

Śrī Nāgābhinandanam

Dr. M.S. Nagaraja Rao Festschrift

**ESSAYS ON ART, CULTURE, HISTORY, ARCHAEOLOGY, EPIGRAPHY
AND CONSERVATION OF CULTURAL PROPERTY OF
INDIA AND NEIGHBOURING COUNTRIES**

Vol. II

Editors

L.K. SRINIVASAN

S. NAGARAJU

Assisted by

V. SHIVANANDA

M.V. VISWESWARA

**Dr. M.S. NAGARAJA RAO FELICITATION COMMITTEE
BANGALORE**

1995

I

From the middle of the sixth century A.D. to as late as the seventeenth century, men who identified themselves as "Cālukya" held sovereignty over vast parts of the Indian subcontinent, from coastal Andhra Pradesh through the Deccan to the west coast, and north to Rajasthan and Gujarat.¹ It is necessary to put "Cālukyas" in scare quotes, since there are rather complex dynastic affiliations already in the case of the first Cālukyan house; the widespread appropriation of the name through the centuries that followed suggests that it conferred an almost magical legitimacy. Whether the rulers who took it belonged to the same dynasty, and if not, why they wanted to appear to belong to it are fertile questions in their own right. To answer them, however, requires tackling questions that are larger and more important. These include the nature of historical memory, or the fantasy and imagination that make up much of memory; the meanings of the past; the charisma that in obscure ways comes to be deeply embedded in the political name; the special character of historical imitation; the idioms of a political discourse in India that endured for a thousand years until the world-historical events of the thirteenth and later centuries, the establishment of the Turkik sultanate (which ended the Gujarati "Cālukyan" dynasty), and later the British Raj (which ended the Veṅgi).

Obviously this outlines a large and complex historiographical-theoretical project. It also calls for special linguistic skills, since Cālukyan space was from the beginning somewhat multilingual - I speak in the first instance with reference to languages-of-state and became increasingly vernacularized over time. It requires unusual bibliographical

1. The variety in the spelling of the name is bewildering (Cālukya, Calkya, Calikya, Caulukya, etc.), though perhaps not meaningfully so. Fleet suggested long ago that Cālukya is the name that "belongs only to the restored" (i.e., Kalyāṇi) dynasty, Cālukya being that of the Bādāmi branch (*Indian Antiquary* 1890, p.13). Whether there is a uniform practice in support of this may be seriously doubted. A more original spelling may have been Caḷkya.

patience as well, perhaps in a higher degree than most other South Asian political, social, and cultural history, since the epigraphical record of the dynasties involved is so widely dispersed (to say nothing of the fact that a number of later documents are yet to be published).² But I would like to begin this project here by offering some general observations on the historiographical project of the Badami Caḷukyas, and a somewhat more detailed exploration of one of the minor but fascinating issues that first attracted my attention to these dynasties and to which the title of this essay refers.

When I first began to read the inscriptions of the Caḷukyas of Bādāmi, I was deeply struck by the historiographical preoccupations they evince. I don't mean to say that these preoccupations are somehow peculiar to this dynasty, but they do manifest the profound historiographical concerns of Indian dynasties with unusual clarity and traceability. The principal discursive arena - in some ways may be the only discursive arena - in which the formulation of a historical record as well as its contestation was effected in pre-colonial India, is of course that of inscriptions, especially the copperplate inscriptions that testified to the king's granting of land. For complex reasons that I cannot address here but that have to do, I think, with the peculiar nature of textuality in India, it was above all in the more official or "public" domain of inscriptions that the discursive constitution of a dynastic past took place.

What we may, by way of contrast to the official and public documentary, call the unofficial "textual" discourse (at least textual Sanskrit discourse) seems to have proffered few comparable opportunities; the tradition determining what could be textualized simply ruled out, for most of the subcontinent's cultural formations, such forms as court chronicles or annals, in which an official version of the past could be presented (here

2. Things could be worse, though. A list, by no means exhaustive, of useful items would include, beside the standard epigraphical bibliographies: A.V. Naik, "Inscriptions of the Deccan: An Epigraphical Survey (circa 300 BC -1300 A.D.)" *Deccan College Post Graduate and Research Institute Bulletin* 9, 1948, pp. 1-160; R.S. Panchamukhi, *Karnataka Inscriptions*, Kannada Research Institute, Dharwar. 1941, two vols.; G.S. Gai, ed. *Bombay-Karnatak Inscriptions*, Vol. IV Delhi: 1965; N. Ramesan, *Copper Plate Inscriptions of Andhra Pradesh*, Government Museum, Vol. I, 1962; Andhra Pradesh Government Archaeological Series, No. 6, Hyderabad; G.S. Gai, "Latest Inscriptions of the *Chalukyas of Badami*" in M.S. Nagaraja Rao (ed.), 1978, *The Chalukyas of Badami*, The Mythic Society, Bangalore, pp. 25-30; M. S. Nagaraja Rao, ed., 1983 *The Chālukyas of Kalyāṇi*, The Mythic Society, Bangalore, Susan Locher Buchanan, *Calukya Temples: History and Iconography Dissertation*, Ohio State University, 1985; for the Chalukyas of Gujarat, Girijashankar Vallabhaji, ed. *Historical Inscriptions of Gujarat*, Vols. 1-3, The Forbes Gujarati Society, Bombay, 1933-42; A.S. Gadre, *Important Inscriptions from the Baroda State*, Vol. 1, Śrī-Pratāpasimha Mahārāja Rajyābhisheka Granthamāla, Memoir No. II, Baroda: N.P., 1943.

Kashmir presents the well-known exception).³ This remains largely true for court poetry, too, even after something of a precedent was set in the seventh century by Bāṇa's masterpiece (again Kashmir offers exceptions, some better known such as Bilhaṇa's account of Vikramāditya VI of Kalyāni, some less so, such as the *Prithvīrājaviṅaya*, a singular account of the Cāhamānas of Ajmer).⁴ Although the discursive division between official documentary and unofficial textual is easily challenged theoretically (the documentary is clearly very "textual," and the "textual" strives to be documentary), it does acquire some reality from the very clear social division of literary labour in middle-period India. For although the mode of composition in inscriptions is *kāvya*, of the very high *praśasti* type, virtually none of the poets known from stone and copperplate records - with exceptions approaching a statistical zero - is found to have also written "textualized" poetry.⁵ The role of copperplates in the construction or fixing of a dynastic past is so unmistakably prominent that one is almost lead to believe that, in addition to the short-term prestige conferred by the building programmes and land donations documented in these plates, such royal largesse may have been so zealously pursued precisely because of the discursive opportunities they afforded a ruler to write his own story in public.

The inscriptional remains of the Caḷukyan dynasties offer such materials in abundance, for exploring some key questions in connection with historical memory and the public practice of historical discourse in early India. Here I can permit myself just a few and those highly speculative observations about these materials before turning to the micro-issue I alluded to above.

3. I begin to address some of these issues in my article "Mīmāṃsā and the Problem of History in Traditional India", *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 109.3, 1989, pp. 603-11.
4. Ed. Gaurishankar Hirachand Ojha and Chandradhar Sharma Guleri, 'Vedic Yantrālaya, Ajmer 1941'. The poem was written around 1190 A.D., the poet's name probably being Jayānaka (cf. 12.63, 68).
5. Almost none of the poets named in inscriptions—and we are talking about 300 named writers at a minimum—are found represented anywhere else, that is, in "textual" works of their own or in anthologies (cf. Ludwik Sternbach, *Poésie sanskrite dans les Anthologies et les Inscriptions*, Institut de Civilisation Indienne, Paris, 1980, three Volumes; vol. 1, p. xxx). There are very few poets who are both named in inscriptions and cited in anthologies or to whom other works are ascribed - that is to say, whom we know to have composed both documentary poetry and textual poetry. (I now find that my remarks have been to some degree anticipated by D.B. Diskalkar, "Sanskrit Poets Who were Authors of Both Inscriptions and Literary Works," *PO* 26 1961, pp. 1-54). The literary-critical tradition, too, is altogether indifferent to this form; *praśasti* is mentioned, and *en passant* at that, only in Rudraṭa's *Kāvyaḍāmkāra* 16.36, and in the *Sābhityadarpaṇa* 6.337.

In the case of the Caḷukyan dynasty that came to prominence in what the first Kannāda *śāstra*, the *Kavirājamārga*, calls *nāḍadā kannāḍadoḷ*, the “country of Kannada,”⁶ we have to do with a clan that, following the Kadambas, held power in the Deccan with their centre at Bādāmi for a little more than two hundred years (c 543-757 A.D.), and with a second that, succeeding the Rāshtrakūṭas, established themselves at Kalyāṇi (modern Basavakalyān, 60 kilometers north of Gulbarga and west of Bidar) and ruled for another two hundred years (c. 960-1200 A.D.). The Bādāmi and Kalyāṇi Caḷukyās present a very rare—perhaps singular?—instance in Indian dynastic history where the same ruling house, or what represents itself as the same ruling house, regains power after a substantial interval, in this case the gap of two centuries during the Rāshtrakūṭa ascendancy. Comparing the inscriptional discourse before and after this period of Caḷukyan obscurity, I initially believed, might provide a unique opportunity for investigating the techniques and quality of dynastic historiography in premodern India. But now the practice of historical – political memory as such, and the nature of memorialization I find equally important, as well as understudied. In both areas the Caḷukyās may have something important to teach us about the recovery, reprocessing, and re-presentation of the past—the practicing of the past—in early South Asia.⁷

II

It is only very slowly over the course of the first hundred years of their rule that the Caḷukyās of Bādāmi establish a coherent and stable historiographical account of themselves, although throughout this period their concern with narrating—fixing, celebrating, contesting—regal events is intense. At first, a good deal of their cultural idiom, and indeed, dynastic self-definition, is adapted from their predecessor dynasty, the Kadambas. Their first copperplate grant, thirty-five years after the first inscriptions of the dynasty (issued by Katti-Arasa, “King of the Sword” [?], but Sanskritized as Kīrtivarman, c. 578 A.D., for

6. The text was produced at the court of King Amoghavarsha Nripātūṅga III of the Rāshtrakūṭa dynasty of Karnāṭaka in the mid-ninth century. The famous verse (*KRM* 1. 36, ed. K. Krishnamoorthy [Bangalore: IBH, 1983]), which first defines the domain of Kannada speech, runs: *kāveriyindamā godāvarivaram īrda nāḍadā kannāḍadoḷ | bhāvīsīda janapadaṃ vasudhāvalayavilīnavīsadavishayavīśeshaṃ ||* (“From the Kāveri to the Godāvari is the country of Kannada, a well-known people/region [*janapada*], an illustrious outstanding realm within the circle of the earth”).
7. It bears repeating that, given the bibliographic complexity of this material, and the fact that a number of inscriptions, especially from Kalyāṇi, remain unpublished (especially those now located in the *durga* of Basavakalyān itself and at the museum in Gulbarga), any generalization is hazardous, and those that I make here are offered in the spirit of a *pūrvapakṣa*.

instance, appropriates wholesale the opening of the Kadamba *praśasti* from a century earlier. Henceforth to the end of their rule the Bādāmi Cālukyas will be *mānavyasagōtra*, *hāritīputra*, *svāmimahāsēnamātri gaṇānudhyātābhishikta*, etc.⁸ A more intriguing set of parallels exists – surprisingly, to my mind – with the Western Kshatrapas. From the very beginning, for example, and with increasing consistency the Bādāmi Cālukyas adopt the *Śaka* era for their records (something largely maintained until Vikramāditya VI of Kalyāṇi *fait l' epoch* by inaugurating his own “Vikramāditya” era), and they are apparently among the first dynasties to do so in official records.⁹ This has been recognized by scholars for a long time, though I'm not sure I've ever seen it asked why a Deccani king should chose to date his inscription according to the (putative) commencement of Partho-Scythian rule in western India, especially in view of the fact that this rule had come to an end some 200 years earlier. Note that antecedent and contemporary competitor dynasties of the region, e.g., the Vākātakas and the Pallavas for example, date their records exclusively in regnal years.¹⁰ Even stranger is a fact that L vi pointed out long ago: highly specific kinship

8. *EI* 28, 1949-50, pp. 59ff (the plates of Pugavarman, *EI* 32 1957-58, pp. 293ff, may be a few years earlier; Pugavarman was the first son of Pulakēśin I, according to P.B. Desai). Cf. *IA* 7, 1878, p. 35, “Dēvagiri Plates of Mṛigēśavarman, regnal year three” (c 450-75 A.D.): meditating on Svāmi Mahāsēna and the Mothers, of the Mānavya gotra; sons of Hāritī” (I believe this is the first occurrence of the formula in the Kadamba records). The Kadambas, for their part, are likely to have borrowed this formulaic identity from their own predecessors, the Chuṭus (on whose coins the name Hāritī appears); the Vākātakas also borrow it.
9. R.S. Panchamukhi in editing Pulakēśin I's Bādāmi Rock inscription dated *Śaka* 465 (= 543 A.D. calls it “the earliest authentic instance of the use of the *Śaka* era in inscriptions” (*EI* 27, 1947-48, p.5). There are, however, several somewhat earlier instances to be found in the records of the Gurjara king Dadā II (*Śaka* 400, *IA* 7, 1878, pp. 61ff. and *Śaka* 407 *JBBRAS* 10, pp. 19ff; cf. *IA* 12, 1883, p.208). Incidentally, the first textual occurrence of the *Śaka* era is found in a Jain work the Lōkavibhāga, which dates itself to *śaka* 380=c. A.D. 458 (cf. *EI* 27, p.5). The Jain influence here (recall the Jain role in the *Śakan* seizure of Ujjain as represented in the *Kālakāchāryakaibā*) and throughout the political idiom of the Bādāmi grants, probably should not be underestimated, even though the Bādāmi Cālukyas were not themselves Jains. In the early years of the dynasty, as in Maṅgaleśa's Mahākōṭa Pillar inscription, other calendrical systems were occasionally used. Regarding the change of era 500 years later, recall that the Yewur grant of Vikramāditya VI is dated to year 2 of the Chālukyavikramavarśa; cf. *EI* 15 1919-20, pp. 348ff. See also the “Gadag Inscription of Vikramāditya VI: The 23rd year”: Kannada vs.17 “(He is) the hero who put an end to the famous *Śaka* era and by setting up the Vikrama era made his own name illustrious on earth...” Barnett's translation.
10. One interesting record is that of Narasiṃhavarman I carved on a rock behind the Mallikārjunadēva temple in Bādāmi after the capture of the city. This document is incised right upto a Cālukyan inscription dated in the *Śaka* era; cf. *SII* Vol. 11, Part 1, line 7; T.V. Mahalingam, ed. *Inscriptions of the Pallavas*, Indian Council on Historical Research, New Delhi, 1988, no. 37.

terminology that had appeared for the first time in the inscriptions of the Kshatrapa kings reappears in the Mahākūṭa Pillar inscription of 602 A.D., e.g., *sugṛihītanāmadhēya*, in reference to the Cālukyan king Raṇarāga, and only there (besides those instances in the drama that interested L vi).¹¹ What isn't asked, again, is why this should be so.

If, as K.V. Soundara Rajan recently argued (reasoning from their adoption of various cultural goods such as script and the like), the Pallavas were the "virtual successors" to the Śātavāhanas, is it possible to suggest that their *prakṛityā śatravaḥ*, the Bādāmi Cālukyas, sought to constitute themselves as somehow representing the Śakas *redīvtvi*?¹² Admittedly such an interpretation would require substantial ancillary evidence, but if true it would provide yet another and telling instance of "historical imitation," such as is found in the case of the Guptas with respect to the Kushāṇas (as seen, for example, in their coinage) and Mauryans, or in the case of early Vijayanagar with respect to the Cālukyas themselves, and which seems thus to play a prominent and as yet unexamined role in the theory and practice of South Asian political identity (analogous, perhaps, to the role it plays in Europe).¹³ An alternative hypothesis that remains to explore is whether the Gurjaras (or Kālachuris) of Broach, ultimate successors to the Kshatrapas, somehow mediate this influence. Observe that soon after Maṅgalēśa defeated the "Kalatsūri" king Buddha

11. Sylvain L vi, "On Some Terms Employed in the Inscriptions of the Kshatrapas" (IA 1904, pp. 163-74; originally *Journal Asiatique* 1902, pp. 95-125). (L vi missed the *Harshacharita*, where on p.91.8 of the Nirṇaya Sagar Press text reference is made to *sugṛihītanāma puṇyarāśī*, though I'm not sure the latter is a proper name, or that *sugṛihītanāma* is used *stricto sensu*.)
12. "Origin and Spread of Memorial Stones in Tamil-Nadu," in S. Settar, Gunther D. Sontheimer, eds., *Memorial stones: a study of their origin, significance, and variety*, Institute of Indian Art History, Karnataka University, Dharwad, South Asia Institute, University of Heidelberg, Germany, 1982, pp., 59-76, especially 64.
13. On "historical imitation" in middle-period India see my "Rāmāyaṇa and Political Imagination" (*Journal of Asia Studies*, May 1993); in Europe, Phillipe Lacoue-Labarthe and Jean-Luc Nancy in *Critical Inquiry*, Winter 1990 p. 299. In "Reapproaching Vijayanagara" (in *Studies of South India: An Anthology of Recent Research and Scholarship*, ed. Robert E. Frykenberg and Pauline Kolenda, Madras and New Delhi: 1985, pp.33-35, Burton Stein discusses the "profound difference in political ecology" that distinguished the Bādāmi Cālukyan formation from its southern contemporaries, and that in its structure was to be prototypical of developments of later polities, particularly that of Vijayanagar. Cf. also his *Vijayanagar*, Cambridge University Press, 1989, p. 1 (the symbols, *lāñchana* etc., of Vijayanagar, and the design of its capital, derived from Bādāmi/Aihole); p. 111 (early Vijayanagar temple style as a quotation of Bādāmi).

around 602 A.D. (*IA* 19, 1890, pp. 7-20, vs. 13), we find the Cālukyas borrowing a writing style from the Kalachuris, as well as, perhaps, a style of "politological" discourse.¹⁴

Through the time of Pulakēśin II, there is considerable variation in the form and substance of the inscriptional discourse of the Bādāmi Cālukyas. A striking change takes place by 658 A.D., when, a little more than 100 years from the first record, Vikramāditya I (or possibly his brother Ādityavarman, though he ruled for a very short time) fixed the way the Cālukyan past was to be represented, and established a paradigm of creative historiography that was to be maintained invariantly until the Bādāmi dynasty comes to an end.¹⁵ A reasonable inference, on the basis of the surviving evidence, is that the earlier historiographers of the dynasty did not as a rule consult documents in the formulation of their inscriptional discourse; the kind of variation we find in the records seems best explained by reliance on oral tradition. Then again, standardization of the historical record may have been an innovation in the political culture of the age, for it is only in this era that the Pallava genealogy, after several hundred years of fluidity, was stabilized.¹⁶

However we wish to account for the development, the copperplate now becomes the site for the serious construction and interpretation of what is historically important, and for an event-centered, chronologically punctillious narrative of this history, along with a

14. As well as, perhaps, the *Śaka* dating system (see note 9 above)? On the appropriating of the Gurjara script, see A.H. Dani, *Indian Palaeography*, Clarendon Press, Oxford: 1963, pp. 178, 184. The "Lohaner Plates" of Pulakēśin II *Śaka* 552 = 630 A.D. (*EI* 27, pp.37ff.) have a number of features in common with the Vadner copperplate inscription of Buddharāja, Kalachuri year 360 = 608 A.D. (*EI* 12, 1913-14, pp. 33ff.; V.V. Mirashi, *CII* IV, 47ff.). All of these were previously absent in Cālukyan records, though a detailed demonstration of this will have to await another occasion.
15. I'm not quite sure that Nilakanta Sastri is correct (unless I have a different interpretation of "definitive") when he asserts that "The definitive form of their *praśasti* for the Bādāmi period is found first in the Haiderabad grant (612 A.D.) of Pulakēśin II" (in G. Yazdani, ed. *Early History of the Deccan*, London: Oxford U.P., 1960, p. 205). The standard form of the Cālukyan letterhead is not found in any of the extant records of Pulakēśin (certainly not the Hyderabad grant, cf. *IA* 6, 1877, pp. 73ff. *Śaka* 534 = 612 A.D. Although we are not sure of the date of his son, Ādityavarman, the brother of Vikramāditya I (cf. Ramesan, *Copper-plate Inscriptions*, p. 82; the latter's rule began *Śaka* 577 = 655 A.D., his single record, from his first regnal year, is probably the first to bear all the standard features (published *JBBRAS* 16, p. 233ff.; undated).
16. The first copper-plate record where we find the genealogy as it will be given from then on (Brahmā; Āṅgīrasa; Bṛihaspati; Bharadvāja; Drōṇa; Aśvatthāman; Pallava) is in the Kōram Plates of Paramēśvaravarman I (reigned A.D. 669-90). Cf. Mahalingam, *Inscriptions of the Pallavas*, no. 46. Note that this was the king who defeated Vikramāditya I and occupied Vātāpi (cf. *Inscriptions of the Pallavas*, pp. liilff).

formal structure that is virtually invariant, including commencing with the new *maṅgalāccharaṇa* "jayaty āviśbhṛitam viśbhob vārābam, etc."¹⁷ We no longer find the general formulaic reference, functioning as little more than an *epithet ornans*, of the earlier documents—Pulakēśin I "performed the *aśvamedha*" or Kīrtivarman "uprooted the Vanavāsis" — but instead the attempt at establishing a substantive narrative account of the dynasty. Consider for instance Vikramāditya II's record of 742 A.D.:

Directly after his consecration into sovereignty over the entire world, he was infused with energy and made up his mind to destroy the Pallava, his natural enemy, who had stolen the luster¹⁸ of the former kings of his dynasty. Straightway he reached Tuṇḍāka district, where he came face to face with the Pallava named Nandipotavarman, defeated him in battle, and put him to flight. He got into his hands the musical instruments called the *kaṭumukha* and *samudraghosha*, the *khaṭvāṅga* standard, and superior elephants, rutting, fullgrown, and renowned; a treasure of rubies whose rays could destroy the darkness; and a treasure of gold that took many men to carry. He spared Kāñchī—the very hip-ornament on that lovely lady, the southern region—home of the Vessel-Born sage [Agastya]; he brought delight to the twice-born, the wretched the protectorless by his constant charity; he acquired great spiritual merit by returning vast treasures of gold to the stone temples built by Narasimhapota, like the Rājasimhēśvara temple; he burned¹⁹ with the shooting flame of his power the Paṇḍya, Coḷa, Keraḷa, Kaḷabhra and other kings; and he planted the victory pillar of his fame, brilliant as the autumn moon, at the southern ocean, where masses of waves boil at the shore glimmering with rays from the heaps of pearls released from the oysters struck and broken open by the trunks of the dolphin-like [?] elephants shaken [by their fear of the ocean?].... This King Vikramāditya, on the occasion of the winter solstice in his eighth regnal year, 664 years of the Śakan having elapsed, grants the village....²⁰

The historiographic process at work here merits brief attention, too. The historical record for each king, as in the above plate of Vikramāditya II, is established at the

17. The first instance of this verse that I have found is the Amudalapaḍu plates of Pulakēśin's second son Vikramāditya, Śaka 582 = 660 A.D., *EI* 32, 1957-58, pp. 175ff.
18. Read *cbāyā* (in place of *jaya*) with the grants of Kīrtivarman II.
19. Read *pratāpita* (for *prasādbīta*) as per Kīrtivarman's records.
20. *EI* 27, 1947-48, pp. 125ff. "Narwan Plates of Vikramāditya II, Śaka 664, regnal year 8." The end of the *prasasti* portion of the record - *kshubhitakarimakaranibatasitasuktimuktāpbalaprakara marīcivēlākulōdgbāṇ amānārṇonidhā nadaksiṇārṇave* - breathes the spirit of Daṇḍin's *Avantisundarīkatā* (ed. Suranand Kunjan Pillai, Trivandrum 1954; TSS 172), p. 14 line 14, *taralatarāṅgabbagnagarbbaśuktigarbbonmuktamu ktāpbaladalaśabalavālukēna*, "[He went a little further along the coast where] its sands were flecked with fragments of pearl released from oyster shells split open by the ceaseless action of the waves."

beginning of his reign, generally by memorializing the signal event of his youth or at his accession. Indeed, it then becomes fixed and is rarely updated. In the case of Vijayāditya (c. 697-731 A.D.), for instance, the narrative was written once, and once only, at the very beginning of his kingship, and unchanged for the next 35 years of his reign. It is rare that a ruler will update his history, but it did occur after exceptional events, as in the case of Vikramāditya I after his capture of Kāñcī in 671 A.D.²¹ The record once established would generally be transmitted by the successor intact, though sometimes micro-adjustments are made. Vinayāditya I, in 682 A.D., to cite just one instance, re-wrote the history of his father's recapture of the realm from the *trairājyapallava*, only to have this revision rejected by his son, Vijayāditya in 697 A.D.

III

The last copperplate grant of the Bādāmi Caḷukyan dynasty is that of Kīrtivarman II, dated 757 A.D. (though even before this date the Rāshtrakūṭas had begun to refer to the demise of the Caḷukyan house). The first dated copperplate of the Kalyāṇi Caḷukyās is that of prince Satyaśraya more than 200 years later in 974 A.D., though a few other inscriptions of the dynasty are available a little prior to this. From their first records, it is clear that the self-representation of the new rulers is altogether different from anything seen previously in the Bādāmi formation.

On the basis of the available evidence, it is fair to say that, initially, the Caḷukyās of Kalyāṇi evince little or no specific historical memory of (or historical interest in) the Bādāmi dynasty. Indeed, they seem to have little memory of events prior Ayyaṇa, father of Taila II who is credited with restoring Caḷukyan hegemony. Nor do they demonstrate

21. In a document of the 16th regnal year of Vikramāditya I (*IA* 7, pp. 219ff.), we find an *apī ca* after the standard portion (I translate from the correct version of a record from 674 A.D., *EI* 10, 1909-10, p.100ff. = the Veṅṅalli grant in Ramesan, *Copper-Plate Inscriptions*, p. 46ff.), p. 103 lines 17ff.: "Victorious is Lord Śrī Vallabha, who crushed the fame of Narasimha, annihilated the power of Mahendra, and with a glance by clever conduct [? *nayana* cf. *prajñātanaya* in his grandson Vijayāditya's record of *Saka* 619 (*EI* 36, p. 313ff., line 11)] conquered Iśvara. Although he had a serious relationship with a lady, the Southern Quarter, destroying the Pallava king [read - *mardō*] of the sprouts [of her couch] and taking the city of Kāñchi/her girdle - he thereby only became all the more the 'Beloved of Śrī.' With his glorious and mighty shoulders, with a taste for battle, he destroyed the dynasty of Mahāmalla, and thereby got for himself the fitting name, Rājamalla. Though its walls are unsurmountable and impregnable; though it is surrounded by huge, deep, impassable moats, this lord of earth took Kāñcī - like the *kāñcī*, 'girdle,' of the Lady South-victorious over Iśvarapotarāja."

any zeal in presenting themselves as historically continuous with the Bādāmi line. In fact, from the earliest public documents of this dynasty there seems to be little concern with historical continuity at all. In the few records of Taila that are preserved (for instance, from c. 974 A.D., *IA* 21, 1892, 167ff.; and 982 A.D., *EI* 4, 1896-97, 204ff.), we learn only his own history: that he destroyed the Raṭṭas, killed Muñja, took the head of Pañcāla (though this already seems to be problematic, since it was his beheading of Muñja that enters the historiography outside of Kalyāṇi),²² and reigned 24 years "from the year Śrīmukha."

Of his son Satyāśraya, similarly, we learn only of *his* deeds. The standardized Bādāmi account that had been developed over a hundred years, and that had begun to function almost as a letterhead, has disappeared. An altogether new identity, with a Sōmavaṃśa connection (like the Veṅgi branch), is asserted. Indeed, the only association with their antecedent dynasty, besides the opening *maṅgalāccharaṇa* (*jayaty āviśbkrītam viśnorvārābam*, etc.) and a representation of the *lāñchana* (*varāba*, sun and moon), are the very names like "Caḷukyan" or "Satyāśraya" (the latter of which, used by Pulakēśin II, was that by which Taila also was known to the Rāshṭrakūtas, cf. *SII* 11.1 no. 40 line 5, "*Satyāśrayakulatilaka Tailap-arasar*" 973 A.D.), which stand out like dimly recollected formulae of a lost heroic language. Indeed, as ultimate signs of cultural dissection from the house that went before, the language used for a number of the earliest Kalyāṇa records is a hybrid dialect with only faint traces of Sanskrit, occasionally a melange of old Kannada and proto-Marathi, or sometimes very faulty Sanskrit. The script, too, though often Kannada script of the period, is sometimes (for the "Sanskrit" records) a crude Nāgarī, whereas the dating is frequently by a system unrelated to the *Śakasamvatsara* convention of the old Bādāmi clan.²³

This is not to say that memory of the past in some form was not preserved at his period. If the public documents of the dynasty show no knowledge of—or no interest in—the historical past and in the imperial culture of old, a new form of "textualized" history shows that at some level the deep past was being re-connected to the present, and already in the lifetime of Taila II. In the fascinating old-Kannada *campū kāvya*,

22. The remarkable story of Muñja of the Paramāra dynasty, predecessor and paternal uncle of the illustrious Bhojadeva, whom Taila slays (after impaling his head in his courtyard "he would daily smear it with curd, nursing his rage"), is narrated for the first time in *Prabandbacintāmaṇī* (ed. Jinavijayamuni, Santaniketan 1933, Singhi Jain Series 1), p. 22ff.

23. See for example the "Marmuri Copper Plates of Yuvarāja Satyāśraya," dated *Bhāva samvatsara* c 974 A.D. (*Journal of the Historical Society of Bombay* 2, 1928, p. 214ff.); also the Mirāj copperplate, issued one month after it (*IA* 14, 1885, p. 140ff.). This latter is also composed in very corrupt Sanskrit.

Sābasabbhīmavijaya (or *Gadāyuddham*) of Ranna, written in honour of *yuvarāja* Iṣivabeḍaṅga Satyaśraya in 982 A.D., a decade or so after his father Taila first begin to issue public records, a skeleton genealogy connecting the Bādāmi and Kalyāṇi Caḷukyas is provided.²⁴ In the second *āśvāsa* (2.7+), an “aged warder” (*vṛiddhakañchuki*) tells the story of the “ancestors who were supreme lords in Ayōdhyāpura.” This lineage begins with Satyaśrayadēva, “also known as Vishṇuvardhana,” followed by Jayasīmhadēva, “who was a lion to destroy the troops of elephants of the Rāshṭrakūṭa,” and then Raṇaraṅgasīmha (of whom nothing special is said). The “supreme lord of the city of Vātāpi, who was consecrated for the horse-sacrifice ritual,” Pulakēśidēva comes next, then Kīrtivarmadēva, “who had the son Satyaśrayadēva the second, whereas the junior son was Maṅgalārṇa.” Then follows a straight list of the succession: “Satyavrati [sic] the second,” Ādityavarma, Vikramāditya, and so on, reasonably close to what we can establish as the Bādāmi line. The period of dynastic eclipse after Kīrtivaraman II is filled in by Piriya Tailapa, Kundiya Bhīma “who slew Mukundi,” Vikramādityadēva, Raṇaraṅgamalla Ayyaṇa, Uttuṅgamalla Vikramāditya, and finally Taila II Āhavamalla, for whom alone the poem presents a substantial historical record.

Several features of Ranna’s account are striking and thought-provoking. The assertion that the kings of this line originally reigned in “Ayōdhyā,” for instance, is mentioned here for the first time, I believe, in any western Caḷukyan text, and will be elaborated on and standardized in later Kalyāṇi records. Ranna is aware of the *aśvamedha* of Pulakēśin I, the principal act associated with him through the Bādāmi Caḷukyan history; what is more astonishing, he knows “Maṅgalārṇa” (that is, Maṅgalēśa), who by “collateral suppression” had been dropped from the Bādāmi dynastic record centuries earlier, though the poet’s knowledge extends only so far as his name. And this superficiality is true of the entire genealogy as Ranna presents it. Somehow – very likely through an oral *Vamśāvalī* – recollection of the earlier dynasty had been preserved. Yet the quality of the historical memory as such, as in all the contemporaneous Kalyāṇa documents, is in no way comparable to the earlier Bādāmi records, rich and detailed as they are, and unlike what is about to come. Admittedly Ranna’s purposes are contemporary and poetic, not genealogical and antiquarian, yet it seems quite evident that he has little specific knowledge of these ancestors.

24. I use the editions of B.S. Sannayya and Rāmegauda, *Kannada Granthamāle* 97 (Prasaranga, Mysore, 1985), pp. 18-19, and of K.V. Krisnabhata (Mysore: Gita Book House, 1973, pp. 34-6. Attention was first called to the passage by R. Narasimhachar in *IA* 40 (1911), pp. 41-5. See also B.R. Gopal, “*Gadāyuddha Mattu Itibāsa*,” in *Rannakavi Kāvyaḷimarsē* (Kannada Sāhitya Parishat, Mysore, 1980), pp. 31-39.

By the third generation of the founding of the Kalyāṇi Cālukya dynasty, however—within thirty years of these first inscriptions and almost as long from the time Ranna wrote — an imperial *samskr̥iti* and with it historical memory had been re-invented.

The “Kauthem Plates” issued by Vikramāditya V, grandson of Taila II, in 1008-9 A.D. (these must be the first record of his reign, since his father Satyāśraya was still king the previous year; *EI* 16, 1921-22, p.74 records his victory over a Chōḷa King in 1007 A.D.) marks a historiographical change of a magnitude over the previous records of the dynasty, and over Ranna’s great poem.²⁵ Not only has the dynasty got imperial culture once more — the record is composed in standard Sanskrit and high *praśasti* style — but more important the historical relationship of the Kalyāṇi and Bādāmi Cālukyas now becomes a matter of central, indeed constitutive interest. Much of the earlier history of the dynasty is systematically reappropriated. Many of these appropriations are from the standard copperplate format common from Vikramāditya I, c. 655 A.D., onward — allusion seems to be made to his records — and especially Vijayaditya c. 697 A.D. But they also, it would appear, derive from earlier Bādāmi, or contemporaneous external sources as well. Copper plates of some Veṅgi Cālukyas were probably consulted, perhaps one of Pulakēśin II’s and without a shadow of a doubt and most remarkably, another document I’ve not yet mentioned.

The Kauthem record begins not only with the standard Bādāmi *maṅgalācharaṇa* (*jayatyāvishkṛitam viśhṇob*, etc.) but also with the full “letterhead” (*samastabhuvanāsamstāyamāna-mānavyasagotrāṇām*, etc.), which reappears now for the first time in Karnataka after 200 years. As I mentioned above, this letterhead is found in virtually every copper plate after Vikramāditya I, but there are also striking additional details. For the first time since the Lohaner plates of Pulakesin II (*EI* 27, p. 37ff., Śaka 552=630 A.D.), for instance, the Cālukyans are said to be “Favoured by Kauśikī” (cf. Lohaner line 5.²⁶ The two names of great ancestors now added to the letterhead are Vishṇuwardhana and Vijayāditya. We’ve seen the former already mentioned by Ranna as the founder of the dynasty, but erroneously, it would seem; no Vishnuwardhana is ever

25. *IA* 16, (1887), p. 15ff., “Kauthem Plates of Vikramāditya V,” dated Śaka 930 (= 1008-9 A.D.) in line 61.

26. There are micro-resonances, too, from earlier records, of which I can offer several illustrations here. The king is invoked, for example, to subdue the earth with her ocean-girdle “ornamented” [*makarika*] with “elephant-like seabests [*karimakara*]” (lines 3-4). These very rare terms hadn’t been heard of since the records of Pulakēśin II (631 A.D.; *EI* 18, 1925-26, p. 257, line 50), and Vikramāditya II (742 A.D.; *EI* 27, 1947-48, p: 125ff, line 50)

mentioned in any Bādāmi grant. The only persons of that name associated with the *vamśa* are the younger brother of Pulakēśin II who was founder of the Veṅgi branch of the dynasty (also known as Kūbja Vishṇuvardhana Vishamasiddha ["the Hunchback, V., who overcame his hindrance"?]), and his descendants. This is almost certainly an innovation borrowed (as are several others) from records of the Andhra line.²⁷ Possible reasons for Vishṇuvardhana's new prominence I'll address below. The commencement of the Cālukya genealogy itself raises some interesting questions. Like Ranna's *campū*, the Kauthem grant begins the *vamśa* in Ayōdhyā, though now specifying that fifty-nine kings reigned there before they moved to "the land of the south." Sixteen kings are said to have ruled in this southern dynasty - this agrees basically with the copperplate records - until it was "interrupted," *antarita*, a word harkening back to the earlier interruption of Cālukyan hegemony after Pulakēśin II, *avanipatitritayāntarita*- (in a grant of Vikramāditya I, *JBRAS* 16, 1885, p.236, line 15).²⁸

The next section of the Kauthem plates suggests that there is more to the historical research behind this document than can be explained by the consultation of contemporary or even earlier copperplate grants. In fact, there is a style to the plates here, a sequence of ideas, and references of a specific and consistent historical sort—references to events that are absent not only from previous Kalyāṇa documents but from the entire Bādāmi Cālukya dynastic record of the post-Pulakēśin era – that point in another direction. These are recorded in one place only: the great *prasasti* of Ravkkīrti in honour of Pulakēśin II on the Meguṭi temple in Aihoḷe (634 A.D.).

The agreements between the plates and the *prasasti* are dense and unmistakable, and embrace every feature from meter to rhetorical figure to historical reference. For example, Kauthem begins the Cālukyan lineage with Jayasimhavadallabha, just as does the

27. See for example the Eastern Cālukyan copperplate of *śaka* 867 = 945-6 A.D., *IA* 7, 1878, p. 15ff. Note that the phrase "favoured by Kauśikī" appears here, too, line 2, as in most of their later grants. As for Vijayāditya it is also not clear which king is meant; it is unlikely to be the grandson of Vikramāditya I of that name (though he was the longest ruling of the Bādāmi kings; we have records for at least thirty-five years). There are also Veṅgi kings called Vijayāditya, including the one who issued the grant in 946 A.D. mentioned above; this is also, according to some other later Veṅgi grants such as that of Vīra Choḷa (*Śaka* 1022 = 1100 A.D.; *SI* 1, 1890, p. 31ff), the last of the dynasty to rule in Ayōdhyā and who moved to the south.

28. This interruption is due either to the confederacy "of the three Pallava kingdoms, the chief over-lord of which was the lord of *Kāñchi*" (*JORM* 10, 1936, p.40), or to the Paṇḍya, Choḷa, and Kerala kings (the standard view, cf. for instance R.S. Pancharukhi in *EI* 22, 1933-34, pp. 26ff.).

Aihoḷe inscription, and uses the identical verse formula: *rājāsījjayastmbavallabha iti khyātaḥ*, (line 14 of Kauthem=line 3 of Aihoḷe).²⁹ The verse on Pulakēśin and the founding of Vātāpi agree not only in point of meter (*āryā*) but specific *alamkāra* (the figure of the husband of the city, lines 17-18 *vātāpipurapatir* = lines 3-4, *ayāsīd vātāpipurīvadhbūvaratām*). As examples of the larger dynastic events consider the reference in Kauthem to Kīrtivarman I as “destroyer of the Nala, Maurya, Kadamba.” In no Bādāmi Caḷukyan copper plate is Kīrtivarman anything more than the destroyer of “the Vanavāsīs and others”; the only possible source for Kauthem’s specificity is Aihoḷe (lines 20-22 of Kauthem = line 4 of Aihoḷe).

Consider further the account of the affair of Maṅgalēśa. As I mentioned above, this king had disappeared from all post-Pulakēśin II records, that is, for something like 350 years. In Kauthem we have not only mention of this king but specific and detailed reference to his attack on Rēvatī island, something unknown from any document—save Aihoḷe, and more significant, to his dispute with his brother’s son Pulakēśin II over the succession. It is worth pausing over this latter parallel since it exhibits clearly the discursive procedures of the Kauthem record. Vikramāditya V does not just copy but rethinks and rewrites the historical record. First vss. 14-15 of Aihoḷe: “When his [Maṅgalēśa’s] elder brother’s son, named Polēkeśin, of a dignity like Nahusha’s was coveted by Lakshmī, and finding his uncle to be jealous of him thereat, had formed the resolution to wander abroad as an exile—that Maṅgalēśa, whose great strength became on all sides reduced by the application of [two of the three political] powers—good counsel and energy³⁰—gathered by him [i.e., Pulakēśin], abandoned, together with the effort to secure the kingdom for his own son, both that no mean kingdom of his and his life” (trans. Kielhorn, slightly revised). This is how Kauthem makes new history (lines 24-5): “During the time that his elder brother’s son, excellent though he was, was a boy and thus incapable of ruling, Maṅgalēśa bore the burden of the world on his own shoulders, and

29. The reference of Jayasimhavadallabha’s defeat of “Indra, son of Kṛishṇa,” of the Rāshtrakūṭas (mentioned in Kauthem line 15, and alluded to by Ranna) puzzles me, for the Rāshtrakūṭas, I believe, are never mentioned in pre-Kalyāṇi records. Jayasimhavadallabha, by the way, is also mentioned in the Mahākūṭa Pillar inscription of Maṅgalēśa (*IA* 19, 1890, pp. 7-20,), but I find no further parallels between that record and Kauthem.

30. *Mantrōtsābasakti*. Ravikīrti wants us to be very sensitive to this phrase. Pulakēśin had to forego the third *sakti* - *prabhuśakti*, the power of the treasury and of his own army, both presumably now controlled by his uncle—and to rely on the other two, his intelligence (*mantra* = *jñāna*), and his energy. Compare Maṅgalēśa’s reference to himself as *Saktitrayasampannaḥ* (*IA* 7, 1878, p. 161 line 10), and cf. *Arthaśāstra* 6.2.33.

then made over the earth to Satyaśraya [Pulakēśin II] when he became a young man. For what member of the Caḷukyan dynasty would ever stray from the path of *dharmā*?"

This should suffice to ground our inference about the *historiographic* process at work here. Vikramāditya V, it seems likely, had Bādāmi Caḷukya copperplates from 300 years earlier, and more recent Veṅgi records, collected and analysed.³¹ Moreover, it is clear that he employed historians to do this – what else shall we call a person who examines ancient documents and possesses the necessary philological and palaeographic skills to do so. Note that the usual (Sanskrit) script in Kalyāṇi at this period is a new "South Indian Nāgarī," while the Bādāmi copperplates and stone inscriptions are typically written in the archaic "Telugu-Kannada" script that had been out of style for some centuries (the Veṅgi script also had altogether diverged from that of Bādāmi, and differed from Kalyāṇi as well).³² Not only this, but the Kalyāṇi king went so far as to dispatch such a historian 200 kilometers to the southwest in order to read the temple record at the great Meguṭi temple in Aihole, and to use it for historical purposes – of every sort, including "revisionist" purposes.³³ Re-establishing the line between Bādāmi and Kalyāṇi – represented as seamlessly continuous in Kauthem and in all the succeeding copper plate grants of the Kalyāṇi dynasty – was clearly a matter of central importance to the reconstituted dynasty³⁴.

31. Though perhaps not always exhaustively: Vikramāditya, for example, is called the son of Ādityavarman when all the copperplates refer to him as elder brother.
32. We find the ability to read different scripts praised elsewhere. For example, in the Kannaḍa portion of the Yewur Grant of Vikramāditya VI, vs. 78 (*EI* 12, p. 287), a brahman refers to his own knowledge of various kinds of *lipi* (for which the editor cites a parallel in *Vikramāṅkadēva-carita* 3.17, referring to the King's skill *sarvaśu lipiśu*).
33. I think it altogether improbable that manuscript copies of these copper plate and lithic records had been preserved from the imperial archives of the Bādāmi dynasty three centuries earlier. I am also assuming that the seat of the dynasty is already in northeast Karnāṭaka (note that Vikramāditya's father Satyaśraya is said to be reigning in "Kalyāṇapura," *IA* 14, 1885, pp. 140ff; the transfer from Mānyakhēṭa is usually, though erroneously I think, ascribed to Somēśvara I reigned 1042-1068 A.D. Kauthem itself, where the document in question was issued, is in southern Maharashtra, near Miraj).
34. I'm not persuaded by the record that the Kalyāṇi Caḷukyas have a very clear sense of their genealogical history in the interval between the two dynasties. Kauthem gives only five names to fill in this period (c. 760-970 A.D.), half as many as are recorded for almost the same extent of time (543-757 A.D.) for the Bādāmi branch. Does this imply that when a dynasty was not empowered to grant land or to build temples it did not or could not or would not record its history, and as per usual remembered only the three or four (or five) preceding the king in power who did gain the power to grant and record?

IV

In a famous passage in the *Lectures on the Philosophy of History*, Hegel argues that it is the state that provides the context within which history takes birth, and without which it does not exist: "It is only the state which first presents subject matter that is not only adapted to the prose of history, but involves the production of such history in the very progress of its own being".³⁵ I think this is an instructive gloss on the development of Caḷukyan historiography. This is especially true of the reappropriation of this history in the early eleventh century, and the "very progress of [the state's] own being" to which it was a response.

The reinvention of a historical record, accordingly, will not be an act unmediated by the world of political interests. What role the assertion of actual political power plays in the Kalyāṇi historiographical developments is no doubt complex. One concrete condition of possibility, however, may be worth further exploration. The circumstance for the reassertion of Caḷukyan identity of Vikramāditya V may have been the same that was to manifest itself even more vigorously two generations later during the struggle between Vikramāditya VI, and the Chōḷa king Kulōttuṅga Rājendra (c.1076 A.D.). This was a dominion over rich but dynastically unstable coastal area of Veṅgi, to which Satyaśraya, Vikramāditya V's father, had already sought to lay claim (*SII*, 6, no. 102). Ramaswami Aiyangar summarises the situation thus: "The Vengi country was one of the bones of countention [between the two kings Vikramāditya VI and Kulōttuṅga Rājendra]. The tract was originally a part of the Caḷukya empire in the seventh century, and became independent under a younger branch of the original Caḷukya line (the 'Eastern' Caḷukyās). Vikramāditya VI belonged to the later Caḷukya line, whose kinship with the older line was hypothetical, while Kulōttuṅga was by descent a scion of both the older Caḷukya line (through the Eastern Caḷukyās of Veṅgi) and of the Chōḷas".³⁶ In 1008 A.D., the claims of the Kalyāṇi branch, if its own identity could be securely established, would far outweigh

35. Cited by Hayden White, *The Content of the Form: Narrative Discourse and Historical Representation* (Johns Hopkins, Baltimore: 1987), p. 12.

36. K.V. Rangasvami Aiyangar, introduction to *Kṛityakalpataru: Dānakāṇḍa* (GOS), pp. 36-7. See also Nilakantha Sastri, *The Colas* (University of Madras, Madras: 1955, second edition), pp. 178ff., especially p. 182: "The subordination of Veṅgi to Rājarāja [was a bitter pill] to Satyaśraya. In fact from this time Veṅgi becomes a bone of contention between the Chōḷas and the Western Caḷukyās, and for the next 135 years, with few intervals, Veṅgi becomes a theatre of their hostilities." A Caḷukyan army actually invaded Veṅgi in 1006 A.D..

those of the Chōlas under Rājarāja, who with none whatever had imposed administrative control on the region two years earlier.

The kind of history we want to capture in studying the historiographical practice of the Caḷukya rulers is not the history of “facts” so troubling to Yazdani when he wrote, in reference to the inscriptions I have studied here, that “no useful purpose will be served by seeking to analyse such late and discordant traditions (as those of the western Caḷukyās) in any detail... Interesting as the beliefs cherished by the members of a historic dynasty for several generations, these puerile stories are of course of no value as factual history”.³⁷ It is not only the “facts” that are of interest but also, and even more so, the *interest in facts* themselves evinced by historical agents, an interest embodied in the stories such agents marshal facts to tell. In other words, what people believe is the case and want others to believe is the case, is as important or more important than what is the case, assuming for a moment that we could ever find out what that is.³⁸ Whether or not the Kalyāṇi dynasty had any “real” relationship to Bādāmi is of minor importance. For those making history in Kalyāṇi in 1008 one of the stories the marshalling of facts served to tell likely concerned the dispute over which clan, Chōla or Kalyāṇi Caḷukya, was the legitimate successor of Bādāmi and therefore the rightful claimants of, inter alia, the rich Veṅgi country between the deltas of Kṛishṇa and Gōdāvarī rivers – and “what member of the Caḷukyan dynasty would ever stray from the path of *dbarma*?”.³⁹ It was to a some degree in the public “documentary” space of historical discourse that this dispute was played out.

37. *Early History of the Deccan*, p. 206.

38. Such a conceptualization of the historical project takes some wind out of the positivist sails of David Henige, “Some Phantom Dynasties of Early and Medieval India: Epigraphic Evidence and the Abhorrence of a Vacuum” (*BSOAS* 38, 1975, pp. 525-49).

39. The attempt to establish connections with the Bādāmi Caḷukyās became something of a fashion in the eleventh century, often serving very local purposes. See the two sets of copperplates purporting to have been issued by Satyaśraya Pulakeśin (*IA* 7, 1878, p. 211; 30, p. 218 no. 35), which have been shown to be forgeries (Panchamukhi in *EI* 27, 1947-48, p.6).

References

- Buchanan, L., Suban
1985 *Chalukya Temples : History and Iconography*, Dissertation, Ohio State University
- Dani, A.H.
1963 *Indian Palaeography*, Oxford.
- Diskalkar, D.B.
1961 *Poona Orientalist*, 26:1-54.
- Frykenberg, E.R. and Kolenda, Pauline, (eds.)
1985 *Studies of South India: An Anthology of Recent Research and Scholoship*, Madras / New Delhi.
- Gadre, A.S.
1943 *Important Inscriptions from Baroda State*, Baroda.
- Gai, G.S., (ed.)
1965 *Bombay-Karnataka Inscription*, Vol. IV, Delhi.
- Jinavijaya, Muni
1933 *Prabandhachintamani*, Singhvi Jain series, No. 1, Santaniketana.
- Krishnamoorty, K. (ed.)
1983 *Kavirajamarga*, IBH, Bangalore.
- Mahalingam, T.V., (ed.)
1988 *Inscriptions of the Pallavas*, ICHR, New Delhi.
- Nagaraja Rao, M.S. (ed.)
1978 *The Chalukyas of Badami*, The Mythic Society, Bangalore.
1983 *The Chalukyas of Kalyana*, The Mythic Society, Bangalore.
1948 "Inscriptions of the Deccan: An Epigraphical Survey (circa 300 B.C. - 1300 A.D.)," *BDCRI*, No. 9:1-160.
- Naik, A.V.
1941 *Vedic Yantralaya*, Ajmer.
- Ojha, G.H., and Guleri, C.S. (eds.)
1941 *Karnatak Inscriptions*, 2 Vols. Dharwad.
- Panchamukhi, R.S.
1954 *Avanti Sundarikathā*, Trivandrum Śanskrit Series, 172, Trivandrum.
- Pillai, S.K. (ed.)
1962 *Copper Plate Inscriptions of Andhra Pradesh Government Museum*, Vol. 1, Hyderabad.
- Rameshan, N.
1955 *The Coṣas*, (2nd edition), Madras.
- Sastri, K.A.N.
1982 *Memorial Stones: A study of their origin, significance, and variety*, Dharwad.
- Settar, S., and Sontheimer, D. Gunther, (eds.)
1989 *Vijayanagar*, Cambridge.
- Stein, Burton,
1980 *Poésie Sanskrite dans les Anthologies et fes Inscriptions*, 3 volumes, Paris.
- Sternback, Ludwick
1987 *The Content of the Form: Narrative Discourse and Historical Representation*, Johns Hopkins, Baltimore.
- White, Hayden
1960 *Early History of the Deccan*, Oxford University Press, London.
- Yazdani, G. (ed.)