over Vīra Gaṇḍagopāla which was another name of Manumasiddhi and Gaṇapati, i.e., the Kākatīya king Gaṇapati. These inscriptions also claim that as a mark
of this victory, Sundara Pandya celebrated his virābhisaṃga at Nellore. This significant victory over the Telugu Cholas was achieved through a battle fought at Mudugur. Mudugur is identified with Muttukur, a sea-side village east of Nellore. But Mudugur can be identified with Muttukur in Cuddapah district as expeditions of the major dynasties in the past passed through this district. This is confirmed by the presence of Jatāvarman Sundara Pandya's inscriptions in this district.

Manumasīhādi II is the best remembered of the Nellore Telugu Cholas. His memory is cherished so much not on account of his achievements as a warrior and king, but to the patronage he extended to the Telugu men of letters. He takes rank with the Eastern Chālukya ruler Rājarāja Narādtra and the Vijayanagara ruler Krishnadēva-varāya as a patron of Telugu writers. Tikkana, the greatest of the Telugu poets, lived in his court. He was not only a poet-laureate but also a minister of Manumasīhādi. He served him loyally and faithfully, and stood by him as a tower of strength in weal and woe. His journey to Warangal to seek Kākatiya Ganapati's help for restoring the kingdom to his master speaks a lot of his high sense of devotion to his master. The relationship that existed between them
was not merely that of a patron and a protege, and a master and a servant, but of equals. They were attracted to each other by bonds of mutual affection and friendship. Manumasiddhi addressed Tikkana affectionately as māma (uncle), and the latter reciprocated it by treating him as his nephew. Disillusioned by the misfortunes such as the death of Manumasiddhi in the battle of Muttukūr, Tikkana retired from public life and took to spiritual and literary activities. He performed a sacrifice and became a Sūmayāji. It denotes the change of his outlook on life. Inscriptions of Manumasiddhi II mention quite a few subordinate chiefs. The more important of them are Mahāmandalēvara Pōtayadēva Chōḍa Mahārāja; Mahāmandalēvara Allāḍu Sudhādeva Mahārāju, grandson of Podakuniri Siddirāju; Sīdhāmādeva Vījayaśēva; Madusūdanadēva Mahārāja, grandson of Anulūri Vījayaśīttadēva of the Mukkanti Kāduvetti race; and Vīra Narasīnga Yādavariyā.

Tikka II

The history of the Nellore Telugu Chōla kingdom after the battle of Muttukūr is obscure. Tikka II or Irumāḍi Tirukālattidēva, the son of Tikka I, came to power in 1265 A.D. A record of this date at
Tondamanāṇḍ in Chittoor district registers the construction of a sluice of a tank at the place by him. He is represented by another inscription at Krishnapatnam in Nellore district. It is dated in his 2nd regnal year and S. 1201 (1279 A.D.). It is obvious from this that his accession to the throne must have taken place in 1278 A.D. The assumption of the title Tribhuvanachakravarti, the use of his own regnal years in the inscriptions and the absence of the mention of any overlord indicate that he was ruling as an independent chief.

Manuma Gandagopala

The next ruler, whose inscriptions we come across, was Manuma Gandagopala. There is no information about his father Hallasiddhi II. We hear of Manuma Gandagopala for the first time in 1272 A.D., in an inscription of Ambadeva, the Kāyastha subordinate of the Kākatiya rulers, at Tripurantakam in Prakasam district. The latter claims to have established Manuma Gandagopala at Vikramasimhapura, i.e., Nellore. The next we hear of him is in 1284 A.D., which is stated to be the third year of his reign. He is mentioned in another inscription as a subordinate of Kākatiya Pratāparudra, the date of which is
Manuma Gandagopala bore the title PrithviIśvara-sīraḥ-
kandukas-trīdāvinīda, the title which is borne by Tikka I. It is likely that Manuma Gandagopala inherited this title. He also had the titles Uraiyūrpuravasādhīśvara and Jagadobbaganda.

Manuma Gandagopala's reign witnessed an attack of the Kakatiyas under Adidamu Mallu who is stated to be the right hand man of the Sakala Sēnāśhipati Sōmayājula Rudrādēva. He opposed the Kakatiya army but was killed in the encounter. Adidamu Mallu assumed the title Manuma-
Gandagopala-sīraḥ-khandana. Manuma Gandagopala is the last known chief of the Telugu Cholas. His period was followed by the invasions of Ala-ud-Din Khilji and his general Malik Kafur in which all the southern kingdoms including that of the Telugu Cholas were swept away.
While discussing the genealogy and chronology we have noticed the existence of three chiefs with the names ending with Gandagopala such as Vijaya Gandagopala, Vīra Gandagopala and Rāja Gandagopala. Since these chiefs could not be fitted into the known genealogies we suggested that they belonged to a branch of the Telugu Cholas of Nellore. We have also noticed that no specific relationships between these chiefs can be established. On the basis of the inscriptions of these chiefs a short account of them is given below.

Of these three chiefs, Vijaya Gandagopala comes first in the chronological order though, of course, there is overlapping of dates with the next chiefs. As observed earlier this is an explicable phenomenon.

It has been seen that the southern part of the Nellore kingdom was under Vijaya Gandagopala and his successors. His period is represented by a remarkably large number of epigraphs. There are one hundred and fifty-five records spread over seven districts. The largest number (108) comes from Chingleput district.
Chingleput was followed by North Arcot (19), Nellore (13), Chittoor (12), Cuddapah (1), Kurnool (1) and Tanjore (1). In these records he was referred to as Vijaya Gandagopala, Tribhuvanachakravartin Vijaya Gandagopala, Tribhuvanachakravartin Sir Vijaya Gandagopala, Madhurantaka Pottapi Chola Vijaya Gandagopala, Madhurantaka Pottapi Chola alias Vijaya Gandagopala, Ananta Vijaya Gandagopala and Mahamandalesvara Vijaya Gandagopala. Of these names, the second is the most commonly mentioned. Vijaya Gandagopala is being confused with Manumasidhi II. For instance, Robert Sewell equates Manumasidhi with Vijaya Gandagopala. Hultzsch is of the view that Gandagopala was the proper name and Vijaya was only an adjective meaning 'victorious'. But this view is not correct because we have at least three Gandagopalas who were distinguished by the appellation Vijaya, Vira and Raja. Only five inscriptions of his are dated in the Sakas era, that is, 1185, 1187 (three inscriptions) and 1207. The first of these is said to correspond to Kudhirasagacin and the second to the 15th and 16th regnal years of his. Only two records help to arrive at his initial year as 1250 A.D. Of the one hundred and fifty-five records belonging to his period, there are hardly two in Telugu. His inscriptions in Nellore district, with the exception of two,
are from Gudur and Sulurpet taluks. The other two are from Nellore and Atmakur taluks. The latter is dated 1285 A.D. His records in Nellore district are dated in his 2, 7, 11, 19, 21, 23, 24 and 27 regnal years indicating that the southern taluks of the district were under his control almost from the beginning of his reign.

Quite a large number of subordinates figure in his inscriptions. The more prominent of them are Rājendraśāla Mumudī Vaidumā Mahārāja Pemmādīva; Aḷaḷīya Pallavān Birīlīsāla Śambuvarāya of the Śengēni family; Madusūdanādīva, son of Mahāmandalēśvara Tripurāntakadēva of the Pallava lineage; Nallasittarasar, son of Bhimarasar of Tīvagasmudrapattai; Kannudaimperumāl Śambuvarāya; Rājarāja Śambuvarāya, Valittunai Apparasar, son of Sindamarasar of Tīvagasmudrapattai; Śrikēryam Pallavarāyār; Śambuvarāyār Viḷrāṇaḷ; Nallasiddarasā of the Pallava family; Rājagambhlra Śambuvarāya; Nulōttungasāla Śambuvarāya; Sālukki Nārāyana Alluvaramarāsan; Gūndur Singapperumāl alias Abhinava Bhatta Bāna of Velīchhērī; Nāyanār Nalla Nāyanār, son of Panchamadīvāna Nīlagangaraiyar; and Semban Kuḍaiyan Sōran Avaiyandai of Tirukāchhērī.
His latest year, according to inscriptions, is 1285 A.D. But his reign is taken to the 42nd year, i.e., 1291-92 A.D., on the basis of the cyclic year Khara mentioned in a copperplate record.

Vīra Gandagopāla

The successor of Vijaya Gandagopāla was Vīra Gandagopāla. His relationship with the former is, however, not known. His inscriptions are dated between 1292 and 1301 A.D., and most of them are in Chingleput district.

Rāja Gandagopāla

The next chief of this branch was Rāja Gandagopāla, for whom also we have dates between 1296 and 1325 A.D. He figures for the first time in an inscription of 1296 A.D., which is said to be his 6th regnal year. Though there are many inscriptions for this chief, they do not mention any specific political event. The latest year giver for him is the 35th which is equated with 1325 A.D. This takes him to the post-Kākiśā period when the country was in the grip of Muslim occupation.
Rāja Gandagopāla styled himself as the lord of the city of Vikramasimhapura. Neither his antecedents nor the circumstances in which he came to power are known. An inscription of 1297 A.D., from Narasaraopet states that one Manuma Gandagopāla raided the territory of Rāja Gandagopāla. He also claims to have destroyed the Sēuna and Dravida armies. The reference to the attack on the Sēunas appear to be the same as the one led by the Kākatiya general Gōna Gann̄a Reddi who went as far as Raichur into the Sēuna kingdom and built a fort there. The Dravida army is identical with that of the Pāṇḍyas.

The beginning of the 14th century witnessed a series of invasions on the south by the Sultans of Delhi. Kākatiya Prataparudra could successfully withstand these onslaughts till 1309 A.D. and, in next year, when any more resistance became impossible, he sued for peace and paid tribute to them. Taking advantage of his preoccupation with these things, the vassals of the Kākatiya kingdom including Rāja Gandagopāla declared their independence. In 1310 A.D. there was a civil war in the Pāṇḍya kingdom between Sundara Pāṇḍya and Vīra Pāṇḍya, the two sons of Māravarman Kulasekhara, for the throne. The Pāṇḍya kingdom was invaded in 1311 A.D. by Malik Kafur at the
instance of the Delhi Sultan Ala-ud-Din Khilji. Ravivarman Kulasekhara of Kerala rebelled against Sundara Pandya and drove him out of his kingdom. Sundara Pandya sought the help of Ala-ud-Din Khilji who, besides despatching some force under Sundara Pandya, sought the assistance of Prataparudra. This came in handy for Prataparudra to re-establish his hold on Nellore and other areas. The Kakatiya army set out under the command of Prataparudra assisted by Muppidi Nayaka and his son Pedda Rudra, Devari Nayudu, Recherla Bradacha and other generals. They defeated Raja Gandagopala and put him to flight.

Nellore was conferred on Muppidi Nayaka who styled himself as the lord of Vikramasimhapura. The conquest of Nellore by Prataparudra took place in about 1315 A.D. An epigraph of 1318 A.D., at Komarapudi in Nellore district registers the assignment of the services of two persons for maintaining a perpetual lamp for the success of Muppidi Nayaka's arms.

Though there is an epigraph at Tiruppalaivanam in Chingleput district referring to Raja Gandagopala's thirty-fifth regnal year, his rule can be said to have ended in 1315 A.D., itself.
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