CHAPTER VI

The Khacharas of Basavura

The Khacharas of Basavura were a minor family of chiefs who yielded administrative authority over a small territory of hundred and forty villages known as Basavura-140.

The Name of the family

The name of the family i.e. Khachara, appears to associate the family with the legend of Jīmūtavāhana. The members of the family claim to have belonged to the lineage of this Vidyādhara prince. As the story goes, this prince was a kind-hearted person and he offered himself as food to the divine bird Garuḍa to save his friend. On certain circumstances Vēṣuṣi the king of serpents became obliged to offer one of his subjects everyday to Garuḍa. The one who got the turn was expected to sit on a stone, where Garuḍa would come and finish his prey. Once, while Jīmūtavāhana saw a serpent Sankachūḍa sitting on the stone and waiting for Garuḍa, Jīmūtavāhana took pity on him and managed to take his place. Garuḍa went to the place as usual and attacked the prey. Only after inflicting deadly injuries, Garuḍa realised that the person whom he was attacking was not the real prey and felt very sorry. Jīmūtavāhana was saved
through the grace of Parvati. Garuda stopped this practice of claiming a prey everyday and he also brought back to life all the serpents he had killed.

Now, this story is current in Indian literary tradition and has been dramatised by Ramesha in his famous Nāgānanda. Now or why the Khacharas claim their association with Jīmūtavāhana and the Garuda of the story is indeed not known. It is also interesting to note that similar claim is made by the more prominent feudatories, the Śilāhāras of Deccan.

Perhaps the heroic and the compassionate deed of the legendary hero might have inspired these chiefs to associate themselves with this family. The association of the Khacharas is more direct since they name their family as Khachara or Khechara i.e. Garuda. They not only bore the title Jīmūtavāhanavāya as noted above, but they used the figure of a serpent on the banner (Pandega dhvaja). It is to be noted that ascribing mythical origin to the ruling families was a common feature in ancient Karnataka, as in other parts of the country, obviously with a purpose to give the family a hoary antiquity and also a sort of supernatural position.

It is worthwhile noting here a reference to the Khacharas in the book entitled "Minor Dynasties of South India (Karnataka) Volume I by Dr.B.R.Gopal." In this book
Dr. Gopal has very briefly touched upon the Khacharas. Rather surprisingly he has listed these chiefs under the Śilāhāras. The only ground for him to do so seems to be that, like the Śilāhāras, Khacharas also called themselves Jimutavahana anvaya or as belonging to the lineage of Jimutavahana. But it is to be noted here that none of twenty-five inscriptions belonging to this family refers to it as Śilāhāras. In my opinion the mere title referring to Jimutavahana is not a sufficient justification for calling them Śilāhāras. Dr. Gopal seems to have followed Dr. P. B. Desai¹ who also calls this family as Śilāhāra on the same ground.

Further, the account of Dr. Gopal is too brief and does not go into the details of the problems of the genealogy and chronology. Dr. Desai's notice of this family is briefer still, covering about a page.

The Khacharas made their appearance on the political scene towards the latter half of the 10th Century A.D. and continued in this power till about the end of the 15th Century A.D. During this period they held the office of Mahāvīravas of Beşavura-140 and perhaps towards the end of their career they were raised to the position of marnava and mahāsamanar. During this period they played a significant role in the political history of this region under different ruling
dynasties in accordance with the existing practices. It is indeed difficult to get the genealogical and chronological details about the various members of the family figuring in inscriptions. An attempt is made below to connect the various members of the family and fix the approximate periods of their rule.

Origin

Who were the Khacharas and where did they come from? To this question inscriptive or other sources do not give a direct answer. For a study of the political history of a dynasty, it is necessary to have a proper perspective of its genealogical position. In the case of the Khacharas of BessaVura, their genealogy is beset with problems and difficulties due to scarcity of source material, both epigraphical and literary.

Genealogy and Chronology

Kaliyammarasa I: The earliest member of this family so far known is Kaliyammarasa I. He figures in an inscription from Kallihal dated 1034 A.D. The known dates of this chief are 1034, 1045, 1048 and 1055 A.D. He was the Nālgavunda, governing this division as a subordinate of Pergade Madinayya who was the governor of Banavasi under Chālukya king
Jayasimha II. One of the verses in the inscription hints at the fact that Kaliyammarasa I was instrumental in the expansion of the kingdom up to the western Ocean. An inscription from Kolur dated 1045 A.D. belonging to the next ruler Someswara I mentions a Kaliyammarasa as the manavva of Basavura-140. It is quite likely that he is the same as Kaliyammarasa of the Kallikal inscription mentioned above.

Further, a Kaliyammarasa of the same family figures in an inscription of 1055 A.D., also found at Kallikal, though no other details of this chief are available because of the damaged condition of the inscription which describes him as nagavunda of Basavura-140. Obviously, he is the same as Kaliyammarasa I of the above two inscriptions. Thus we have for him three dates viz., 1034 A.D., 1045 A.D. and 1055 A.D.

It is to be noted in this connection that in between these dates another Khachara chief, doubtfully read as Nelliymarasa figures as the Nagavunda of Basavura-140 in 1045 A.D. in an inscription from Mallur in Dharwad district. But we know that Kaliyammarasa was the Nagavunda of this division during this period. But how to account for another person holding the same office during the same period? A suggestion can be made here. As stated above, the name Nelliymarasa does not seem to be quite clear in the
inscription. The letter "li" is read doubtfully in brackets. It may therefore be suggested that this name Nelliymmarasa is a mistake for Kalliymmarasa. In that case he can be identified with Kaliymmarasa I above. This gives yet another date for him i.e. 1048 A.D.

Rājēdityarasa (1959, 1063, 1065 A.D.)

The next Khachara chief who figures in an inscription is Rājēditya. Taking into consideration the dates he can be said to be the son of Kaliymmarasa I. Obviously he succeeded the latter to this office. He figures as the ammeya of Bāsavura-140 during the reign of Sōmeśvara I. In this inscription, he is said to have accompanied Pampēdēvi to Mallavura, where they made a grant in 1059 A.D. When this inscription was published, it was stated that Pampēdēvi was the wife of Rājēditya. Further in an inscription of Jayasimha II where she is clearly stated to be the wife of a chief called Kunderaṇa. The same Rājēditya figures in an inscription of Dēvihoṣur dated 1063 A.D. as holding the same office. He has yet another inscription at Dēvagiri which is dated 1065 A.D. and which also mentions him as Maneyya of Bāsavura. Thus this successor of Kaliymmarasa I has three dates viz., 1059, 1063, and 1065 A.D.
Kaliyammarasa II (1075, 1085, 1096, 1121 A.D.)

After Rajadityya we once again come across a Kaliyammarasa. On the basis of the dates on which his inscriptions are dated we may call this Kaliyammarasa as Kaliyammarasa II. But before dealing with him we have to consider another chief namely Joyimarasa who figures in an inscription of 1080 A.D. which does not mention any overlord though obviously it falls in the reign period of Chalukya Vikramaditya VI. Considering the fact that the Khaohara chief Kaliyammarasa II has dates from 1079 A.D. to 1096 A.D., it is difficult to assign a place in the order of succession. Indeed he is described as Jimutavahana savse Prasute and Khachara Vemaotttama. But his association with Basavura is not clear. He is stated to have raided Gutta, the capital of a principality known as Guttavolal during the days of the Chalukya of Kalyana. In the absence of clear evidence it is difficult to think that this Joyimarasa was ruling over Basavura. Under these circumstances it may be stated that he belonged to the Khaohara family and was in the military service under the Chalukyas. He does not seem to have been belonging to the line of Khacharas who were the rulers of Basavura-140.

The earliest available date for Kaliyammarasa II is 1075 A.D. There is reason to believe that this Kaliyammarasa
was the son of Rājādītya, because in the inscription of 1075 A.D. belonging to the reign of Sūmēśvara II he is described as Rājādītyaṇa Singa (a lion of Rājādītya) i.e. the favourite of Rājādītya which expression can be interpreted to mean the son of Rājādītya. It is to be noted also that the predecessor of Rājādītya was also a Kaliyammarasa. It is not unlikely that this Kaliyammarasa was the father of Rājādītya. Giving the name of one's father to his son is a common tradition even today in Karnataka. Thus we have here three generation of the family vis.

Kaliyammarasa I

Rājādītya

Kaliyammarasa II

The next available date for Kaliyammarasa is 1079 A.D. when Vikramadītya VI was on the Chālukya throne. Indeed in the inscription of this date mentioning Vikramadītya VI as the ruling king the name of the chief is missing though Bāsavura-140 figures. But on the basis of another inscription of the same king dated 1085 A.D. where Kaliyammarasa is mentioned, it can be reasonably presumed that the mannaya of Bāsavura figuring in the inscription of 1079 A.D. is also Kaliyammarasa. In the inscription of 1086 A.D. which also belongs to
Vikramāditya VI, there is a mention of two persons viz., Basava and Kōtemalla, who are said to have belonged to Uraga Kule i.e., race of serpents. On the basis of this Dr. Barnott, the editor of the record suggests that these persons also belong to Jīmūtavāhana lineage. The suggestion is made on the basis of the association of uraga with the family. But they do not seem to have anything to do with the Khachara family to which Kaliyammarasa belonged. Incidentally this Basava is stated to have sacrificed his life for Kaliyammarasa who was very pleased with him. We have for him a date in 1096 A.D. in an inscription from Devagiri during the reign of Chālukya Vikramāditya VI. He continued to have been in the position for a long time. We have for him a date in 1121 A.D. in an inscription from Kāgenelli in Dharwed district, though this inscription does not mention the name of the Khachara family, that Kaliyammarasa was a manneya of the Bēsavara-140, clearly indicates that he is identical with Kaliyammarasa II mentioned in the earlier inscription. Kāgenelli inscription is dated 22nd January 1121 A.D. and this is the latest known date for Kaliyammarasa II.

There is an inscription at Devagiri which is dated 25th December 1121 A.D. and it mentions a mahāgamanta Hermādiyarasa as the governor of Bēsavara-140. This Hermādiyarasa is described as the son of Kaliyammarasa.
Incidentally we get here the name of the wife of Kaliyammarasa obviously Kaliyammarasa II as Lachaḍēvi.

We shall pause here for a while to consider another name viz., Tailapadēva as belonging to Jīmutavahana lineage and Khahara family. There are two inscriptions mentioning this chief, one from Bankāpur and another from Didgūr. The first one is dated in 1122 A.D.\(^2\) and in the other the date is missing because of the damaged condition of the inscription. In the Bankāpur inscription the family of the chief is not mentioned, but the Didgūr inscription though damaged indicates that he belonged to the Khahara family. The Didgūr inscription further indicates that he was born of Nāchidēva and Kallaḍēvi. It is difficult to establish any relationship between him and Kaliyammarasa.

*Kaliyammarasa III (1134, 1149 A.D.)*

Next in the main line comes another Kaliyammarasa, third in that order. We have a date for him in 1134 A.D. in an inscription from DeVagiri.\(^2\) This Kaliyammarasa was governing Bāsavura as manneya under Chālukya Sōmesvara III. He figures again in an inscription from Devihosur of Bāvēri taluk in Dharwad district dated in 1149 A.D.\(^2\) though no details about this record is given in the text. This record belongs to the reign of Chālukya Jagadekamalla II. Yet another record of this
Jagadēkamallā the date of which is lost, mentions Kaliyammaraṇa as the manṇeya of Bāsavura. Obviously, he is the same as Kaliyammaraṇa of the Devegi and Devihoṣur inscriptions.

Māchidēvāraṇa (1152 A.D., 1160)

The next Khachara chief as the governor of Bāsavura we come across is Māchidēvāraṇa. His earliest known date is 1152 A.D. which is the date of an inscription of Chālukya taila III from Hāvērī. This Māchidēvāraṇa figures in another inscription of 1160 A.D. This latter inscription presents an interesting problem regarding the genealogy. It mentions some names in the genealogical order. The portion giving this genealogy is damaged, but interestingly enough, the same account figures in, yet another inscription from Sangūr in Hāvērī taluk of Dharwad district, dated 1167 A.D. On the basis of this text it follows that in the Khachara family there was a chief known as Kāma. His wife was Padmamavī. To them were born Mallidēva, Nelliga, Kāliga and Nāranaṇa. Then the inscription says that in this family (Nattam k Vamanadol) there was a king whose name is read in one inscription as Simha, Simharāja and in another as Mahārāja, according to the reading Simharāja appears to be correct. His son was Kalideva. Māchidēva was the son of Kalideva. It is impossible to connect the earlier set of names from Kāma to Singa with any
of the known names discussed above. In the second set of names Simha, Kalidēva and Māchidēva, it is indeed tempting to identify Kalidēva with Kaliyammarase III, but the question is about Singha, the father of Kalidēva. We have no other means to confirm that the name of the father of Kaliyammarase III was Singha though it cannot be ruled out altogether. Presuming that Kalidēva and Kaliyammarase III are identical, Māchidēva can be said to be the son and successor of Kaliyammarase III.

It is to be noted here that by the time Māchidēva came to power there was change in the political scene of Karnataka. Tāla III of the Chālukya family under whom Māchidēva was initially serving was now ousted and the Kalachuri chief Bījjala II occupied the Chālukya throne. Obviously, Māchidēva pledged his loyalty to the new master. Thus we find that the inscription of 1160 A.D. referred to above mentions Kalachuri Bījjala as overlord of Māchidēva.

Kaliyammarase IV

The inscription of 1167 A.D. mentioned above carries the genealogy of the Māchahares by one more generation. It states that Māchidēva had a wife called Pampađēvi. Their son was Kaliga, who is later on called in the same inscription
as Kaliyammarasa. There is no difficulty in calling this Kaliyammarasa as Kaliyammarasa IV. He was governing Basavura, as manneya in 1167 A.D. Incidentally it is to be noted that Mächidövarasa, had a sister called Iachchaladëvi. Her name is revealed in the same Dëvagiri inscription of 1160 A.D., where Mächidöva is stated to have made certain grants to a deity for the prosperity of his sister Iachchaladevi.

Mallidëva 12th Century A.D.

The next and the last Khachara chief to be known through our sources is Mallidëva who figures as the Manneya of Basavura, under the Sëupa king Singhana. The inscription is not dated, but it can be placed in the beginning of the 12th Century A.D., since Singhana commences his rule in 1200 A.D. Between the last known date of Kaliyammarasa III i.e. 1169 A.D. and the period of Mallidëva, there is indeed a big gap of about 30 to 40 years. In the absence of any evidence it is difficult to fill the gap with a Khachara name though it is not unlikely that one of the Khachara chief was in power during this period. Politically this was the period of confusion. In 1156 A.D., the Kalschuris succeeded in occupying the Chälukyan kingdom, but they did not succeed in keeping it with them for long. Within next 20 to 25 years Chälukya Somëvara wrested power from the Kalschuris. But he also could not rule for long. By the time he came to power his
subordinates, the Sënás in the northern and the Hoyasalas in the southern regions had already grown too strong for the ruler and each was vying with each other in gaining control over the Chälukyas kingdom.

By 1186 A.D. Sëuna Dhillama succeeded in establishing his independent rule in the northern part of the Chälukyas kingdom. In such an unsteady situation and political turmoil, smaller chiefs like Khacharas obviously sank into insignificance. No wonder therefore, we do not have any information about them during this period.

As mentioned above Mallidēva is the last known chief of the Khachara family. Nothing is heard about this family during the period of the next Sëuna ruler.

It can be seen from the above discussion that the Khacharas held power though in a comparatively minor position for a fairly long period, from the beginning of the 11th century to atleast the early decades of the 13th century A.D. i.e. for more than two and a half centuries. From what has been discussed above, the names of these Khachara chiefs can be chronologically arranged as below.
Genealogy of the Khacharas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kaliyammarasa I</td>
<td>1034, 1045, 1048, 1055 A.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rajaditya</td>
<td>1059, 1063, 1065 A.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaliyammarasa II</td>
<td>1075, 1079, 1085, 1086, 1096 A.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaliyammarasa III</td>
<td>1120 A.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hermadiyarasa</td>
<td>1121 A.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tailapadeva</td>
<td>1122 A.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaliyammarasa III</td>
<td>1134, 1149 A.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machidevarasa</td>
<td>1152, 1160, 1161 A.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>= Pampadevi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaliyammarasa IV</td>
<td>1167 A.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mallidevarasa</td>
<td>12th Cent. A.D.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As seen above, the Khacharas made their appearance on the political scene from the beginning of the 11th Cent. A.D. coinciding with the rise of the Chalukyas of Kalyana and they served the Chalukyas in a subordinate capacity till their end i.e. till the end of that dynasty. With the decline of the Chalukyas they shifted their loyalty to the Kalachuris and the Seunas, coming to power, they served them also. During
this long period, in a limited way they contributed to the consolidation of the power of their masters and also to the cultural development of the area under them. Some of these details gathered from the inscriptions are noted down.

The Khacheras started their career as the *nalaavundas*, i.e. the headmen of *nādu* or the region of Basavura-140, but they appear to have yielded considerable influence in the political field as is indicated by their title *manna*ya, which is a title indicative of a subordinate chief or the feudatory who was more than a mere officer of any area. We notice that sometimely they are also called *mahāsāmantas* which is indicative of this prestigious position. It is also to be noted that their influence grew in course of time and ultimately they reached the position of *mahāmendalēsvāra* i.e., a feudatory who enjoyed almost an independent status under the ruling monarch.

**Political History of the Khacheras**

Hardly any details regarding the political activities of these rulers can be gleaned from the inscriptions. In a conventional way these chiefs are described as the nalgavundas, or the manneya of Basavura-140. Sometimes in a conventional way, again, they are described as great fighters vanquishing with ease all the opponents. Very rarely any specific...
achievement is mentioned. As pointed out earlier Kaliyammarasa I is described as having expanded the kingdom up to the western ocean by defeating the Malepas or the tribes at the instance of his master Jayasimha II. Similarly, he is described in an inscription from Devagiri as Dayiga dhalla i.e. one who tormented Dayiga, but it is impossible to identify this Dayiga with any contemporary ruler or chief. Joyinarasa, whom we have suggested to be belonging to a branch of the Khacharas is said to have attacked Guttala i.e. modern Guttal in Haveri taluk. It is not known as to why or against whom this attack was directed. It is only narrated that in this fight a warrior called Kaleyamukha of Devagiri exhibited remarkable heroism and lost his life on the battlefield. Guttal, as we know was the headquarters of the chiefs called the Guttas of Guttavolal who were also the subordinates and contemporaries of the Chalukyas of Kalyana. At the time of this incident in 1080 A.D. Magutta was the Gutta chief.

An inscription from Kolur makes a vague reference to a fight in which two heroes Basava and Ketamallia were involved at the instance of Kaliyammarasa II. But there are no means of knowing as to which specific fight this reference pertains to. Similarly, Machidevarasa is praised highly for his victory in the battles, but only in a general way without referring to any specific event.
The territory in charge of the Khachoras was known as Basavur-140. It is well known that for the purpose of the administration, the kingdom was divided into different big and small divisions which were kept in charge of the members of the royal family, or the officers appointed for this purpose, or many a times they were governed hereditarily by the feudatory chiefs. But one feature of the system of administration of the kingdoms of early and medieval Deccan, more precisely Karnataka, this system was characterised by adding the numerical figures against the name of the place which was the headquarters of such an administrative division. For example, in large number of inscriptions of this period we come across names of the administrative divisions like Basavasi-12000, Holambavadi-32000, Tadavadi-1000, Basavur-140, Kolamur-30 and so on. This system of suffixing the numerical figure for the divisions was not so much prevalent in the neighbouring areas such as Andhra and Tamilnadu of the contemporary days.

There has been considerable discussion, and speculations, regarding the significance of this numerical suffix. Before going into this discussion it is worthwhile noting that the number so suffixed is sometimes as large as seven
and a half lakhs and sometimes even as small as six or even two.

Kautilya indeed tells us that villages are to be grouped in convenient numbers for the purposes of administration. But this method of suffixing the number to the name of the division appears to be peculiar to the kingdoms of Deccan from the days of the Chalukyas of Badami to the end of the days of the Seunas and Hysales.

The significance of this has been explained in different ways by different scholars. If according to some, this number indicated population, some others said that it denoted the revenue of the area. It was also suggested that when the figure was very large it was used in the symbolic or figurative way, while the smaller number denoted the actual number of villages included in the particular divisions.

With all this discussion one thing remains to be said and that is, whatever be the number big or small, it refers to the number of grāmas in a particular division, because we find in large number of cases the word grāma is associated with the division. For example, the Aihole inscription of Pulakesi II speaks of three Mahāraštrekas consisting of 99000 villages. In an inscription from Margund there is reference to a
division called Koleṣūr-30 and all the 30 villages are enumerated in the inscription. Many instances of this type can be quoted. Thus, there is no doubt that the number did indicate the grāma and now the question is what was meant by grāma? By grāma we normally mean a village and naturally we imagine a village of a normal size of the present day. From the present day standards it is difficult to believe that an administrative division especially big ones could contain as many villages as denoted by the figures suffixed to their names. But at the same time it is also to be concluded that they were the villages. We may thus have to conclude that these villages could have been considerably smaller so as to be located in a smaller area. This does not seem to be unusual if we take into consideration the situation now prevailing in those days. It is our experience that in an area of better transport and communication facilities depending on the fertility of the region more number of villages are located in a considerably smaller area. This situation could be more so in the ancient and medieval days. Though this argument does not fully explain such big numbers as seven and a half lakhs, there is indeed no room for doubt that the number stood for grāma alone.

With this background we may now try to demarcate the extent of Basavura-140 as far as possible. Basavura-140 was
an administrative division consisting of hundred and forty villages with Basavura as its headquarters. This division was a part of the bigger and famous division Banavasi-12000. A study of the inscription shows that the division of Banavasi roughly covered southern parts of North Kanara and Dharwad districts and mostly the whole of Shimoga district upto the river Tunga Bhadra. It is indeed difficult to locate today all the hundred and forty villages. Nevertheless on the basis of the available evidences we can locate atleast a few of them and try to mark tentatively the boundary of the same.

On the basis of the inscriptions studied we can surmise that Basavura hundred and forty covered the area between the River Varada and river Tungabhadra part of Bangal taluk below the Varada river and adjoining Haveri and Byadgi taluks, and a small portion of northern part of Raajbennur taluks.

Inscriptions indicate that the following villages formed a part of this division:

1. Ajjadi
  Probably identical with Kallihal in Haveri taluk  
SII XVIII, No.50

2. Beluhuge-70
   Modern Belvagi in Haveri taluk  
SII,XVIII,No.69

3. Devangere
   Devgeri in Haveri taluk  
SII XVIII, No.177
4. Deyada Posevuru Devihosur in Haveri taluk SII XVIII, No. 152
5. Guttavolal Guttal in Haveri taluk SII, XVIII, No. 357
6. Haveri Haveri taluk SII, XVIII, No. 157
7. Honnavatti Modern Honnavatti in Rangbennur taluk SII XVIII, No. 302
8. Jidugur Didgur in Haveri taluk SII XVIII, No. 52
9. Kedarmidi Modern Kedermendalgi in Byadgi taluk EI IV, No. 11
10. Kagenelli Kagenelli in Hirekerur taluk SII, XVIII, No. 117
11. Kerage Probably Kerajgi in Haveri taluk EI XIX, p. 116
12. Kolur In Haveri taluk EI XIX, p. 182
13. Konavatti Possibly represented by two villages HireKonatti and Chikakonatti situated in Hirekerur taluk SII, XVIII, No. 152
14. Mallavura Mallur in Haveri taluk SII, XVIII, No. 60
15. Mreralgi Mreralgi in Haveri taluk SII, XVIII, No. 151
16. Sattalige in Haveri taluk SII, XVIII, No. 69
17. Tambuge Modern Konanatambuge in Haveri taluk EI XIX, p. 183

There are other villages included in this division, but their identity cannot be established with certainty. Their list is given below. It is also difficult to trace all the hundred and forty villages included in this division.
1. Aggalajura - SII, XIX, p.190
2. Bankagur - SII, XIX, p.182, l.13
3. Bedapalla - SII, XIX, p.187, l.27
4. Kalabur - SII, XVIII, No. 45, l.15
5. Kuppugadde - SII, XVIII, No. 117
6. Medugare - SII, XIX, p.196, l.37
7. Paduvuru - SII, XVIII, No. 117
8. Pallavuru - SII, XIX, p.183, l.14
9. Paraluru - SII, XVIII, No. 303
10. Tadasuru - SII, XVIII, No. 60, l.36
11. Tambe - SII, XVIII, No. 177, l.25
12. Yalleya tambuge - SII, XIX, p.183, l.15
13. Kannavagede - SII, XVIII, No. 303, l.15

The headquarters of this division, as we know, was Basavura. It is identical with modern Basur which however is divided into two viz. Hire Basur (i.e. Hire - the big) and Chikka Basur (i.e. Chikka - the small) each situated on either side of the border between Hāṅgal and Byōḍgi taluks. In one inscription of 1121 A.D. this place is described as Vyāsapura and another inscription explains that this place got its name because the great sage Vyāsa, the author of Mahabharata, performed his penance here. Indeed this appears to be an ingenius method of Sanskritizing the original Basūr and ascribing it a mythical importance.
Inscriptions indicate that this division was further subdivided into smaller divisions or administrative units. Belhug-70 was one such. Belhug which is modern Belvagi in Havari taluk was the headquarters of this division. Some of the other villages which were included in this division were Guttal, Mirali, Bonnavetti-12 was another small division. It included areas around Bonatti in Ranbennur taluk of Dharwad district. Kagenelli-12 was yet another small division of 12 villages, Kagenelli, Kagenelli the famous place associated with the mystic Kanakadasa in Byadgi taluk was its headquarters. Thus, roughly the northern boundary of Basavura division would be the river Varada from along the borders of Havari taluk flowing into Hangal to touch its borders at Honkana.

In the east the river Tungabhadra proceeding from Belvigo and covering Havari taluk and proceeding upto Belur in the south a line down from Hirekonatti in Hirekerur taluk to about Belur on the banks of river Tungabhadra in Ranbennur taluk covering a small portion of Hirekerur and the northern portion of Ranbennur taluk can be said to be Basavura hundred and forty division.

To the north of this division were Purigere and Basava divisions. To the west, Panumgal-500 and to the south west
Hāgarakhanda and south east Rattapalli and other divisions.

**Prominent places:**

Inscriptions describe many a place in this division as pretty prominent from the religious or other points of view. As for example Devihosur:

Devihosur or the ancient Deyvada-Posavur was an important centre in this division. As is indicated by the name itself this was a religious centre dedicated to a deity. It was also an agrahāra i.e., a centre of higher learning and religious activities. The famous deity of this place was Malati or Malachi said to be the consort of God Mailēradeva. The temple of this deity must have had an existence at least in the 10th Cent. A.D. itself. An inscription of 1065 A.D.\(^3\) describes that a makaravartana was constructed for the temple of this deity by an officer called Indapayya or Indra. This deity here is described as 'Kali', Raudri and Bhāravi. An inscription from this place dated 1149 A.D.\(^4\) gives a fine poetic description of this place extolling its beauty. In a mythical way it states that this agrahāra was granted to the Brahmanas by king Janamejaya of the Purānic fame. This was a famous Ṣhāktapīta or centre of Ṣhaktī worship and people from far and near came to this place to offer worship to this deity. This very inscription says that an officer of Banavasi, Recharasā
by name, visited this place to fulfil his vow (hareke) and made certain grants in the presence of people of different villages round about.

*Kagenel*e, ancient Kagenel*e was yet another important place in this division as already noted above. It was the headquarters of the division of the twelve villages. In the 16th century A.D. it became very famous because of its association with one of the noted mystic saint and composer of Karnataka viz., Kanakadāsa. But its history of this place goes back to at least the 10th-11th Cent. A.D. One of the inscriptions from this place dated 1121 A.D.²⁵ tries to give a fanciful explanation of the name of the place Kagenel*e. In Kannada Kāce means a crow and neli* means the abode or resort so Kagenel*e means the abode of the crow. The poet seems to imagine that on the 14th day of Kartikāmaṇḍa would be available in this place mud and earth. *mrittika* (mrittika) by eating which a crow became white and the people thought that this mud and earth had peculiar merit and hence the place came to be known as Kagenel*e.

In an exaggerated way again an anonymous poet of this inscription says that, this was one of best places on earth with natural beauty, wisdom and prosperity. The place was surrounded by beautiful gardens and there was a beautiful tank surpassing even the ocean. And the sylvan beauty surpassed
that of the garden of Indra. It was a big city with many localities. The streets of the dancing girls, the row of shops of big merchants, temples as high as the divine mountain and the groups of Jina basadis. This Kāgelīṭṭā was a monument of prosperity.

Honnatti, Honnavatti-12 was another division of twelve villages included in the division. Modern Honnatti in Ranibennur taluk of Dharwad district was the headquarters of this division. An anonymous poet who composed an inscription dated 1124 A.D. in this place has spared no words in describing the beauty of this place. According to him no city either on earth or heaven was equal in glory to this place. The cities of Indra and Kubera viz., Surapura, Bhāgavatipura and Alakāpura were nothing before this city of Honavatti. In fact, according to the poet, no human being was capable for describing this "emperor of cities" (Urgala Chakravarti).

There were Saiva and Vaishnava temples, Jaina basadis and Bauddha vihāras. It was full of trees bending low at the foot, and groups of lakes of cool water and gardens beautiful in all the seasons. Whether all these things were actually there or not is not the question. The description of the poet is at least very pleasing. The Mahājanas of this place were highly learned and thorough in all the lores.
The Khacharas wore comparatively a smaller family being in a limited authority as nālgāvundas under the supervision of the governors. Nevertheless, in their own limited way they did contribute to the spiritual and material prosperity of the region. Inscriptions of these chiefs refer to them and their officers as liberally denoting land and money to the temples in their territory. The titles of these chiefs were Padmāvatī-dāvī-labdhā, Prasadā i.e., the recipients of the favour of Goddess Padmavati, indicates their tradition and affiliation to Jaina religion, Padmāvati standing for Padmavati Yekshi of the Jaina pantheon. But as was the practice with imperial rulers, their subordinate chiefs also maintained a secular policy of promoting all the religions of the land irrespective of their personal affiliation. The most prominent religion in the Deccan during the days of the Khacharas was Śaiva religion mostly of the Kālāmukha sect. Constructing a temple and/or making donations generously for the maintenance of temples was considered as an act of merit and many people of different ranks came forth to earn such merit. Apart from the merit to the donor these institutions served the society in a variety of ways. In addition to catering to the spiritual needs of the people they contributed to the social and cultural growth. They developed great religious centres, prominent educational institutions and a forum for cultural activities.
such as fine arts, art and architecture. Almost every inscription
speaks of such institutions patronised by the kings,
chiefs, officers and wealthy merchants.

An interesting feature of this region is the growth of
a centre for worship of Sakti. This centre was Devihosur, now
a small village in Haveri taluk, but a prominent Sakti centre
during the period of our study. This was a centre of worship
of Malashidévi, a form of Sakti who in course of time came to
be considered as the consort of Mailäradéva, a local form of
Siva, a deity who attracts large number of devotees at times
from north Karnataka and Maharashtra. An inscription from
Devihosur describes this place as Malaschipita and obviously
the place got its name "Devyada Posaára" or D eviya Hosavúr
because of this deity only.

Kágenele was another important seat of religion. Not
only it was an abode of many temples of Siva such as Kalaśóvara
constructed by Kalaganda, there was a temple of Súrya constructed
by his son, Adityavarman. Other important Saiva centres of the
territory were Cuttal, Galaganatha, Naralahalli and Chaudadénpura.
The Kágenele inscription speaks of an Nátyaśála, a dancing hall
and a Vagalahaya mantapa or Sarasvatáki mantapa, obviously a
hall for studies and learned discourses.
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