CHAPTER VIII

Guttas of Guttavolal

The Guttas ruled over a small area around its chief town Guttavolal i.e. Guttal, a village in the Haveri taluk of Dharwad district. They gained some prominence in the history of Karnataka during the 11th and 12th centuries and also a part of the 13th century A.D. These chiefs ruled first as the feudatories of the Chalukyas of Kalyana and continued in the same status during the reign of the Kalachuris and then transferred their loyalty to the Seunias. Beginning as governors of a small principality around Guttal, they gradually gathered strength and slowly expanded their territory covering considerable portions of the Dharwad district and adjacent districts of Shimoga, North Kanara and Bellary. Towards the end of the Chalukya rule they found an opportunity to free themselves from the yoke of the overlordship of the imperial rulers and declare independence. However, they could not enjoy the independence for a long period and they had to accept suzerainty of the Kalachuris and later on of the Seunias. Fleet was the first scholar to give an account of this family in the Bombay Gazetteer Volume I, Part ii p. 578-34. Many new inscriptions have been discovered pertaining to the Guttas in the later
days. But no fuller account was available until the publication of the Sāṃsāra by B. S. R. Ritti, where we find a restudy of especially the genealogy and chronology of this family. We also find a study of this family in South Indian Inscription volume XVIII, edited by N. Laksminarayan Rao. An attempt is made here to make a fresh study of this family on the basis of the material available.

The Name of the Family

The inscriptions call the family as Gutta. This term is obviously a corruption of the term Gupta; in fact some inscriptions refer to them as belonging to Gupta Ānvaya i.e. the lineage of the Guptas.

These Guttas claim the descent from the famous Guptas, who ruled over the whole of North India in the 4th-5th Centuries A.D. Some of the inscriptions state that these chiefs belonged to the family of Chandragupta (Chandraguptānāvaya) obviously claiming that they belonged to the family of the illustrious Gupta ruler, Chandragupta II. The titles borne by them such as Ujjainī-puravarādhīvāra, Vatālipuravarādhīvāra Ujjainī-HabĒkālaēvāra-lakhā-mahāpragāde and the like, clearly indicate that they associated themselves with the famous Guptas of the North. However, it is difficult to establish any relationship between the two families.
because of remoteness both in time and space. For example, if it is to be said that they were the descendants of the Guptas, the question arises as to under what circumstances they migrated to so far south and if they did, when? We have no knowledge of the Guttas before the 11th Century A.D., whereas the Guptas were predominant as early as in the 4th-5th Centuries A.D. It can only be remarked therefore that for reasons inexplicable at present, the members of the family claimed to be the descendants of the erstwhile Guptas and bore the titles indicative of it. They also appropriated their names. The glamour of the name and fame of the Guptas could also be one of the reasons.

Origin

These chiefs originally belonged to the place Guttal in Haveri taluk of Dharwad district. The name of this place also is traceable to the name of this family. In inscriptions the place figures as Guttavolal or Guttavolalu i.e. the abode of the Guttas. From this place as the centre of their activities they slowly spread their influence to the neighbouring region finally extending to the North Kanara, Bellary and Shimoga districts. For a small family holding sway over a small region claiming the fame of Guptas may appear too much; nevertheless it is to their credit that they contributed
though in a limited way to the cultural growth of the region, like building temples and fostering religious institutions.

Genealogy and Chronology

The genealogy and chronology of the Guttas were first worked out by Fleet in his account of this family in *Bombay Gazetteer volume I Part II*, on the basis of the available material then. Subsequently, a number of inscriptions have been discovered which give us additional information in this respect. Utilising the later discoveries on the Guttas, Dr. Ritti has briefly dealt with the subject in his work *the Śūnya*. These materials have been utilised here in discussing this topic.

Though the definite date for the Gutta chiefs is known from the rule of Mallidēva (1115 A.D.) the history of the family can be taken back by two generations. From an inscription of Chandrānāyapura which gives the genealogy of the Guttas from the beginning, we gather that Nāgutta was the first member of this family. Nāgutta is obviously the corrupt form of Mahāgupta i.e. the Great Gupta. The same inscription tells us that his son was Gutta. He can be called Gutta I, since we come across other persons of the same name, subsequently in the genealogy. Gutta's son was Mallidēva. No definite date is known for any of these chiefs, but we
learn from the same inscription that Mallidēva was a subordinate of Govindarasa the famous general of Vikramēditya VI. On the basis of this information and the date of the record Fleet has given him the date 1115 A.D. An inscription from Honnatti mentions a Jōmadēva as the brother of Mallidēva. He figures as a subordinate of Vikramēditya V in 1124 A.D., which is the date of the inscription. The name Jōmadēva is a variant of Joyidēva which figures in other inscriptions also. Therefore this Jōmadēva can be called Joyidēva I, in view of the fact that the other chiefs of the same name figure subsequently.

An inscription indicates that Joyidēva I had a sister named Bāchaladēvi. She was married to Biradēva, a Kadamba chief of Nurāmbēla. An inscription from Guttal belongs to a Gutta chief named Vikramēditya. From the genealogical accounts in these inscriptions we learn that Mallidēva had a son named Vikramēditya. He can be identified with Vikramēditya of the Guttal inscription and be named Vikramēditya I. His date in the Guttal inscription is given as 1162 A.D. His wife was Siriyadēvi as known from an inscription from Haralahalli. A record indicates that Vikramēditya had a sister called Laliyadēvi. She was married to Kētarasa of the Kadamba family. Pāṇḍya, the son of Laliyadēvi was married to Bāchaladēvi who was the daughter
of Vikramāditya I. An inscription speaks of Jyidēva as the son of Vikramāditya. This fact is mentioned in the Haralahalli inscription also. The same inscription tells us that Jōma had a brother named Gutta. He can be called Gutta II. This Gutta had a son named Vikramāditya born of Padamaladevi. Regarding this Vikramāditya there are many dates between 1183-1263 A.D. The Haralahalli inscription states that this Vikramāditya had a sister (Sahajātē) named Vijayamahēdēvi. The same inscription states that she was married to Singinripāḷa or Singhidēva of Sāntalimandala.

Ballāla was the son of this couple. He married Tuluvaladevi, the daughter of Gutta Vikramāditya II. Apart from Tuluvaladevi, Vikramāditya had two sons Jyidēva III and Vikramāditya III. There are evidences to show that Jyidēva ruled between 1238-1241 A.D. Jyidēva was succeeded by Vikramāditya III. We have a date for him in 1248 A.D. in the Hosahalli inscription when he was serving as a feudatory of Śeṇa Kannara. On the basis of this statement in a Chaudadānpur inscription (in line 44) it was held that Vikramāditya II's son was named Gutta i.e. Gutta III. But on a re-examination of this text it can be surmised that this Gutta who is referred to as the brother (Anujātē) of Vikramāditya, is to be taken as the brother of Vikramāditya IV rather than Vikramāditya III.

This Gutta has a date in 1259 A.D. Two Chaudadānpur inscriptions mention Vikramāditya as his brother. This
Vikramaśītya can be called Vikramaśītya IV. Perhaps he did not rule at all. One of the Chaudāṇpur inscriptions mentions three more sons of Vikramaśītya III, Gutta IV rather than Gutta III, Hiriyedēva and Jōyidēva. Of these, only Gutta III came to power after Vikramaśītya III. An inscription from Hirebidari brings to light a son of Jōyidēva IV, He was Vikramaśītya V. His queen was Padmaladēvi. He was a subordinate of Sūna Rāmaśandha, in 1283 A.D. This Vikramaśītya is the last known member of the Gutta family.

Soon after, the Sūna kingdom fell a prey to the attacks of Alauddin Khilji and his general Malik Kafur. With that the fortunes of the Gutta family also sank into oblivion. On the basis of the above discussion the genealogy of the family can be shown as below:
## Genealogical Table of the Guttas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generation</th>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mallidēva</td>
<td>(1115 A.D.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joyidēva I*</td>
<td>(1124 A.D.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kadamba Biradeva of Nuruabada</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Laliyadēvi*</td>
<td>= Kētarasa II of Kadamba family of Nuruabada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joyidēva II</td>
<td>Gutta II =Padmaladēvi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mallaladevi</td>
<td>(1248 A.D.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joyidēva IV</td>
<td>Vikramaditya V*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes
- * indicates the female gender.
- The table traces the lineage of the Guttas, including their marriages, births, and deaths, spanning several generations.
- The dates indicate the approximate years of these events.
As mentioned earlier the Guttas come to the fore with Māgutta. He figures in an inscription from Chaudānapur, but no details are given about his activities. On the basis of the fact that his grandson Mallidēva was a contemporary of Gōvinda Dandanēyaka a famous general of Vikramēditya VI, in 1115 A.D., it can be safely surmised that Māgutta held some position under the Chalukya king Vikramēditya VI towards the beginning of his rule, or it is possible that he started his career as a subordinate chief under Somēvara II. About the next chief Gutta I, the son and successor of Māgutta, also, we have no clear information. But the Chaudānapur inscription mentioning him makes a very pointed statement though vaguely, about his valour and ambition. It says that "Great is this Gutta who, not being satisfied with the hereditary territory he acquired through his ancestors, subdued the enemy rulers and obtained the earth. This verse does not give the names of the adversaries, but we can gather that he was an ambitious chief struggling to expand his territory and extend his authority.

Gutta's son Mallidēva has been highly eulogised in this very inscription. From that account we can make out that he was a noted general and an indomitable fighter, and a great donor. He is stated to have fought many a battle
though it is not specified in which battle he actually participated.

A similar account of Mallidēva appears in an inscription from Honnatti23, wherein also he is described as a great fighter. Some members of the Jatechōna family are described as his subordinates. Their genealogy is given as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Jēma} & \\
\text{Dāsa} = \text{Chandabharasi} & \\
\text{Attirāja} & \quad \text{Chanda}
\end{align*}
\]

Attirāja is described as a generous donor and he seems to have constructed the temple of Śiva in Nanditirtha.24 It is obvious that when Govinda Danḍanēyaka was incharge of the division of Banavēsi-12000, Mallidēva was the governor of Guttavōla and the round about region. Possibly he was trusted general of Govinda and participated in the southern campaigns conducted by his master. It can be surmised that the political power of the Guttas began to grow with the period of Mallidēva.

This surmise is corroborated by the very fact that Mallidēva's brother Joyidēva was ruling the divisions of Beluhage-70, Honnavatti-12 and Bennevur-12 with his headquarters at Guttavōla.25
Further he is given the title *Nabhamandalesvara* which is indicative of the position that he was enjoying under the Chālukya king Vikramāditya VI. The Honnatti inscription mentions two of his ministers, Dēkanna and Nakanña who are described as the eyes of Jōyidēva. They are stated to have constructed a temple of Chēmēśvara, presumably at Honnavatti.

The next chief of the family was Vikramāditya I, the son of Hallidēva. His rule marks a further step in the increase of the power of the Guttas. The changing political condition in the region became favourable to them. They consolidated power and expanded their territory and influence.

This was the period when the Chālukya power was on the decline and the Kalachuris, the subordinates of the Chālukyas were rising to prominence. After the rule of Vikramāditya the heydays of the Chālukyas were over and Kalachuri Bījolē an ambitious relative of the Chālukyas usurped the Kalyāna throne in course of time in 1156 A.D. This period of confusion encouraged the Guttas obviously to strengthen themselves and act as independent rulers. This is indicated in an inscription of Guttā Vikramāditya I from Guttal. Most of the considerable portion of this inscription is indeed worn out, but it is clear that it does not mention any overlord at all. It starts with the *Prāśāti* of Vikramāditya himself.
and is dated in the Śaka year 1084 corresponding to 1162 A.D. Bījjala was the ruling king in this year, but Vikramaditya does not appear to have recognised his authority. However, we have no evidence of any clash between the Kalachuris and Guttas during this period.

Vikramaditya's wife was known as Siriyadēvi who is known from a record from Haralahalli. He had also a sister called Lalīyadēvi who was married to a Kadamba chief of Surumbāṅa called Mētarasa. He had two sons Joyidēva II and Gutta II and a daughter Mekaladevi. She was married to Pāṇḍya, the son of Lalīyadēvi mentioned above.

The Haralahalli inscription referred to above extols Vikramaditya as a great hero and a generous donor. However, no actual details of his achievements are available.

Vikramaditya was succeeded by his son Joyidēva II. He continued the expansionist activities and like his father he also conducted himself as an independent ruler. He extended his territory over a wider area which included Bennevara-12, Sattalige-12 and Bidirahalli-12. In fact an inscription of 1177 A.D. claims that he was ruling over Banevāsi-12000. This inscription does not mention any overlord either. It is interesting to note that this inscription is dated in
Chalukya Vikrama year 102. As we know the Chalukya rule had been extinct by this time and the Kalachuris were in power and the ruling king was Kalachuri Kannava II. The mention of the date in Chalukya Vikrama era only goes to show that the Gutta chiefs refused to accept the authority of the Kalachuris and they still considered the Chalukyas as their masters. Two inscriptions from Haralahalli highly eulogise Joyideva as a hero in a conventional way. The next Gutta ruler was Vikramaditya II, the son of Gutta I, the brother of Joyideva II. It follows therefore that Joyideva II had no issue.

The Gutta family reached the pinnacle of glory during the days of Vikramaditya II and this is indicated by the greater number of inscriptions of this ruler which are lengthy and highly poetic in composition. Following the policy of his predecessors, Vikramaditya was able to establish his suzerainty over Banavasi-42000 as a Mahamandalesvara. He seems to have extended his authority even further over Holambavadi and Perbalu-70. He also continued to be independent, though obviously he could not enjoy this position for a long time. He came to power in about 1183 A.D. when Kalachuri Ahavamalla was on the Kalyana throne. His reign was comparatively peaceful and he appears to have given his attention to the unruly subordinate chiefs who were bend to
submit to the Chālukya authority. Naturally Vikramāditya II was a target of his wrath. There is no clear evidence of clash between the two, but it must have taken place. Otherwise, we cannot explain his submission to Kalachuri Ahavamalla as is indicated by his inscriptions. One of his inscriptions from Haralshalli dated 1188 A.D. February speaks of no overlord and it describes Vikramāditya as a paramount ruler. But other inscription from the same place dated in the same year 1188 A.D., but in December, mentions Kalachuri Ahavamalla as the ruling king and Vikramāditya is described as his subordinate. This change in position therefore must have taken place towards the end of 1188 A.D.

The inscription of February 1188 A.D. from Haralshalli highly eulogised Vikramāditya. It mentions his minister Dēśirāja who is stated to have constructed a temple for Śiva and named it after himself as Dāsēśvara. Another of his inscriptions at Guttal dated 1189 A.D. June speaks of Vikramāditya as building a Śiva temple and naming it as Padmēśvara after his mother. His other inscriptions from Guttal speak of his ability, but only in vague terms. During this period a major change took place in the political field. The Kalachuris could not hold on to their power and Chālukya Somēśvara IV was able to re-establish his authority. The Guttas were traditionally attached to the Chālukyas and Vikramāditya V
also, soon, recognised the suzerainty of Somévara. He became a trusted general and as an inscription tells us he fought for Somévara against the Hoysala king, who tried to attack the Chalukya territory in 1186 A.D. Right at this time one change took place field. Samévara IV could not continue long on the Chalukyan throne owing to his weak position aggravated by the pressures from either side by the Seunas and the Hoysalas. Somévara quit the capital. Vikraméditya II took advantage of this confused state of affairs and declared himself as an independent ruler. He ruled till about 1233 A.D. which is the latest known date for him. From 1186 A.D. down to this date i.e. 1233 A.D. he functioned as an independent ruler.

A struggle for supremacy in the area between the Seunas and the Hoysalas resulted in the bifurcation of the Chalukya empire. The area north of the Tungabhadrā was occupied by the Seunas and the area below that river came under the Hoysalas. With the consolidation of the Seuna power in the Tungabhadrā region the short lived independence of the Guttas came to an end, because we see the successors of Vikraméditya II accepting the overlordship of the Seunas.

Vikraméditya was succeeded in about 1238 A.D. by his son, Joyidēva III. With him started the decline of the Gutta power. We have hardly any details regarding his activities.
He was succeeded by his brother Vikramāditya III, who figures in an inscription from Hosahalli in Dharwad district as a subordinate of Śeuna Karna, he is stated to be enjoying the privilege of Kumāravṛttī over the village Hebbalī.

The next Gutta chief who came to power was Gutta III who also was the subordinate of the Śeuna kings, Karna and Mahādeva. The absence of inscriptions of this ruler indicates the decline of his prominence. An inscription from Chandānpura indicates that he had an elder brother by name Vikramāditya who was the fourth in the order in genealogy. There is no evidence to show that he came to power. Gutta III had two brothers, Hiriyadeva and Joyadeva. But the next ruling chief appears to be Vikramāditya V, the son of Joyadeva IV. He figures in an inscription of Śeuna Ramachandra dated 1283 A.D. His wife was Padmaladēvi. This Vikramāditya is the last known member of the family. On the basis of this, it may be surmised that the Guttas remained in power for nearly a century and took active part in the political affairs of the region as subordinates of the ruling monarchs over a period and as independent rulers for sometime at least.

**The extent of the Gutta territory**

It is seen above that the Guttas commenced their rule as small chiefs exercising their authority over a small region.
around Guttavolal i.e. the present day Guttal in Banebennur taluk of Dharwad district. Slowly they extended their authority over a wider area comprising the southern part of Dharwad district and possibly the essential areas in Shimoga district. One of the inscriptions claims that the Guttas ruled over Nolambavadi but this appears to be a false claim. Nolambavadi covers essentially Bellary district and it is doubtful that the Guttas extended their sway as far as that region. But during their heydays in the time of Vikramaditya II, the Gutta authority could have extended a little into the Bellary district across the Tungabhadra. Even the claim of some inscriptions that the Guttas ruled over the whole of Banavasi, seems to be a little exaggerated. Broadly, Banavasi division comprised of the area between the rivers Varade and Tungabhadra, covering portions of North Kanara, Shimoga and southern part of Dharwad districts. That Guttas held their sway over southern Dharwad is clear. They could have extended their authority in Shimoga district also, but it is doubtful if they could have a hold in North Kanara region.

Soyidevi is stated to be governing Beluhuge-70, Ponnavartti-12 and Bonnevur-12. Of these Beluhuge-70 had its headquarters in Beluhuge i.e. modern Belvegi in Haveri taluk of Dharwad district. Among others, Guttavolal i.e. Guttal, Niralgi i.e. Neralgi and Benavalli i.e. Kanavalli (all in
Haveri taluk) were situated in this division. Honnavatti-12 which also figures as Ponnavarti-12 was a small region of 12 divisions around Honnavatti i.e. modern Honnatti in Ramobennur taluk. Bonnevur was a small division around Benneu i.e. modern Motebennur in Ramobennur taluk. These details show that during the time of Jōyidēva I the area comprising Haveri and Ramobennur taluks of Dharwad district was under the Guttas.

The next ruler Vikramāditya I is also stated to be governing the same regions while his son and successor Jōyidēva II appears to have added some more regions. They were Benneu-12, Sattalige-12 and Bidarahalli-12. Benneu-12 was a division of 12 villages around Benneu which is modern Motebennur, taluk headquarters in Dharwad district. Villages like Badalur and Veddraveri were situated in this division. Sattalige-12 is too difficult to identify. In some inscriptions we find mention of a division called Satyalge i.e. Satyalige-70 indicating that division comprising of 70 villages. It may be that originally this division consisted of 12 villages and later it was enlarged with the addition of more villages. It is difficult also to identify Satyalge, but it is suggested that it could be same as Satenahalli in Hirekerur taluk. Bidarahalli-12 was obviously a division of 12 villages around modern Bidarahalli in Ramobennur taluk.
One of the inscriptions dated 1177 A.D. states that Joyideva II was governing the division of Banavasi-12000. The next chief Vikramaditya II is also credited with the governorship of this division in Banavasi-12000. As noted earlier, Vikramaditya II's rule was the best period in Gutta history and he functioned independently. Even presuming that taking advantage of political situations, explained earlier, he succeeded in expanding the Gutta territory, it is difficult to assert that he extended his sway over the whole of Banavasi region. This region comprised the whole of North Kanara district, southern part of Dharwad district and the adjoining parts of Shimoga district. The Gutta inscriptions are found only in the southern part of Dharwad district and taking into consideration the context, it is reasonable to presume that he exercised actual authority over the southern part of Banavasi region and that only conventionally he is ascribed the governorship of the whole of Banavasi. He is also stated to be ruling over the divisions of Nolambavadi and Perbalu-70. Nolambavadi was a very big division of 32000 villages adjoining Banavasi. It is really doubtful if the Gutta authority extended that far in Chitradurga and Hassan districts parts of which extended in Nolambavadi. This ascription can only be said to be a mark of prominence enjoyed by the Guttas during this period. Perbalu-70 was a division of 70 villages.
with the headquarters at Porbāḷu i.e. Hobbal, near Lakṣāṇa in Dharwad district. As noted above the Guttas lost their independence with the advent of the Seunās and continued in a position of subordination for sometime later. It can thus be stated that the territory occupied by the Guttas roughly corresponds to the southern part of Dharwad district and the adjoining parts of Bellary and Shimoga districts.

Available inscriptions show that some important cities flourished in this period in this region. Guttal the headquarters was naturally one such, while Chaudāṇpur was a seat of religion. Honnatti and Haralahalli were other towns which gained prominence during this period.

Guttal or ancient Guttavolal was their headquarters. An inscription\textsuperscript{44} describes it a fortified city in the Benavēsi division.\textsuperscript{45}

Chaudāṇpur was a famous religious centre and the Gutta rulers were devotees of the deity Muktiśvara of this place and the followers of the saint Śivadēva of this place. It was a holy place on the bank of the river Tungabhadra and the temple here is a fine specimen of architecture of the Chālukya-Hoysala period.
In those days this place was situated in a small administrative unit known as Guttavalal-12, the headquarters of which was Guttavalal i.e. modern Guttal about two miles from Chaudadénpur and the Guttas governed this unit along with others. The main attraction of this place was the temple of Muktisvara which was constructed by Attirāja a chief of the Jatāchōḍa family who was a subordinate of the Guttas and it was later on renovated by the saint Śivadeva.

Honnatti or ancient Honnavarti or Ponnavarti was another prominent place in Guttal region. In the eyes of the poet it was the city of beauty consisting of a cluster of temples and basadis. It could be compared with the city of gods, nay it even surpassed the cities of Deccan, and Alakāpura. There were many gardens consisting of fruit trees filled with varieties of fruits and also the tanks - all added to the beauty of the city.

Śaivism of the Kālamukha sect was quite predominant in the Deccan, during the days of Guttas. It is but natural that they sponsored this religion with all zeal. We find references in inscriptions to the effect that almost all of the Gutta chiefs contributed to the growth of this religion by munificent grants to Śiva temples and Śaiva teachers. An inscription for example from Honnatti dated 1124 A.D.
speaks of a temple of Chämośvara constructed by Dēkaṇṇa and Nākaṇṇa, the ministers of Joyidēva I. A grant is stated to have been made for the maintenance of this temple which was entrusted to Brahmarāṣṭījiya the Ṛchārya of the temple. An inscription of 1181 A.D. from Kuruvatti in Bellary district speaks of the temple of Āhavamallēśvara grants for the upkeep of the temple made by the officers of Vikramaditya II. The name Āhavamallēśvara is interesting. It is indeed well known that the deities and temples were named after the donor or sponsors of the religious institutions. According to this practise the sponsor of this temple was Āhavamalla who perhaps can be identified with Kalachuri Āhavamalla. Kōtaṇgaṉa, an officer of Vikramaditya II, who was incharge of Dinnvūru-12, made certain grants for the maintenance of the temple of Rāmeśvara. This temple was constructed by Kēsavamāyaṇaka who also appears to have been in the service of Vikramaditya II. This very Vikramaditya and his son Joyidēva III made a grant of village Dēdaṇālūru to his officer Vėsuṇēva-Deṇḍanāyaka who utilised that grant for the maintenance of the temple of Mallikārjuna of that place. This inscription mentioning this fact states that this officer nominated Someśvara-pandita, a learned scholar as the sthanāchārya of the temple:
Dasiraja, an officer of Vikramaditya II is stated to have constructed a temple, Dasasaara, at the behest of his teacher who appears to have been Kalyanasaktideva. This teacher was given further grants by other officers like Māharasa.⁵²

An inscription dated 1188 A.D.⁵² tells us that Joyideva III constructed a temple of Vikramasvara obviously in the name of his father at Gottagādi on the bank of Tungabhadra. Kalyanasaktideva was the abhārya of this temple also.

An inscription found at Guttal dated 1189 A.D. gives an interesting information. It states that Vikramaditya II constructed a temple called Padmalēśvara to commemorate his mūeso (āhātri), who was called Padmaladevi. A point of further interest is that this temple is stated to have been constructed according to Śilpaśāstra, work of the scholars Māvyā and Mahāvya. We indeed know a work on architecture called Māva mata, but a text of Māndavya is yet to be discovered. Incidentally this is a very rare epigraphical reference to Māva as an exponent of Śilpaśāstra. Further it is stated that at the time of installing the deity permanent endowments were made for the proper maintenance of the temple. The recipient of this grant was also Kalyanasaktideva.
The temple of Muktisvara at Chaudadanpur was a famous seat of Śaiva religion, during this period. The deity here was like the family deity of the Guttas and the temple received munificent gifts from the Gutta chiefs. Vikramāditya II for example made grants of land around Honnatti for the maintenance of the temple and continuing the worship. In 1192 A.D. January, similar grants were made, a little earlier in 1191 A.D. December, by Vikramāditya's Officer Khameya.

An inscription from Heralehalli speaks of a touching incident of the death of Tuluvaladēvi, the daughter of Vikramāditya II. She seems to have died young, soon after delivering a child. The inscription says that to commemorate her death Vikramāditya built a Śiva temple under the name of Tuluvalaśvara at Gottagadi on the bank of the river Tungabhadra and made grants for its maintenance.

The above account shows that Śaivism was the most predominant religion in those days in the region of the Guttas. It is interesting to note that towards the end of their period the Veeraśaiva religion was slowly developing and Chaudadanpur was slowly developing as the centre of this new religion in this region, as is indicated by the inscription of this place. Buddhism had been long extinct from this region though only conventionally we find references to the Buddhist institutions.
like the Viharas, only occasionally in the inscriptions. Indeed, Jainism did continue to be predominant throughout the period though it received a setback towards the 13th Century A.D. However, it is to be noted that this religion did not find favour with the Guttas.

As against the large number of inscriptions of these chiefs mentioning Śaiva temples and recording grants thereto, there is only one inscription belonging to 1162 A.D. and to Vikramāditya I, which speaks of the installation of Pārāvanātha by a merchant. The inscription mentioning this fact comes from Guttal and it is badly damaged. It mentions the disciple of Maladharīdeva who appears to have recorded the grants made by Vikramāditya I to this Basadi.

Thus in conclusion it can be stated that the Guttas, though comparatively a small family, played an effective role in shaping the political and cultural life of the small region under their rule, taking advantage of the opportunities created on account of the political changes in the region. They were loyal subordinates of their masters, the Chālukyas of Kalyāṇa and tried to protest against the usurpers, the Kalachuris. Though they could not succeed in their endeavour they kept up their traditions in the matter of the administration and encouraging religious institutions. Chaudānapur,
Kuruvaṭṭi, Honnattī, Gaḷaganāṭha and some other places flourished as the religious centres and artistic monuments which stand today as masterpieces of the Chālukya architecture, came to be constructed in these places.
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