CHAPTER II

HISTORY OF CAULUKYAS UP TO VASTUPĀLA

A) ORIGIN OF GURJARADEŚA AND ITS PEOPLE

In any attempt to study the History of Caulukyas certain problems connected with the history of Gurjaradeśa have to be examined again in the light of materials which the labours of Indian Scholars have made available.

A controversy has arisen over the word 'Gurjara'. Does the word primarily denote the country, Gurjaradeśa, Gurjarabhumi, Gurjarātra or Gujarāt? And has the word been transferred to its rulers and residents in its secondary meaning? Or was Gurjara in its inception the name of an immigrating tribe or tribes and was later transferred to the tract where they first settled and to the kings and the people of that race?.

This problem has been created by a failure to appraise the value of two facts. Modern Gujarat (=Gujarat) is not geographically the same as the Gurjarabhumi of the Caulukyas; and modern and Caulukyan Gujarats are both different historically and geographically from Gurjaradesa. The term ‘Gujarat’ is at present, used in different senses by different people. In ordinary language the term Gujarat is used in two senses. In the first sense it denotes the main land between Mount Abu and the river Daman-Ganga distinguishing it from Cutch and Kathiwar on the one side and Marwar and the Malwa on the
other. In the second sense it means the much larger language-field in which modern Gujarati is spoken. The boundary of this linguistic Gujarat in the north touches Sirohi and Marwar and includes Cutch and the districts of Thar and Parkar in Sind. Its eastern frontier runs down from the Aravalli hills along the eastern boundary of Palanpur enclosing the Bhill settlements and running along the eastern boundary of Dharampur, with the sea in the west. Linguistic Gujarat tapers down to a narrow strip which ends in the bilingual area of the city and the suburban district of Bombay. This area, within which modern Gujarati is spoken may, therefore be called modern Gujarat.

But at no time in history were its frontiers co-terminous with the boundaries of any part of political Gujarat or of Gurjaradesa known to history. At the same time at no time in history were Mount Abu and the town Srimala or Bhillamala outside the boundaries of the tract known as Gurjara or Gurjaradesa or Gujarat. Bhillamala therefore, is the centre, the fluctuating boundaries of the province have to be measured from it.

Gujarat again is not the same thing as Gurjaradesa or Gurjara. The word 'Gurjara' appears in history as applicable to a region in the middle of the sixth century A.D. Its capital was Bhillamala. Its southern boundary was somewhere about the river Sarasvati on which the town of Patana (now in Baroda state) came to be situated. Its northern boundary was beyond modern Jodhpur. The land was styled 'Gurjara' pure and simple. The names of the countries which surrounded it and which now form part of modern Gujarat were not very different in point of population, but were differently
delimited. Nasik was Nasik in Maharashtra. From Bulsar to Broach was Bhrgukaccha or south Lata. From Broach to Mahi including the modern Baroda. Pranta was Malava, from Mahi to Sabarmati was Khetaka, modern Kheda; parts of Ahmedabad district were Asapalli near the modern village Aslali; north of it was Anarta with its capital Anandapura of modern Vaḍanagar. Kathiawar was divided into Valabhi and Saurastra. Kaccha was so named even then. What is Malva now was called Ujjayini or Avanti. The southern part of the old Gurjara is now included in modern Gujarat as its northernmost part and lies between Sirohi and the Sarasvati.

The imperial Gurjaras of the first dynasty, who are styled by modern historians as the Pratihāras of Kanauj, looked to Gurjaradesa as their homeland. That is why they were called Gurjaras. And the imperial Gurjaradesa, under the greatest of them, Mihirabhoja, extended in the west, from Prthudaka in the Punjab to Jodhpur, from Jodhpur to Abu, from Abu to the mouth of Sarasvati, so as to include the portion east of modern Wadhwan. The Sarasvati was the southern limit or perhaps Anarta was absorbed in Gurjaradesa. The bulk of modern Malwa also formed part of it. Saurastra and Kaccha were not in Gurjaradesa but were ruled by the Imperial Gurjaras. The region from Khetaka, modern Kaira, or perhaps from Mahi to Kaveri in the Surat district was not in Gurjaradesa and was called Lāṭa. Lāṭa was the battle-ground, between the Pratihāra emperors of Gurjaradesa and the Rāṣṭrakuta emperors of Karnataka.
Two successive raids of the Rastrakutas, one in 915 A.D., and the other in 940 A.D. broke the first empire of Gurjaradesa. The political fabric which the imperial Gurjaras of the Pratihara dynasty had reared went to pieces. Every feudatory became independent. Gurjaradesa from the homeland of emperors became a battle-ground of petty kings. The principal fragments of the imperial Gurjaradesa were the regions of Delhi, Sapadalaksa with Sakambhari, modern Sambhar, as its capital in the north, Gopagiri, modern Gwalior, Kiradu near Jodhpur, Marwar with its capital at Naddula, Medapata with its capital at Citrakuta or Chitor, Jabalipura or modern Jhalor, Abu with its capital at Candrawati; Sarasvata Mandalas or the valley of the Sarasvati river with its capital Anahilavada Patana; Vagada or Dungarpur Banswara State and Malwa with its Capital Dhar. Gurjaradesa at the height of its first Empire includes other provinces also, Viz. Kanyakubja Visaya, the region around Kanauj. Pratisthana Visaya, the region around Kasi; Jejabhukti or Bundelkhand, Saurashtra and Kaccha. These also drifted away as separate kingdoms and the limits of old Gurjaradesa were forgotten.

In this confusion, Mūlarāja the founder of the Caulukya dynasty captured the Southernmost slice of Gurjaradesa and established himself at Anahilavada Pāṭana. His little principality was known as Sārsvata Maṇḍala, not as Gurjaradesa. When he carved out this little kingdom for himself the Paramara ruler who ruled over modern Malwa, Khetaka Maṇḍala and parts of Lāṭa was called a Gurjara. But the title, Gurjareśvara struck to Mūlarāja and his successors who ruled at Pāṭana. No doubt Sārsvata Maṇḍala and Satyapura Maṇḍala which he soon captured and adjoining Abu region, were parts of old
Gurjaradesa \(^5\) But after 940 A.D. the territory over which the Caulukyas of Gujarat ruled, came to be called ‘Gurjarabhumi’. And as the Southern frontier of their little kingdom advanced under Karṇa, Jayasimha-Siddharaja and Kumārapāla, the name ‘Gurjarabhumi’ or ‘Gujarat’ came to be applied to such accretions. Each of the other fragments of the imperial Gurjaradesa was known by a separate name, but the region from Abu in the receding southern frontier which first rested on the Mahi, then on the Narmada and then on the Daman-Ganga on the main-land, came to be known as Gujarat. The kings of Anahilavāda were invariably Gurjaresvaras.

The name Lāṭa as applied to the portion between Mahi and Daman slowly disappeared and the southern boundary of Gurjarabhumi was Daman-Gahgā when Kumārapāla died in 1174. A.D. \(^6\) When the Muslims captured Anahilavāda Pāṭana the kingdom that they inherited from the Caulukyas of Pāṭana was known as the kingdom of Gujarat. Thus it was Mūḷarāja and his successors who acquired a part of the imperial Gurjaradesa for themselves and brought with them the name Gurjaresvāras and it was in their time that the bulk of the peninsular Gujarat received its name.

The second belief almost elevated to the pedestal of a religious dogma, which consciously or unconsciously obscures judgement of this period of Indian History, is that Gurjaras were a foreign tribe. They immigrated to India with the Hunas in C.450 A.D. Whatever the locality of which the word ‘Gurjara’ or any word of which it forms part like Gujranwala, Gujarat, Gurjarkahan is applied at present, indicates the settlement of this foreign tribe
in its onward march from the north-western frontier of India to the Khatiawar peninsula. People or kings referred to as Gurjaras, therefore, belonged to this foreign tribe.

This theory of immigration has so captured the imagination of students of Indian History, both Indian and Foreign, that everything connected with Gurjara is sought to be explained by it. But against great names in Indian Research like JACKSON, BHAGWANLAL, HOERNLE, BHANDARKAR and SMITH, there has been a protest led by VAIDYA, OJHA and KRISHNASWAMI IYENGAR the last of whom states, "I do believe that the immigration of the Gurjaras is not such a settled fact of history for deductive applications. I did my best to examine the materials on which the theory of immigration was based and I submit that in view of all the evidence that has been forth-coming of recent years the theory of immigration is unsustainable".

K.M. MUNSHI, clarifies the position in this statement by saying "I venture to submit that there is no determinative piece of evidence that the word Gurjara was used to indicate the race of the person indicated; or that the person denominated was of the foreign origin."

The theory began with an early bias which can be traced to European scholars of the mid-nineteenth century. Some of the inferences drawn under the influence of this bias were remarkable:

(A). The Gurjaras were always coupled with the Hunas. They were 'Khazaras', part of the great horde of which Juan-Juan or Avars and the Epithaletes Yeats and the white Hunas were leading elements. Therefore the Gurjaras came with the Hunas to India.
As against this, is the other view which is borne out by the literary and ephigraphic references of six centuries. In the seventh century A.D. a certain tract in modern Rajaputana was known by the name of Gurjara. Its inhabitants were divided into Brahmanas, Kṣatriyas, Vaiśyas and Śūdras and were similar in race and culture to others of North India. They with the people who occupied Lāṭa, Saurastra, Malva, Ānarta and Ujjayini formed a homogeneous people. The people residing in this tract whenever they migrated to other parts of the country, were known as Gurjaras from the name of their homeland just as residents of other provinces like Gouda, Lata, Dravida were known by the respective names of their homelands. The rulers of Gurjaradesa politically consolidated the surrounding parts of which the people were homogeneous. As a result Gurjaradesa grew to become co-terminous with the kingdom of its kings. The geographical units which are known as Gujarat, which carry the word Gurjara in it, are isolated fragments of that larger Gurjaradesa which have retained old name while the surrounding parts have lost it, or were towns or fortresses built or occupied by persons who called themselves Gurjaras. Finally the castes and tribes which bear the name Gurjara and the kings who styled themselves or were known as such, derived it from their homeland.14

A detailed examination of the sources therefore becomes necessary. But, a few correctives must not be forgotten while securing such evidences.

Firstly, the absence of reference to the name of a country in the Mahābhārata or such earlier records does not mean that the name of the country
is necessarily derived from a foreign name. Lāta, for instance, is not known to the Mahābhārata, and yet no one has suggested that the name was given to modern south Gujarat by foreigners. Vāgada, the name of the region represented by modern Dungarpur-Bansvadra, is not mentioned in the Purāṇas. Even Khetaka Maṇḍala is not found in old literature though its name sprung into existence between the first and the fifth century of the Christian Era. The absence of the name of Gujjar or its Sanskritised form Gurjara therefore from any literary or epigraphic record before the sixth century A.D. need not necessarily involve its foreign origin.15

Secondly, the name of a country is used for its kings both in literature and epigraphic records as in the case of Lāta, Malava, Kuntala, Cedī etc. If Gurjara was the name of a country, its kings would naturally be referred to as Gurjara. Such use does not necessarily denote the original tribe to which the king belonged.

Thirdly, the residents of a country were always described by the name of the country. The use of the words Saurāstras, Lātas, Malavas for residents of these parts is well-known to literature. If the sub-conscious bias in favour of foreign immigration of the Gurjaras is excluded, there is no reason whatever why the word Gurjara applied to Brahmanas, Kṣatriyas, Vaiśyas and Śūdras need be treated as referring to anything except their home-land.16

Fourthly, the evolution of Hindu tradition and society shows a tendency to absorb foreigners settled in this country within the social organisation of Varnāśramadharma. The absorptive tendency of Hindu
(B) Sapādalakṣa is Sevalik. Sevalik is Socotra. Socotra is in Africa. Socotra was colonised by remnants of the Greek army of Alexander. The Capas were Gurjaras and were therefore descended from the Greek heroes.11

(C) The Huna group of tribes permanently settled in Rajaputana. The Gurjaras were its important elements. They migrated to all parts of India, among them were Gurjara Brahmanas and Gurjara cultivators. Therefore the foreign tribe of Gurjaras under Brahmanical influence divided itself into four castes, and hence the foreign Gurjaras became Gurjara Brahmanas. Gurjara Vaiśyas Gurjara Kṣatriyas and Gurjara Śudras.12

(D) People calling themselves Gurjaras are found from the Indus to Ganges, and from the Hazara mountains to the Narmada. They are numerous in western Himalayas a tribe of herdsmen is found calling itself Gurjar in Kāśmir. They are numerous on the banks of upper Jumna and the Doab. This distribution testifies to the tribal movements of the foreign Gurjaras.13

(E) In the Punjab, the names Gujarat, Gujarnwala, Gurjarakhan, still retain their connection with the word Gurjar. Saharanpur was called Gujarat in the eighteenth century. One of the northern districts of Gwalior is still called Gurjaragadh. The northern and central portions of Rajputana were called Gurjarattra in the ninth century. The Gurjaras are found in Bundelakhand. The word Gujarata of course is there as applied to modern Gujarat. There are Gurjaras in the Narmadā valley and Nagpur; and also in South India where they have drifted at least before sixth century. These places, argue eminent scholars, indicate the main stages in the onward march of the foreign Gurjaras from Peshawar to Narmadā.
culture was so effective that within two generations communities of foreign origin became rooted both in tradition and social institutions of the land. If Gurjaras were foreigners, if its warriors had been absorbed completely as Kṣatriyas, so that they traced their decent from a Brahmana Haricandra or from the Ikṣvāku Lakṣmaṇa, it would be surprising indeed if they continued to maintain the badge of their foreign origin by calling themselves Gurjaras. The absorption of foreign tribes in Hindu society has always taken the form of giving to military leaders the position of Kṣatriyas and others the position in the lower strata of the society according to the profession they followed. But in no case except in the isolated and doubtful case of Maga Brahmanas settled at Śrīmala who are stated Magi priests of Persia, has foreign group been given the status of Brahmanas. But to assume that the Gurjaras under Brahmanical influence divided themselves into four castes is to misread the processes of Hindu social and cultural evolution.¹⁷

Fifthly, Rajaputana, Gujarat and Malva wherein are found traces of people, kings and places known by the name of Gurjara or any other name associated with it, were not empty places before the sixth century. From early times Brahmanas, Kṣatriyas, Vaiśyas of Aryo-Dravidian stock, and the aborigines lived there; and the foreign Hunas or Gurjaras, only came if at all as conquering tribes to win, to settle, and to be absorbed among the existing population. Their number therefore could never have been so large as to displace or to absorb the population. The Rajputs of Rajaputana so named only by the Muslim chroniclers could not be all Hunas and Gurjaras, who simply elbowed out the original Kṣatriya donned the belief, tradition and
culture of their victims, as if it were a clock. And if so, where did the old Kṣatriyas go?

If the earliest records which refer to the word Gurjara are examined with the aid of these correctives the theory of immigration will appear to be of doubtful validity.

Bāṇa in his Harṣacarita describes Prabhākaravardhana (569-601 A.D.), the father of Emperor Śrī Harṣa as "The lion to the deer which is the Huna, the dangerous fever to Sindhu Rāja, the one who kept the Gurjara awake, the fell disease to the elephants of Gandhara, the thief of the expanse of Lāṭa, the axe of the creeper of the sovereignty of Malava". These rhetorical references are clearly to the kings of Huna, Sindhu, Gurjara, Gandhara, Lāṭa and Malava, the countries. There is no warrant for treating Gurjaras as necessarily referring to the race, as opposed to the country of the king, nor is Gurjara connected with Huna in such a manner or context as to suggest affinity of race.

Next are two references, one of an individual called Gurjara who engraved a copper-plate charter of Śrī Harṣa found in a village thirty-two miles north-east of Azamgadh, and another to "Kucharakudihai" a temple of Gurjara workmanship referred to in a Tamil poem Manimekhalai composed in the sixth century A.D. These references would equally make sense if the word Gurjara was applied to the individual or individuals with reference to the country of their origin. In C.550 A.D. a Gurjaranrpati invaded region of Broach in Lāṭa from the north; and Daḍḍa I, of Lāṭa is described as
Gurjaranrpativamsa in the inscription of his grand-son. This Gurjaranprani, from epigraphic evidence is now identified with Haricandra the Brahmana who founded the fortunes of the Pratihāra family in the region of modern Jodhpur, which up to the tenth century A.D. was included in Gurjaratra or Gurjara-desa. Why should he be taken to be a king of a foreign tribe and not as referred to by the name of the kingdom he ruled over, when definite epigraphic evidence establishes that this king was a "Learned Brahmana well versed in Vedas?" A Javanese tradition places the arrival of Bhrvijaya the son of Kasamcitra or Bālāditya, King of Gujarat in 603 A.D.

In the seventh century the evidence is conclusive. The Aihole inscription of Pulakesi II of C.625 A.D. records the defeat of Lata, Malava, Gurjara. This is a clear reference to the kings of Gurjara, Lāṭa and Malava whose territories were contiguous. The king of Lāṭa was Gurjaranprativamsa; while the king of Gurjara can be no other than Haricandra's descendant of the Pratihāra dynasty who reigned at Bhilamāla, the capital of Gurjara-desa.

Yuan Chwang, the Chinese traveller, is definite that the countries in Western India from South to North were ranged as follows:

(a) Maharashtra;
(b) Bhīgukaccha;
(c) Malava, the territory between the Narmadā and Mahi and West part of modern Malva.
(d) Khetaka or the modern district of Kaira;
(e) Asapalli or the Ahmedabad district;
(f) Valabhi and Saurasṭra in Peninsula;
(g) Anarta, North Gujarat.
(h) Gurjara; and
(i) Ujjayini.

In 739 A.D. Pulakeshi Avanijanāśraya of Navasari describes the conquest of the Arabs or Tejakas over different kings among whom are mentioned Saindhava, Kaccha, Saurasṭra, Cavotaka, Maurya and Gurjara. Though Cavotaka and Maurya are the family names of rulers, Kaccha and Saurasṭra are the names of countries used for their respective kings. The word Gurjara need not therefore be assumed to be applied to the race of the king but to the country over which he ruled.

In the Pañcatantra, there is a reference to Gurjaradesa where camels were available. This points to Gurjara being identical with Rajputana.

In 778 A.D. Udyotana writing his work Kuvalayamūla at Jabalipura, modern Jhalor, describes the beautiful Gurjaradesa and also refers to its residents in general as Gurjaras.

C.942 A.D. Mūlarāja, the founder of Caulukya dynasty and his successors adopted the title of Gurjaresvara, possibly because they came from
Gurjaradeśa or because Sārasvata and Satyapura Mañḍalas over which Mūlarāja ruled formed part of Gurjaradeśa.28

C.997 A.D. Kṣemendra in his Aucitya-Viśera-Carca describes the war between Munja, identified as Vākpati II, and Mūlarāja of Pāṭana as one between the lion of Malava and the lord of Gurjara.29

These all facts make it clear that the people of Rajaputano, Malva, and of modern Gujarat during the period under survey, were one homogeneous people divided into Varnās.

Next, we have to observe the Cauhikya dynasty of Gujarat, of which, our hero of the Vasantvilāsa Mañḍakāvya, by name Vastupāla was the prime-minister in the court of Cauhikya king Viradhavala.

B. HISTORY OF CAULUKYAS

In the following pages an attempt has been made to trace in brief the history of the dynasty established by Mūlarāja in Gujarat with its capital at Anahilapāṭaka. This dynasty is usually referred to as the Caulukyas of Gujarat, though two other dynasties are known to have existed in Gujarat who also called themselves Caulukyas. The relationship, if any, which existed between these three dynasties is not known, and we shall confine our attention exclusively to the activities of the dynasty established by Mūlarāja, and of its successors, the Vaghelas, of which the hero of the Vasantvilāsa Mañḍakāvya Vastupāla was the prime-minister.
It is generally held that the terms Caulukya and Calukya are synonymous and that these two names and their variants denote the same or various branches of the same family. But while the royal houses of Badami, Vengi and Kalyana were called Caulukyas, Calukyas——and particularly in the case of the house of Badami under variants of the same term——the dynasty founded by Mularaja described themselves in all but four of its records as Caulukyas.30 Thus while the earlier dynasty and its branches practically never call themselves Caulukyas, the latter dynasty also never uses the form Calukya. Moreover, while both the Eastern Caulukyas of Vengi and the Western Calukyas of Kalyana have claimed relationship with maunu dynasty of Badami the Caulukyas have never done so, nor have they like the Calukyas of Badami ever claimed to be the sons of Harisi and to belong to Manavya-gotra.31 But they had the following common traditions with the Calukyas of Kalyana, namely, origin of the dynasty from Brhma's Culuka, and migration of their ancestor's from Ayodhya, the latter being common with the Vengi branch also.32 Hence though the term Caulukya will be used throughout this work to denote the family name of Mularaja and his successors, it may be assumed that all these families had a common origin, though there is no conclusive evidence for such an assumption.

According to the tradition current among the Caulukyas as early as the twelfth century A.D. their ancestor was created from the Culuka or the water-pot of Brahma. This has been described in two inscriptions of the reign of Kumāralpāla of which the Vadānagara-Praisūtī states: “Humbly asked by the gods for a protector against the insults of Danu's sons, the Creator, though
about to perform the twilight worship, produced forthwith in his pot (Culuka) filled with the holy water of Gaṅgā, that hero named Culukya who sanctified these three worlds with the floods of his fame. From him sprang a race ...." which came to be known as Caulukya.33

Practically the same story is repeated by Abhayatilaka Gaṇi, the commentator of Dvīṣrayakavya, while commenting on the word Caulukya-vamsa occurring in the second verse of that work; and Merutuṅga in his Prabandha-cintāmaṇi repeats the verse quoted by Abhayatilaka Gaṇi:

The elephants are ill to take service with, the mountains

have lost their wings

The tortoise is a laggard in love of his friends, and this

lord of the snakes is double tongued,

The creator considering all this, produced, for the support

of the earth,

From the mouthful of water sipped at the evening ceremony,

a brave warrior with waving sword blade.34

Bālacandra Sūri, however, in his Vasantavilāsa follows story of the Vaḍanagar-Praśasti, and relates that the first Caulukya was created to destroy the demons.35
An entirely different version is given by Jayasiṃha Sūri, who wrote his Kumarapālakūṭapālacakarita later than the authorities cited above. Ignoring the supernatural origin of the race, Jayasiṃha Sūri traces the descent of his hero’s ancestors from one Caulukya, who was a great and virtuous warrior who destroyed countless enemies and then fixed his capital at Madhupadma. There then arose a race known by his name Caulukya; after many kings and in the course of time Śrī Siṃhavikrama was born in the family, who freed the whole world from debt and proclaimed his own era. Siṃhavikrama’s son was Harivikrama from whom were descended eighty-five kings of admirable splendour. Then came a king named Rāma, his son was Bhaṭa, destroyer of Śakas and his son was Śrī Daḍḍaka, conqueror of the Gaja king of Pipasa. Daddaka’s kingdom was occupied by Kāśchikavyāla. Then there shone the moon-like king Rāji who married Lilādevī; their son was Mūlarāja.36

It may be mentioned here that in the Vikramāṇkadevacarita, Bihāra relates that once during his Sandkya meditation, Brahma was requested by Indra to produce a warrior and Brahma created one from the water of his Cūluka. From this warrior arose a race of kings which included the first man Harita and Māṇavya.37

Thus we see that with the exception of Jayasiṃha Sūri, all the other authors have recorded mythical stories probably because during that age it became customary for the royal dynasties to trace their origin to some mythical or epic hero.
The bardic stories which gave another version of the origin of the Caulukyas are no less fanciful; some of these tales were first recorded by Tod, according to whom the Paramaras, the Pratiharas, the Caulukyas, and the Chahamanas belonged to the *Agnikula*. Tod recorded a bardic tale according to which once upon a time the *Daityas* began to render impure the sacrifice of the *Munis* who had their *Agnikunda* (Fire-pit) on the summit of Mt. Abu. Tormented by its repeated desecration, the priests assembled round the fire-pit and prayed for help to *Mahādeva*. “From the fire-fountain a figure issued forth, but he had not a warrior’s mien. The Brahmins placed him as guardian of the gate, and hence his name Pratihadvara. A second issued forth, and being formed in the palm (Caloo) of the hand was named Calooka, the third was Paramar, and the fourth Chauhan”.38

A different bardic account was however recorded by Cunningham. It is as follows:

From Brahma’s essence the Solankhi was born
Brahma named him Caluk Rao;
From Siva’s essence the Puwar was born
From Devi’s essence the Pariyar was born
From the fount of fire sprang up; and wandered forth
leaving Abu for Abharh of chosen race the Chahuwan.39

It is difficult to trace the source of the second legend, but there is hardly any doubt that the first legend gained in popularity after its inclusion in the
Prithvirāja Rāso of Chand Bardai, who is generally considered to be the originator of the tale. According to the Rāso an incantation was commenced by the whole body of the Sages on Mt. Abu under the leadership of Vasiṣṭha. The ceremony was interrupted by the demons, when in answer to the prayer of Vasiṣṭha there appeared the Pratihara's, Caulukyas and Paramara's, one after another but as none of them was able to defeat the demon, the Chāhamāna had to be created who killed the demons, so that the Sages were at last able to conclude their ceremony peacefully.⁴⁰

MODERN VIEWS

Like the myths, these fanciful tales do not deserve serious consideration; but these bardic lores generally known as the Agnikula legend was accepted by Jackson, Campbell, Indraji and D.R. Bhandarkar, as a corroborative testimony of their theory of the foreign origin of the Gurjaras amongst whom they included Caulukyas.⁴¹ But Buhler, Syamaldas, Ojha and Halder have conclusively proved by demonstrating great historical discrepancies that the worth of Prthvirāja-Rāso, as a sober historical work, is practically negligible.⁴² Among the errors contained in the Raso is the statement that Anāṅgapāla Tomara was the grandfather of Prithviraja which is not a fact; similarly the Rāso's statement that Rāṇa Samarasiṃha of Mewad married a sister of Prithviraja and died fighting Muʿizz ud-Din is quite unfounded. The known facts about Rāṇa Samarasiṃha prove that he flourished a century after Prithviraja, so that it was as impossible for him to
have married the sister of the Chāhamāṇa Emperor as to have fought against his conqueror. Further the Rāṣo relates that Bhima II was killed by Prithvirāja, though it can be proved that the latter outlived the former by about half a century. As for the Agnikula legend neither the Caulukya records nor any of the Gujarat chronicles claim for them such an origin, though they not only knew the legend but recorded that Paramara's were descended from the sacrificial fire.43

A.K.Majumdar in his celebrated work “Caulukyas of Gujarat” discussed all the statements of scholars about the origin of Caulukyas and came to the conclusion that:

“ The discovery of the Varuṇāṅgakārmaka grant has thrown fresh light on the ancestry of Mūlarāja. These plates issued during the reign of Mūlaraja by his son record that Mūlarāja was a descendant of Vyālakāṃchi-Prabhu. As Jayasimha Suri states in his work that Kāṇchikavyāla was the father of Rāji, M.M.Mirashi has identified him with Vyālakāṃchi which is quite likely. Thus, of the three Chroniclers Jayasimha Sūri alone seems to have based his narrative on a tradition which is to some extent corroborated by an inscription; therefore we may place greater reliance on Jayasimha Sūri’s statement. According to him the progenitor of the race was a warrior called Chulukya, who, after having destroyed many enemies established his capital at Madhupadma. There then arose a race known by the name of Caulukya and in course of time king Sinhavikrama was born in that family. Sinhavikrama freed the whole earth from debt, and proclaimed his own era. His son was
Harivikrama from whom were descended eighty five kings. Then came a king named Rāma whose son was Sahajarāma, the destroyer of the Śakas. His son was Dadakka conqueror of the Gaja king of Pipāsa. Dadakka’s kingdom was occupied by Kāśchikavyāla, whose son was Rāji, the father of Mūlarāja.

"Evidently the first part of Jayasimha Sūri’s story has no more value than a legendary tradition. But, beginning with Rāma, the kings mentioned in his chronicle seem to be historical persons. Probably Rāji’s ancestors were petty princes of a place called Madhupadma. M.M.Mitashi is of the opinion that, this Madhupadma was situated on the river Madhuveṇī (modern Mahuwar) a tributary of the Betwa. But this identification is beset with too many difficulties, and tentatively we may assume that Madhupadma was Mathura. We may therefore conclude that Raji came from outside Gujarat, not from Kanauj, but probably from Mathura”.

From Mularaja, we will get a correct historical informations about the Caulukya dynasty. Now we can briefly observe the geneology of the kings from Mūlarāja to Viradhavala.
I) Mūlarāja I [V.S.998-1053] (A.D.941-997)

There were once three brothers, Rāji, Bija and Daṇḍaka, who came to Somanātha on a pilgrimage. On their return journey they were passing through Anahilapāṭaka, the capital of the Chapotkata king, Sāmantasiṁha. One day king Sāmantasiṁha was engaged in the amusement of manege and the three young pilgrims hastened to witness the show. Suddenly the king mishandled a horse and whipped it. This was too much for Rāji who exclaimed: “Alas! Alas!” This censure drew the attention of the king to Rāji who was then able to impress him by his knowledge of horsemanship. Thus began a friendship which was strengthened when Sāmantasiṁha gave his sister Līlādevī in marriage to Rāji. Some time later Līlādevī died while pregnant; her womb was opened and the son taken out. This son was named Mūlarāja as he was born under the auspices of the star Mūla.

Mūlarāja became popular at an early age because he was ‘resplendent as the newly rising sun’, and by his valour he extended the sway of his maternal uncle Sāmantasiṁha. But Sāmantasiṁha began to throw dangerous temptations in the way of his ambitious nephew: he would crown Mūlarāja when drunk and depose him when sober; the ‘Chapotkata gift’ became a proverbial jest. Finding himself daily disappointed in this manner, Mūlarāja made ready his followers and while he was one day being placed on the throne by his inebriate uncle, he killed him and thus became the master in reality. This event probably took place in V.S. 998.
This detailed story of Mūlarāja’s accession is given by Merutuṅga. But three other Chroniclers, namely, Arisīṁha, Udayaprabha, and Kṛṣṇāji also state that Mūlarāja was the son of the sister of the last Chapotkaṭa king.⁴⁵ We also learn from the drama *Moharājaparājaya* that the Chapotkaṭas were notorious drunkards.⁴⁶ Mūlarāja claims in one of his inscriptions that he conquered the “province watered by Sarasvati through the strength of his arms”. ⁴⁷ Thus it seems that the transfer of power from the Chapotkaṭas to the Caulūkyaśas was not peaceful and Mūlarāja was most probably the nephew of the last Chapotkaṭa king.

However, Merutuṅga’s story suffers from one great drawback. According to him Sāmantasimha reigned only for seven years. If, therefore Rāji married Sāmantasimha’s sister during the latter’s reign, the child of that marriage could at most be about six years old at the time of Sāmantasimha’s death. The absurdity of a child of six years murdering his uncle and ascending the throne was pointed out long ago by Bühler, who entirely dismissed the story of the Gujarāt Chroniclers and suggested that Mūlarāja was a conqueror of Sāmantasimha’s kingdom.⁴⁸

There is no doubt however that Mūlarāja removed the Chapotkaṭa king, for we find in the *Vadanagar-Praśasti* the following statement:

“Illustrious Mūlarāja ..... by excessively light taxes gained to the affection of his subjects. He made the fortune of the Chapotkaṭa princes, whom he took captive at his will, an subject of enjoyment for the multitude of his relations, of Brahmins, bards and servants”.⁴⁹
II) Cāmuṇḍarāja [V.S.1053-1066] (A.D.997-1009)

Cāmuṇḍarāja, son of Mūlārāja, probably ascended the throne sometime in A.D.996-7. 52 As early as V.S.1033 (A.D.977), Cāmuṇḍa as a Yuvarāja was issuing land grants.53 This shows that he was at that time old enough to be entrusted with such considerable power. Hence at the time of his accession, he must have been quite advanced in age.

No inscription issued during the reign of Cāmuṇḍa or the two successors has yet been discovered, and the Chroniclers record little about them. We have already seen that Hemacandra gave the credit to Cāmuṇḍa for defeating Bārapa during the reign of Mūlārāja but as all other Chronicles ascribe the victory to Mūlārāja himself, it seems that Cāmuṇḍa fought under his father, though he may have led the army during the actual combat. 54

Two conventional verses in the Vastupāla-Tejapāla-Praśasti describe Cāmuṇḍa as having decorated the earth with the heads of the enemy-princes, and his sword is compared to the well of Goddess Harisiddhi, wherein the truthless enemies, prepared for death, earn fame by pouring their blood.55 Jayasiṅha Sūri mentions more specifically that Cāmuṇḍa killed in battle one Sindhuraja who was as ungovernable as the sea.56 This Sindhuraja can be no other than the Paramara Sindhurāja of Malava who was Cāmuṇḍa’s contemporary. Sindhuraja’s court poet Padmagupta mentions his victory over the princes of the Hunas and Keralas, and the inhabitants of Vagadā, Lāṭa and Murala. 57 Vagadā was the country comprising Banswara and the Dungarpur states, which lies to the north-east of Gujarat, and Lāṭa was southern Gujarat. Padmagupta
does not mention the names of the kings with whom Sindhurāja had to fight for Lata, but it could be either Cāmuṇḍa or Gogginīja. The history of Lāṭa during this period is confused. Most probably Sindhurāja attacked while Lata was under Cāmuṇḍa, who soon after took his revenge. For, apart from the Gujarat Chronicles mentioned above, the Vāḍanagarpalasti composed about two centuries before Jayasiṁha Sūri’s work, records that on seeing from afar the armies of Cāmuṇḍarāja, Sindhurāja together with his elephant-forces beat such a cowardly retreat that he thereby lost all his well established fame.58 There is no doubt therefore, that Sindhurāja was thoroughly beaten by Cāmuṇḍa, though the statement of Jayasiṁha Sūri, that Sindhurāja was killed need not be taken as literally true. The effect of Cāmuṇḍa’s victory probably led to a diminution of the Paramara influence in Abu and Mewar where Caṅkulya influence predominated.59

According to Hemacandra, Cāmuṇḍa had three sons, namely, Vallabharāja, Durlabharāja and Nagarāja. After their education had been completed, Cāmuṇḍa asked Vallabha to uproot a ‘thorn’ that is an enemy. In obedience to his father’s command Vallabha set out with an army.59
III) Vallabharāja. [V.S.1066] (A.D.1009)

Hemacandra nowhere refers to Vallabha as a king, far less does he mention his coronation in the Devāśrayakāvyā, though a bendictory verse in the Siddha-Hemacandra is devoted to Vallabha, which shows that Hemacandra regarded Vallabha as a king, for those verses were composed in honour of only the Caulukya Kings.60 The Vādanagar-Praśasti, composed during the time of Hemacandra includes Vallabha in the list of the Caulukya kings. Bālacandra Sūri also includes the name of Vallabha in the Caulukya genealogy respectively in the same line up.61 Some Caulukya inscriptions do not include the name of Vallabha in the Caulukya genealogy, but most inscriptions do.

The reason may be as suggested by Bihler, that the shortness of the reign induced the writers of inscriptions sometimes to omit his name; it may also be due to the possible fact that his father Cāmunḍarāja was living when he died, as suggested by Dr.Ray. In view of the insertion of the incidents mentioned above by Abhayatilaka Gaṇi, the suggestion of Dr.Ray seems to be correct solution to the problem.62

Merutuṅga in his Prabandhacintāmaṇi states that Vallabha ascended the throne after the death of Cāmunḍa and reigned for six months.63 But in his other work, namely, Vīcāraśrīṇi, he has assigned Vallabha a reign of fourteen years, and has placed Cāmunḍa in the list of Chapotkaṭa kings.64 Probably Merutuṅga gave the correct version in the Prabandhacintāmaṇi, but it is evident from his conflicting testimonies that his source of information for this particular period was corrupt. This confusion of the narrator can be
Hemacandra has described the exploits of Mūlarāja in six long cantos; and in his dedicatory verses to Mūlarāja in his Siddha-Hemacandra, praises the latter in unmeasured terms customary to a court poet. But, both he and the other court poet, Somesvara, and also Bālacandra Sūri of Vasantavilāsa Mahākavya, are entirely silent about Mūlarāja's pedigree and his mode of accession to the throne. Had Mūlarāja come as a conqueror, it would have been reasonable to expect at least one of them to have mentioned the fact in his eulogy. Hence their silence may be taken to be significant; it fits well with Merutuṅga's statement that Mūlarāja murdered his uncle, the last Chapotkata king. And there it seems, until further evidence is available, the question must rest at present.

Mūlarāja had appointed his son Cāmuṇḍarāja as the Yuvarāja, and had granted him the important right of issuing land grants without his sanction as early as V.S.1033. According to Hemacandra, after Cāmuṇḍa's return from the victorious campaign against Bārapa, Mūlarāja invested him with full royal powers, and had his Abhiseka performed. Then Mūlarāja retired to Siddhapura where he gave up life by immolating himself on a funeral pyre on the bank of Sarasvati. Merutuṅga gives a different version of the abdication of Mūlarāja. It may therefore be concluded that shortly before his death Mūlarāja abdicated in favour of his son, most probably in V.S.1053 (A.D.997)
explained if we assume that Vallabha actually ruled during the life time of his father Cāmuṇḍa which Merutuṅga was loath to believe probably because assumption of loyalty by a son during his father's life time was beyond the range of his knowledge.65

Abhayatilaka Gani has supplied some details about the death of Vallabha. From the description of disease left by Hemacandra, the commentator rightly concludes that Vallabha was attacked by small-fox, and this is corroborated by Merutuṅga. At first the disease was not properly diagnosed, but with the appearance of eruptions all hope of life was given up. Vallabha then called to his death-bed all his ministers and chided them for not being able to come to a decision even when he was alive. He then called for the commander of the army and ordered that officer to keep his death a secret. Vallabha then offered the officer some gifts and added: "If you remember any benefit derived from my father, return immediately to Anahilapāyaka with the army."

The unhappy officer had to carry out his orders, but could not prevent the news of the King's death from spreading. But the army returned safely to the capital from Northern frontier of Malava, though mourning the loss of the gallant prince, who, placing the safety of the army before his own, had chosen to die alone.66

The death of his eldest son under such tragic circumstances, naturally affected Cāmuṇḍa, who placed his second son Durlabha on the throne and retired to Śuklatirtha on the banks of the Narmadā where he died some time later.67
IV) Durlabharāja [V.S. 1066 - 1080] (A.D. 1009-1023)

Durlabharāja ascended the throne some time in V.S. 1066 (A.D. 1009). The most important event of his reign was the re-conquest of Lāta. The Vādanagara-Praśasti states that, "when filled with anger he somewhat contracted his arched eyebrows, that forthwith indicated its result the destruction of the Lata country." Jayaseṁha Sūri also writes, "Then Durlabharāja having obtained his kingdom, a cloud of the forest having destroyed the lord of the Lātadesa, enjoyed his land with his fortunes."

According to Hemacandra, Durlabha was invited by Mahendra to attend the Svayamvara-Sabha of his sister. Abhayatilaka Gani explains that Mahendra was the king of Naddula in Marudeśa. He is probably identical with the only Mahendra king of Naddula that we know of who was a Cāhamāna king of that branch, whom Kielhorn identified with the prince of the same name who took shelter with Rāstrakūta Dhavala when chased by Cāhamāna Durlabharāja.

Hemacandra devotes practically half a canto to the description of the Svayamvara-Sabhā which was held at Naddula. Durlabha went there and was accorded a fitting reception by Mahendra and almost all the girls of the city hastened to catch a glimpse of the good-looking Caulakya king. At last Durlabha reached the Svayamvara-Mandapa where he was given a seat befitting his exalted rank. Then Durlabhādevi, the sister of Mahendra, entered the pavilion, leaning on a female attendant. The attendant pointed out to the princes-the kings of Aṅga, Kāśi, Avanti, Cedi, Kuru, Huna, Mathura, Vindhya,
Andhra and Gurjara. But Durlabhā selected Durlabha and garlanded him. After the marriage ceremony was over, Mahendra gave his younger sister in marriage to Durlabha’s younger brother Nagarāja, and according to the Abhayantilaka Gaṇi. Laxmi was the name of this princess. But the rejected suitors had become very angry with the successful Durlabha, and attacked him when he was returning to Gujarat. Durlabha however, defeated them with comparative ease and returned home with his bride.73

It is difficult to accept the whole of this narrative as a historical truth. During the time when the marriage of Durlabharāja is supposed to have taken place, North India was reeling under the remorseless raids of Sultan Mohammed. Hence it would have been remarkable for so many monarchs of North India to have left their domains for the purpose of attending the Svayamvara-Sabhā of an insignificant Naḍḍula chief’s sister. But what sets the stamp of real imagination on the whole episode is the defeat by Durlabha of all the assembled kings. It is not surprising that this brilliant feat of Durlabha is not recorded in any Caulukya record, nor is it noticed by any other Chronicler; there is hardly any doubt that it was introduced by Hemacandra so that his Mahākāvya might not suffer from want of the elements that characterised the classical Svayamvara of Indumati as described by Kalidāsa. 74

According to Merutunga, Durlabha built in Anśhilapāṭaka a seven storeyed palace, with a disbursement office and an elephant stable and a clock-tower. Moreover he had built the temple of Madanaśankara for the welfare of the soul of his brother Vallbharāja and he also had the tank of Durlabha excavated.75
V) Bhima (V.S.1088-1122) (A.D.1023-1065)

According to Hemacandra, the childless Durlabha was very fond of his nephew Bhima, son of Nagaraja. When Bhima came of age, Durlabha crowned him king despite his protests. Nagaraja also retired from all public activities at the same time and the two brothers died soon after. These incidents probably happened at the beginning of A.D.1024.

Bhima played an important role in the downfall of Paramara Bhoja of Malava, which for a time left the Paramara's totally powerless. The defeat of the great Paramara monarch was naturally considered the high watermark of Bhima's glory, and almost all the Chroniclers, with the surprising exception of Hemachandra, have recorded this victory in suitable verses. The Vadanagara-Prasasti states: "Illustrious King Bhima, who, though terrible to his foes, ever granted enjoyment to his friends, as ruler, carried this load of the earth. What wonder was there that his horses supremely skilled in accomplishing the five faces (called dhara) quickly gained Dhara the capital of Malava." The chaplain Somesvara states that, just as on the rising of the moon the lotus withers, so did Bhoja wither away by (the power) of Bhima. "He (Bhima) who has conquered the lord of Dhara with a two bladed sword, what wonder is there, that he (Bhima) should conquer hundred of swordsmen. By whose (Bhima's) strong bow, though it reached his neck, Bhoja, when fleeing, has hurled from his horse, as if supposing that he was virtuous." The Vastupala-Tejapala Prasasti, states that it was proper that upon this at-
tack the Goddess of wealth left Bhoja's heart, the Goddess of learning his mouth, and the sword his hands. Arisinha and Bālacandra Sūri, describe in a matter of fact manner how Bhima defeated Bhoja. But Jayasiṅha Sūri writes: "At the setting in of the frost of his greatness the arm of Bhoja faded away like the lotus very properly."

Udayamati was the name of Bhima's queen; but according to Merutuṅga he was excessively fond of a beautiful courtesan named Bakulādevī whom he took into his Antaṅkura. Both Hemacandra and Merutuṅga say that Bhima had three sons, but whereas they agree that the name of the eldest was Mūlarāja, and that another was Karṇa, the other son is called 'Kṣemarāja' by Hemacandra and 'Haripāla' by Merutuṅga. According to Hemacandra, Mūlarāja died during the lifetime of his father who thereupon offered the throne to Kṣemarāja, Kṣemarāja refused the crown, and he and Bhima induced Karṇa to accept it. As instances of such voluntary abnegations extremely rare, it may not be a presumptuous reflection on the great monk's veracity to assume that he was glossing over the unsavoury genealogy of his royal disciple as befitted a courtier. For, Merutuṅga relates that Haripāla (who is undoubtedly the Kṣemarāja of Hemacandra) was a natural son of Bhima by Bakulādevī.

Great as the political importance of Bhima's reign was, its significance in the history of Indian architecture was no less. It was during his reign that one of the finest temples extant was built, - the Dilwara temple at Abu. The
two other important temples constructed during his reign are now in ruins, having been broken by later Muslim hordes. It is interesting therefore to find that the earliest known mosque built in India was erected during his reign and within his territory in A.D.1035 at Ahmedabad. 87

Queen Udayamati was also a famous builder. Merutunga says that she excavated at the capital a new reservoir which was much better than the Sahastralinga lake. Popular legend credits her with digging the ‘Rañī ki Vāv’, a well at Anahilapātaka, which is in ruins to-day but its exquisite carvings still excite admiration.88

Bhima is described by Krishnaji as dark, stout, tall, and hairy, but handsome, haughty, fond of war, and not afraid of the Mlecchas. Bhima’s reign probably came to an end some time in V.S.1122 (A.D.1065)89

VI) Karna (V.S.1122-1150) (A.D.1065-1093)

Karna, the youngest son of Bhima, ascended the throne some time in A.D.1065-6. His mother was Udayamati.

Hemacandra states as usual that Bhima abdicated and placed Karna on the throne; but, we need not take his statement seriously as he makes the same uncorroborated statement about all the Caulukya kings except Siddharāja. Hemacandra further adds that immediately after Bhima’s death his only other surviving son, Kṣemarāja, retired from public to Dadhisthali.
whither Karna sent the former's son Devaprasanda, to look after his father, but this was done probably to get rid of the two possible pretenders to the throne. In any case, this narrative of Hemacandra leads one to suspect that the indication is that the legitimate son Karna, forcibly occupied the throne and banished his step-brother and nephew after Bhima's death. This would explain the hatred shown by Siddharaja Jayasimha, son of Karna, towards Kumaraapala, the great grandson of Ksemaraja.

Hemacandra records no other incidents in Karna's life except his marriage to a Kadamba princess under romantic circumstances, and Karna's prayer to the Goddess Laksmi for the birth of a son. Indeed from the Dvayrajya written by his son's court-poet, one is led to believe that Karna's reign was a peaceful interregnum between those of his father and son. This may have been the effect intended by Hemacandra in order that the heroic deeds of his first patron, Jayasimha might stand out in greater relief. Probably partiality for the same king led Hemacandra to remain silent over the activities of Bhima and Karna in Malava, so that the whole credit for conquering the Paramaras might be reserved for Jayasimha. But from the testimony of other Chroniclers, and the records left by other dynasties, it is known that the picture left by Hemacandra is by no means the correct one. As a matter of fact though less successful, Karna was as aggressive as was either his father or son.
Like his father, Karna was also a builder. According to Merutunga after defeating Áśa in Áṣapalli he built a temple. He also laid out a new city called Karnavati, where he erected a big temple called Karnesvara and excavated a large tank called Karnasagara. In Anahilapataka he built the temple of Karnameru. According to Forbes the river Rupin, flowing down from the hills beyond Kheraloo, was arrested in its course towards the Runn and compelled to relinquish its natural outlet and to empty its waters into Karnasagara; the dam broke down in A.D.1814 after a heavy rain.

Like his ancestors Karna was a Śaiva, and maintained a friendly respect for the Jainas. The commentator Rajaśekhara (A.D.1424) in his Pañjika on Śridhara’s Nyāyakāndali mentions that king Karna of Gujarat, perceiving the holy dislike of cleanliness of the celebrated Jaina monk Abhayadeva Sūri conferred on him the Biruda of Maladkari. The same Rajaśekhara informs us that Kheṅgara was at that time the ruler of Saurāṣṭra, and that at the instance of Abhayadeva Sūri, he made the deserted path to the shrine of Girnar full of the traffic of pilgrims again; that is, he induced Kheṅgara to lesson or remit altogether the tax levied on pilgrims. Peterson mentions a tradition according to which Karna became a disciple of Vardhmāna Sūri whose disciple Jinesvara won the debate at the court of Durlabha. But this statement must be wrong as we know that Vardhamana Sūri consecrated Vimala’s temple and shortly afterwards starved himself to death.

Karna was famous for his good looks; an inscription of Kumārapāla refers to him as ‘Rupārījita-Manmatha’, while an inscription of Bhima II
describes him as Kāmini-kandarpā. Bālacandra Sūri describes his attractive and beautiful form like thus: “Having seen his attractive beautiful form, capable of deluding any woman, lord Śiva began to suspect the fidelity of his wife Umā and so ran to the peak of Kailāsa mountain to dissolve her in his own body”.

According to Hammira-Mahākāya Karna was killed in a battle by Cāhamaṇa Durlabhāja, but we have seen that according to Pṛthvirāja-vijaya Karna survived Durlabhāja. Karna’s reign probably came to an end in V.S.1150. (A.D.1093)

VII) Jayasimha Siddharāja [V.S.1150-1200] (A.D.1093 1133)

Jayasimha, son of Karna and Mayanallādevī, who assumed Biruda of Siddharāja was the most famous king of his dynasty, and of all the Caulukyas his memory is best preserved to-day in the land of his birth. According to Hemacandra, Karna laboured under a great sorrow because he had no son, wherefore he repaired to a temple of Lakṣmi. There the king meditated for a long time and having successfully overcome the temptations offered by some Apsarāses to distract him, he continued to repeat the mantra taught to him by his preceptor and remained unperturbed even when a demon appeared on the scene threatening to kill him. His wonderful devotion was at last rewarded when Lakṣmi herself appeared and bestowed on her suppliant the blessing of
a son. In due time the son was born, whom the old ladies of the palace named — more appropriately than they imagined — Jayasimha.

This semi-mythical account of the birth of Siddharaja did not find favour with Merutunga, who simply stated that some time after Karna was reconciled to Mayaalladevi their famous son was born. Merutunga further adds that when three years old, Jayasimha while playing with some other children, suddenly climbed on the throne and sat on it. As the astrologers predicted that, that particular movement was propitious, Karna then and there performed the coronation ceremony of his son. This coronation took place, according to Merutunga, on Saturday the third day of the dark fortnight of Pausha in V.S. 1150 in the Nakṣatra of Śrāvaṇa in the lagna of Taurus. Hence according to this account Siddharaja was born in A.D. 1091. Though Karna ceased the reign from the day of his son’s coronation, he must have lived some time longer as Merutunga himself says that Karna defeated Asa after Siddharaja’s coronation.

To-day, when this large empire has passed away, this great monarch is chiefly remembered for his peaceful activities, particularly for the help he rendered to a young Jaina monk. That grateful scholar immortalised the name of his royal patron by associating their names as a title for his grammar Siddha-Hemacandra.

Siddharaja gathered round him many poets and men of letters, but unquestionably Hemacandra was the towering genius, the polymath, before
whose encyclopaedic knowledge, others paled into insignificance. The Chronicles have preserved different versions of the first meeting between the king and Hemacandra. The Prabhavakacarita relates that Siddharaja was once passing through the streets of his capital on an elephant when his eyes fell on a graceful young monk standing by a shop. The king stopped the elephant and called out to the monk to say something. Hemacandra promptly replied: "Siddha, let the stately elephant jump freely without any hesitation! May the world protecting elephants tremble! What is the good of all of them? By thee alone is the world guarded". Siddharaja was so pleased with this verse that he invited the monk to come to the palace daily at noon to entertain him. Hemacandra gradually won the king's esteem and friendship.  

In the Prabhavacarita, Hemacandra is first mentioned after the return of Siddharaja to his capital after his great victory at Malava. On that occasion "representatives of all the sects were summoned on separate days to utter blessings; and so, when the time came for the Jaina teachers with Hemacandra at their head, to be invited, they presented themselves before Siddharaja, and were rewarded by the king with presents of clothes and other gifts. Though they were all charming in their incomparable readiness of intellect, they put Hemacandra in front of themselves in two senses, and he recited to the king the following blessings:
‘O wishing-cow, sprinkle the earth with streams of thy products! O jewel mines
Make a swastika of pearls! O moon, become a full pitcher!
O elephants of the quarters, take leaves of the wishing tree, and with your erected trunks make a temporary arches of forage!
For truly Siddharāja is coming having conquered the world.104

Like many famous Indian monarchs Siddharāja was a great builder. The most important edifice built by him was the Rudramahālāyā temple at Siddhapura which is said to be one of the largest of its kind ever built in India.105 His governor of Saurāstra, Sajjana, is said to have been guilty of appropriating three years’ state revenue without authority, which he used to build a temple of Nemīnātha, but the beauty of the temple so pleased the king that he pardoned the erring officer.106 Siddharāja is chiefly remembered however, for the construction of the Sahasralinga-lake which was surrounded by 1,008 small shrines each containing a Siva Linga; he also established several student’s hostels. A pillar of victory raised its head proudly in front of this magnificent lake.107 On the banks of the Sarasvati he built a temple to Daśāvatāra Nārāyaṇa.108

The last days of the King were darkened by the sad thought that he would die without leaving a son and he was afraid that his subjects would be oppressed.109 Hemacandra, who was probably a member of the royal entourage describes the peregrinations of the Emperor from one temple to
another - Hindu and Jaina - passionately praying to each deity for the gift of a son, while the sight of his loyal subjects, who used to come to pay their respects to their great King evoked in him an upsurge of paternal love. At last, Hemacandra states, the king came to learn through divine intervention that he would not have a son but would be succeeded by his grand-nephew Kumārapāla. Shortly after this Siddharāja died.

VIII) Kumārapāla [V.S.1200-1229] (1143-1172 A.D.)

To a large section of his countrymen particularly the Jains, Kumārapāla remains the greatest king that ever sat on the throne of Gujarat. His fame rests not so much upon the great power in wielded over the extensive territory that formed his kingdom, but on his propagation of the Jaina faith which he adopted. Of all the Indian kings, ancient and medieval, he has the unique distinction of being the one about whom the largest number of Chronicles have been written. This makes his life an interesting study, but unfortunately the Chronicles differ in many important details, and it is therefore necessary to examine the more important of them.

According to Hemacandra, Bhima's son was Kṣemarāja to whom a son Devaprasāda was born during Bhima's reign. Hemacandra further states that Kṣemarāja was, from his youth, of an ascetic disposition, — hence the name of his son Devaprasāda — and that renouncing the throne offered to him
be retired to Dadhistali, whither Karṇa, on his accession, sent Devapraśāda to
look after him. Learning of Karṇa's death Devapraśāda put his son
Tribhuvanapāla in the care of Siddharāja and burnt himself. Tribhuvanapāla
served Siddharāja faithfully; but Hemacandra does not mention when or how
he died, though the point is of some importance as we shall see later.
Tribhuvanapāla's son was Kumārpāla who succeeded to the throne after the
death of Siddharāja. 113

According to Merutunga, during the reign of Bhima I, there was a hetaera
called Bakulādevi at Paṭṭana, famous for her beauty and other merits. The
king wishing to test her rectitude arranged that his servants should deposit
with her a dagger worth a lac and a quarter, as a retaining fee, and on that very
night he himself left on an expedition to Malava. After having spent two years
in that country he returned and found that Bakulādevi had, on the strength of
the retaining fee, avoided all men and lived in a state of perfect chastity. Her
behaviour pleased the king and she was placed in the Antaḥpura. Bhima had a
son called Haripala by Bakulādevi, and Haripala's son was Tribhuvanapāla,
the father of Kumarapala. 114

According to the Chronicles, Kumārapāla defeated Mallikārjuna the king
of Koṅkana, who has been identified as the Sitahara king of that name who
ruled in North Koṅkana.

From the Kumārapālacarita of Hemacandra, it appears that Kumārapāla
did not take any part in the battle. Hemacandra relates that one day while
Kumārapāla was seated in his court, a Sandhīvigrāhika described campaign in Konkana to him: "Listen now, to what has happened to the lord of Konkana, who by virtue of his strength, opposed you". The Sandhīvigrāhika then dwelt on the strength of Mallikārjuna and told how in the fight the soldiers of Gujarat at first fared badly and some of them began to flee from the battle field. The situation then became so critical that collyrium mixed with their sweat ran down the faces of the Gurjara soldiers blackening not only their faces but their glory as well. But some of the soldiers valiantly continued the fight; then suddenly Mallikārjuna, who had all along been in the forefront of the attack, fell from his elephant and was immediately surrounded by Gurjara soldiers who struck off his head.  

Somesvara also mentions this victory of Kumārapāla but from his statement it appears that Kumārapāla personally led the attack. But Somesvara does not supply any detailed information and his version need not be taken seriously. Arisimha states: "What is wonderful in this strong one's (Kumārapāla) conquering even the Jāṅgala princes, seeing the ruler of the masshy land, the Kauṅkapa emperor was defeated by his very tradesman (Vaṇīk)". This victory was also credited to Kumārapāla by Bālacandra, who says as follows: "Even though he had abandoned all the seven vices, he was addicted to the sevenfold constituents of the kingdom. He defeated and destroyed the kings of Jāṅgala Kauṅkana, and also Bāla."
This tradesman was evidently Atkbadat, the son of Udayana, who is credited with this victory by Balacandra, according to whom Vastupālā when provoked exclaimed: "Did not Ṭmbaḍa, though a Vanik kill Mallikārjuna? "119 According to Prabhaçandra, Ambaḍa was the second son of Udayana. Ambaḍa was a very powerful man and in execution of Kumārapāla's order struck off the head of Mallikārjuna, the king of Kuśkaṇa.120

Kumārapāla is remembered today as the last great royal protagonist of Jainism; in that respect his position is unique in the history of medieval India. When he first became attracted to Jainism is not known; some Chronicles state that as a young man he met Hemacandra at Siddharaja's court where he was induced by Hemacandra to take a vow that he would 'view other people's wives' as sisters. Most probably this tradition according to the modern historian, A.K. Majumdar, is incorrect, and it may be true however that Kumārapāla gained his throne with the active support of Udayana's family with which Hemacandra was closely associated.121

Jay asiṃha Sūri relates that one day Kumārapāla told Hemacandra to advise him as to who should be his successor. "Shall I leave it", said the king, "to Ajayapāla my nephew or to my grandson (Dauhitra) Pratāpamalla". Hemacandra told Kumārapāla that Ajayapāla was a rascal and was not fit to be a king; and that if indeed he got the kingdom, he would destroy everything. As Pratāpamalla was not as a bad as Ajayapāla, Hemacandra advised Kumārapāla to nominate Pratāpamalla as his successor. Kumārapāla said that he would do so in proper time and left.
This conversation was overheard by Bālacandra (not the author of Vasantavilāsa), a wicked disciple of Hamacandra, and a childhood friend of Ajayapāla. Bālacandra went to Ajayapāla and told him everything that had passed between the king and Hemacandra. In return for this treachery, Bālacandra received the thanks of Ajayapāla and his promise that should he become the king, he would appoint Bālacandra as his preceptor as Hemacandra was of Kumārapāla.

In V.S. 1229 (A.D.1172), Hemacandra died. Kumārapāla was overtaken with grief; he was also an old man. He therefore thought of bequeathing his kingdom to Pratāpamalla; but before he could take any decisive step, he was overtaken by illness. Ajayapāla having learned of the intentions of Kumārapāla from Bālacandra, harbored murderous thoughts; and when opportunity presented itself; he mixed poison with milk and administered it to Kumārapāla.

Immediately after taking the poison, Kumārapāla felt its effects and asked that the shell which was an antidote should be brought from the treasury. But the treacherous Ajayapāla had already hidden it. Kumārapāla thereafter banished all worldly thoughts from his mind and gradually passed away. He died in V.S.1230. (A.D.1173) 122

Almost the same story is repeated by Rajaśekhara and Jina Muṇḍana. But for reasons which will be given later, it is difficult to believe this version of the Jaina Chroniclers.123
Kumarapāla's body was cremated and his ashes immersed in the holy water of the Gaṅges and Jamuna at Prayag by the Brahmin Chaplain of his successor, who probably also offered oblations for his departed soul at Gaya.\(^{124}\)

**IX) Ajayapāla [V.S.1229-1232] (A.D.1172-1175)**

The short reign of Ajayapāla after the glorious reigns of Siddharāja and Kumārapāla, comes as an anticlimax in the history of Gujarat. The reputation of this monarch also suffered in the hands of the Chroniclers. We have seen that Jayasimha Sūri, Rajasekhara and Jina-muṇḍana state that Kumārapāla was poisoned by Ajayapāla as he had accepted Hemacandra's advice to disinherit him. It is therefore necessary to note that the Chroniclers have always ascribed to Hemacandra a political role but whereas his earliest biographer Prabhācandra contended himself by limiting it to Hemacandra's efforts on behalf of the fugitive Kumārapāla, the later Chroniclers not only developed the role but assumed that Hemacandra exercised considerable political power during the reign of Kumārapāla, and also influenced him in nominating his successor. But neither Prabhācandra nor Merutuṅga, who was no means friendly to Ajayapāla, apparently knew anything about the story of Kumārapāla's murder by Ajayapāla, or Hemacandra's advises to the king regarding this succession to the throne. These stories are only recorded by the late Chroniclers, and are not worthy of credit unless it can be corroborated by more trustworthy evidence.
We shall now see that the Chroniclers know little about Ajayapāla and probably cared to know even less. There is no doubt that Ajayapāla was a devout follower of the Brahmanical religion. Hence probably his reign was not studied with sufficient care by the Jaina Chroniclers; for, we shall show, that the story that Ajayapāla was the persecutor of the Jainas was started at a late date and that probably he was the son and not the nephew of Kumārapāla. All these misstatements about Ajayapāla confirm the suspicion that the story of his poisoning Kumārapāla was an invention of the Chroniclers. 125

Little is known of the event of the reign of the Ajayapāla. Many copper-plates of his son Bhīma II give him the epithet Karadikṣa-Sapādalakṣa-śṛṅgāpāla, 126 which indicates that he had defeated the Cāhamana king of Ajmir, who at this period was most probably Someśvara, the grandson of Siddhaṛaja. Arisimha states that the king of Sapādalakṣa sent Ajayapāla a silver pavilion. 127 In the Kṛiti-kumudī it is stated that Ajayapāla wrested from the king of Jaṅgala, as a punishment, a gold pavilion and the Jaṅgala King’s furious elephants. 128 Bālacandra Sūri also states that: “By the strength of his army consisting of tall and ichor-oozing elephants he subdued the king of Jaṅgala. 129

It is therefore evident that Ajayapāla had defeated the king of Ajmir, and forced him to pay some tribute as a mark of submission.
The reign of Ajayapāla does not seem to have been the unmitigated failure that it is generally said to have been. The Udayapura stone inscription shows that Malava up to Bhilsa was completely under his control and there is no reason to suppose that during his reign the Caulukya empire lost any territory. The army he left was strong enough to inflict a crushing defeat on the Muslim invaders even under the immature guidance of his son. The stable administration which could not put up such a resistance does not seem to have been the legacy of a capricious king guilty of the worst outrages.

According to Merutūnga Ajayapāla was stabbed to death by one Vayajaladeva, a Pratihara. But because there are strong reasons to disbelieve his account of Ajayapāla's reign, it is difficult to believe his account of king's death. It is known that he died between Tuesday, 25th March and 6th or 7th April, A.D. 1175.

X) Mūlarāja II. [V.S.1232-1235] (A.D.1175-1178)

Mūlarāja II or Bāla Mūlarāja as he is affectionately called by the Chroniclers, ascended the throne of his father Ajayapāla, while still a boy. His mother was Naikidevi, the daughter of one Paramadin, who has been identified with the Goa Kadamba _Mahāmandalesvāra_ Permadi or Śivacitta. But in a Chandella inscription issued in V.S.1261, it is stated that the Donnee's father died at Kakadadhaha while fighting the Turushkas. Now Merutūnga states that Queen Naikī fought the Muslims at Gadararaghatta. Probably
Gadaraghatta and Kakadadaha are identical, and it is likely that Naiki was the daughter of the Candella Paramardin.\textsuperscript{134}

Mūlarāja ascended the throne in V.S.1232. The earliest known inscription of his brother and successor Bhima II, is dated V.S.1235. Hence Mūlarāja’s reign lasted for not more than three years.\textsuperscript{135}

The Chroniclers rightly single out the defeat of the Muslims as the only incident worthy of being remembered about Mūlarāja. Somesvara states that Mūlarāja defeated the lord of the Turushkas, and vanquished the Mlechchha army.\textsuperscript{136} Bālacandra states that King Mūlarāja, though an infant, defeated the Mlechchha king.\textsuperscript{137} From the Sūkṛṭakirīṭikalolīṇi we learn that his mother gave Mūlarāja an army to play with out of curiosity, and with that army he defeated Hammira and his Turushka army which was dressed in robes that covered the soldiers from the head to foot.\textsuperscript{138} Arisimha also refers to Mūlarāja’s victory over the Muslims, and an inscription of Bhima’s reign states that during the reign of Mūlarāja even a woman could defeat Hammira.\textsuperscript{139}

The Mlechchha king was identified as Muizz udin, when he attacked Gujarat in A.D. 1178.\textsuperscript{140}

The other important event during the reign of Mūlarāja was the uprising in Malava. This incident is only mentioned in Suratotsava by Someśvara whose father Kumāra was given the command in Malava. According to Someśvara Kumāra was made the chief minister by Pratapamalla of the Rāṣṭrakuta family, who was apparently the regent; Kumāra was
entrusted with the charge of the army by the Caulukya king, and achieved victory by defeating the enemies. Kumāra had to fight with Vindhyavarman the king of Dhara, who had to leave the battle-field. Thereafter Kumāra destroyed a town called Gogasthana which belongs to Vindhyavarman, and struck a well where the palace of the Malava king once stood. Kumāra then plundered the Malava country and took away all its wealth though his son complains, he did not find any gold or silver. Kumāra is also said to have brought down an army of the Mlechchha near the Queen’s lake.¹⁴¹

Soon after the battle with Mu’zz ud-din, Mūlarāja died; for the earliest known inscription of Bhima II is dated V.S.1235. All the Chroniclers of Gujarat have proudly mentioned this gallant boy with affection and Someśvara laments that the Creator swiftly uprooted the shoot of the tree of paradise that was Mūlarāja.¹⁴²
Bhima II, at an early age, succeeded his brother Mūlarāja after the latter's premature death. At the time of his accession, the extent of his kingdom was practically as Kumārapāla had left it. In the north it included Mewad and Aghatapura; in the south it included Lāta up to Broach. In the north-east it included the Vāgaḍa region, that is the area occupied by Dungarpur and Banswara. Part of Malava including Dhara probably still formed a part of the Caulukya empire, for the Paramara's are not likely to have succeeded in freeing that part of Malava from the Caulukyas soon after Vindhyavarman suffered the humiliating defeat at the hands of Kumāra.

At his accession, Bhima was faced with the grave situation created by the defection of his Maṇḍalikas; that is the provincial governors, who trying to take advantage of his extreme youth, attempted to parcel out the kingdom amongst themselves, as had been successfully done in the neighbouring states. It was at this juncture that Arṇorāja, who had served under Kumārapāla as a Sāmaṇa, came to the rescue of the throne, which he seems to have saved at the cost of his life, for the Chroniclers state that he died fighting with the rebels. This brave action, however paved the way for the future greatness of his son and grandson, Lavaṇapraśāda and Viradhavala, the real founders of the Vaghela dynasty.
It was all along the peculiar misfortune of Bhima that he had to face trouble from within and without almost at the same time. Probably the internal disorganisation invited foreign invasion from which the throne emerged weaker and further shorn of glory, which again prompted internal risings. This vicious circle all but exhausted the kingdom in spite of the energetic aid he received from the three or four generations of the Vaghelas.

It has been seen that Lavanaprasāda and his son Viradhavala played a vital role in the history of Gujarat during the reign of Bhima. It is possible that they came into prominence by helping Bhima, to recover his capital from the usurper, though different Chroniclers give different versions, of the rise in power of the Vaghelas.

According to Somesvara, once the Gurjaralakṣmi in distress appeared in a dream to Lavanaprasāda, and called upon him with the aid of his son Viradhavala, to save the kingdom which had fallen into decay in the unskilled hands of Bhima. Somesvara further states that he himself was called before Lavanaprasāda on the following morning, and asked the meaning of the vision. He convinced Lavanaprasāda that he was appointed by Providence to save his mother-land and induced to obey the command of the goddess. Thereupon Lavanaprasāda entrusted to his son the execution of the duty laid upon him. Shortly afterwards Vastupāla and Tejapāla were appointed ministers by Lavanaprasāda without any reference to Bhima.
Balacandra Sūri wrote his work for the delectation of Vastupāla's son at the end of the thirteenth century of the Vikrama era. He praises Bhima for his charity but states that owing to his extreme youth, he was unable to control the Mandalikas who began to divide the country amongst themselves. Arnórāja, the father of Lavaṇaprasāda remained true to the king, and annihilating Mandalikas, protected the kingdom. His son was Lavaṇaprasāda who delighted in battles and before whom the kings of Cola, Kerala, Lāṭa, Malava, Rada, Huna Andhra, Kaśchi, Kaunkana, Jāngala, Pandya, Kuntala, Vaṅga, Kalinga and Cedi trembled. His son was Viradhavala who was also very valiant, shared the burden of administration with him. As Viradhavala was thinking of appointing an able minister, one night he had a dream in which Rajyalakṣmi appeared before him and asked him to appoint as ministers the two brothers, Vastupāla and Tejapāla. Next morning Viradhavala acted accordingly.

The other contemporary author Arisimha, writing in V.S.1285, gives a different account of the rise of Vaghelas into prominence. According to Arisimha, it was Bhima who dreamt; but in his case Kumarapāla appeared and advised him to appoint Lavaṇaprasāda as the Sarvēśvara, his son Viradhavala as the Yuvarāja, and to help to spread the Jaina faith. Next day in the Durbar, Bhima declared publicly that as it was through Arnórāja's help that he became king, so out of gratitude and in order to increase his decreasing prosperity, he would appoint Lavaṇaprasāda as Sarvēśvara and Viradhavala as his heir apparent. As Viradhavala humbly begged for an advisor, Bhima recommended the two brothers, Vastupāla and Tejapāla.
According to Vastupāla-Tejapāla-Praśasti, Bhima was very charitable. He appointed Lavaṇaprasāda to the task of reviving the fortunes of his kingdom. Viradhavala requested Bhima to give him some good ministers, whereupon Bhima recommended Vastupāla and Tejapāla who had been working as Bhima’s ministers.151

According to Udayaprabha, the preceptor of Vastupāla, Arṇorāja was the king of Bhimapālli and recipient of favours from Kumārapāla. Arṇorāja defeated the kings of Medhāpata and Candravatī. In view of the fact that Arṇorāja made him king, Bhima in his turn entrusted his kingdom to Arṇorāja’s son Lavaṇaprasāda.152

Bhima had two wives; one was Lilādevi the daughter of Cahamana prince Samarasimha, who has been identified with the Jāvālipura Cahamana king of that name; the other was Sumaladevi, who had the distinction of signing a land grant jointly with her consort. 153 The Chroniclers testify to his charitable disposition, and his assumption of the epithets such as Abhinava-Siddharāja, Saptama-Cakravarti, and Bala-Nārāyana tend to show that though overshadowed by the abler Vaghelas he was not without the qualities that make a man fit to rule.154
C) VAGHELAS

Origin:

The Vaghelas called themselves Caulukyas, and even went so far as to trace the rise of their earliest ancestor to the same mythological person as the Caulukya did. The Cambay inscription of Visaladeva thus describes the beginning of the Vaghelas: “Who then will destroy the sons of Diti? Once upon a time when Brahma was thus thinking, a warrior suddenly came out of the Cufuka..... from (this) Caulukya ..... descended the fearless race of the Caulukyas. In this line of glorious fame flourished king Arnoraja.”155 But that the Vaghelas did not belong to the dynasty established by Mulara I, is made clear by their court-poet Someśvara, who has stated that the Vaghelas arose from a “different branch of the Caulukyas.”156

The earliest known member of the Vaghela dynasty was one Dhavala, who, according to Merutuṅga, married Kumārapāla’s mother’s sister; Dhavala’s son by Kumārapāla’s aunt was Arnoraja, mentioned in the Cambay inscription noted above.157 Arnoraja was the first member of the family to gain any importance. We learn from Udayaprabha Sūri that Arnoraja in return for services rendered, received from Kumārapāla the village of Bhimapalli.158 It is possible that Kumārapāla rewarded Arnoraja, because he had a successful campaign in Saurāśtra. Probably Arnoraja acted as a subordinate commander; but later his role was magnified by his descendants. The village Bhimapalli was probably identical with Vyūgrahapalli- the tiger’s lair-a
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Aṇṭorāja’s son Lavaṇapraśāda was born during the reign of Kumārapāla, when according to Merutuṅga, Aṇṭorāja was a Sāmānta. We further learn that the news of Lavaṇapraśāda’s birth reached Aṇṭorāja when he was in attendance on Kumārapāla in the palace. On learning the happy news, the great king is said to have predicted a brilliant future for the new born baby. 160 Aṇṭorāja probably continued his carrier in the army after the death of Kumārapāla, though we do not hear of him again till we reach the reign of Bhīma II. The reason probably was that he had to remain content with a subordinate rank without any chance of promotion, after his patron Kumārapāla’s death. But he had a chance to show his valour and loyalty to the throne after the accession of Bhīma, when the provincial governors revolted. Aṇṭorāja not only proved his devotion, he also displayed other qualities as well, for the revolt was crushed, but Aṇṭorāja died in the attempt to restore order. It was probably during this time that he defeated the kings of Medapata and Candrāvati. 161 Probably there were other loyal officers of Bhīma like Pratāpaḷalla and Jagaddeva who also helped in restoring order, but all the Chroniclers who relate his activities were the proteges of Aṇṭorāja’s descendents or of their ministers, so that the whole credit for suppressing the rebellion is ascribed to him. However, there is hardly any doubt that Aṇṭorāja played a leading part in rendering the throne safe for Bhīma.
Arnorāja's son was Lāvapya-prasāda or Lavaṇaprasāda. He continued to render faithful services to Bhima and was promoted by the grateful king to the highest position in the land. We have already discussed the position of Lavaṇaprasāda in the government of Bhima and have shown that he remained loyal to the king. But it appears that he enjoyed a feudatory status, and Dhavalakka or Dholka was his fief. His official rank was that of a Mahāmaṇḍalaśvara and Rāṇaka. His son by his wife Madanaṇajī was Vīrādha-vaṇala. According to Merutuṅga, Madanaṇajī left Lavaṇaprasāda after the death of his sister, and began to live with her dead sister's husband, Devarāja. She took Vīrādha-vaṇala with her, but when the boy came of age, he became ashamed of the circumstances and went back to his father.¹⁶²

Vīrādha-vaṇala shared with his father the burden of government, and he took an active part in repelling the many foreign invasions which at this time threatened Gujarat. The careers of both the father and the son are, however, inextricably linked up with the reign of Bhima, and have already been narrated in that connection.

Thereafter Vīrādha-vaṇala appointed Vastupāla as a Mahāmātya of his kingdom. From the good administration, public works and good deeds of Vastupāla, Vīrādha-vaṇala was overshadowed by him, and most of all the chroniclers are giving a testimony to that, they composed their works on the good deeds of Vastupāla, one of this was Bālacandra Sūrī's Vasantaviśāsa Mahākāvya.
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