The term Pandya denoting a ruling dynasty is perhaps one of the very few words which occupies the longest period in the history of our country. The word occurs for the first time in the edicts of Asoka, belonging to the 3rd Century B.C. As a ruling dynasty the Pandyas figure again in the Tamil Sangam literature, though they built up a vast kingdom much later in the history, from the 12th to the 14th century A.D.

Another interesting feature of the Pandya family is the branching off of the main line into several tributaries which settled in different regions in different periods of history. From the days of Asoka, the Pandya country was located in the far south below the river Kaveri. Asoka mentions them along with the Choles and Keralas as his neighbours. Scholars place these Pandyas in Madurai region which is traditionally associated with them. Apart from the Sangam literature the Pandyas make their next appearance in the 6th Century A.D. and continue till about the middle of the 9th Century A.D.

The heydays of the Pandyas came however in the beginning of the 12th Century A.D. when they gradually built up a mighty empire and continued up to the beginning of the 14th Century A.D. until they were swept away along with other rulers of the Deccan by the invasion of Alaeddin Khilji.
It is indeed difficult to connect the Pandyas under study i.e. the Pandyas of Uochangi with the imperial Pandyas or the Pandyas of the South. But there is no doubt about their connection, though we cannot explain the rise of the family suddenly in the Deccan without any antecedents. It is not unlikely that at some stage probably at the end of the first phase of the Pandyas in the 9th Century A.D. some members of the family might have moved towards the Deccan when they faced adverse days at the hands of the Chalas and took to service under the Chalukyas of Kalya. It is however, to be noted that no trace of their migration is available in their records. Instead, they have a different genealogy claiming descent from the Yadava race.

**Genealogy**

The Pandyas of Uochangi claim to belong to the Soma envesya. Passing through mythical personages Brahma, Atri, Soma, Yadu and others, we come to the first historical person in the family viz., Adityadeva. Both Rice and Dinkar Desai give him an alternative name Mangeya, but there is some difficulty here. BO Volume II Dg. 41 which gives the genealogical account contains the name Mangeya in the Kannada version, while the Roman text contains dots in place of these letters which makes the Kannada reading doubtful. However,
Mitya can be considered as the first member of the family.

Rice places Pandya as the son and successor of Adityadēva but this appears to be doubtful. The text of the inscription is not clear. This passage seems to state that from Adityadēva rose the Pandya family. In that Pandya family was born the son Chōdirāja. Here the expression, Pandya refers to Adityadēva only and not to another person called Pandya. Further, Rice identifies this Pandya with Tejirāja figuring in an inscription of Hoysala Breyanga. The reason for this identification seems to be that Tejirāja's son is called Pandya and the latter's brother is called Irukkavēla. The identification does not seem to be correct. Firstly, Tejirāja is not called Pandya anywhere. Secondly, the contention of Rice that Adityadēva's son is called Pandya and the latter's brother is called Irukkavēla is itself doubtful. Thirdly, it is difficult to ascertain if this Tejirāja and his son belong to the Uchchangī Pandya family at all.

According to Dg 414, Aditya's son was Chēdirāja. According to the same inscription, Chēdirāja's son was Palamendēva Pandiya. Hō 565 mentions a Palattapandya who appears to be the same as this Palamendapandya. Similarly, Palanta Pandya figuring in Dg. 396 as the son of Chēdirāja. Pandya is also identical with Palamēra Pandya. All the inscriptions agree that Palamēra Pandya's son was Irukkavēla.
As noted above we have reference to another Irukkavēla, a son of Tējirāja in the Uyayala inscription referred to above. Though both Rice and Dinker Desai make him the brother of Tējirāja Pandya, there is no valid ground to do so. 64 however gives the different names for example, after Paḷamāṇḍapāṇḍya he places Phondipāṇḍya, but there is no reference to such a name in other inscriptions.

The next Paṇḍya chief was Rāja or Raṇapāṇḍya, the son of Irukkavēla. 64 places him after Phondipāṇḍya probably as his son. Under these circumstances, it is tempting to identify Irukkavēla with Phondipāṇḍya, but there is no clear evidence for this identification. Raṇapāṇḍya had a wife Somaladevi or Sāvaladevi who is said to have been a daughter of Bhillavarāya. She was also the sister of Vikramāditya. This Raṇapāṇḍya as stated in the inscription had four sons. They were Paṇḍitaṇḍya, Viṭapāṇḍya, Paḷamāṇḍapāṇḍya and Kāmadēva. 64 can be designated as Paḷamāṇḍapāṇḍya II. It may be noted here that Dinker Desai does not take note of this chief at all. Paṇḍitaṇḍya had a son called Tailapāṇḍya. Viṭapāṇḍya's wife was known as Gangadēvi alias Mahādēvi. She was the daughter of an officer (Māhāpradāhena) Mityadēvi. He had another wife Vijayadevi, who is described as a younger sister of Vikramāditya. It may be noted here that Viṭapāṇḍya's mother Sāvaladevi is also described as a sister of
a Vikramaditya. Taking into consideration the relationship, it is impossible that both these Vikramaditya could be the same. It is also difficult to identify two Vikramadityas.

Virapandya also obtained the title Jagadekamalla from the ruling Chalukya king.\(^12\) Kamedeva, the fourth son was also known as Vijaya Pandya. His another title was Nigelanka-malla. Dg 43\(^13\) appears to add two more generations after Kamadeva. They are Kamadeva's eldest son Panditapandya II and the latter's son Vijayapandya II.

MK 56\(^14\) is a little enigmatic. It seems to give genealogy as follows:

```
Palattapandya
  | Phondipandya
  | Rahulapandya
  | Nolayapandya
  | Kamadeva
  | Odeya
```

Rice identifies Palattapandya of this record with Palamandapandya the son of that name of Kayapandya. But Dinkar Desai does not mention these chiefs at all, except that he makes Odeya as the son of Vijaya Pandya who was the son of Kayapandya. The inscription is clear to the effect
that Odeya was the son of Kāma i.e. Vijayaṇḍya. Further
DG Volume II 444 (revised ed. 1973) mentions a Odeya as being
attacked by Balkāla II. On the basis of this it can be
confirmed that Odeya was the son of Vijayaṇḍya, who was the
son of Raṣṭrapāṇḍya. Though there are nearly fifty inscriptions
pertaining to these chiefs there are only few which give the
genealogy. On the basis of the material available we can
prepare the genealogical table as below:

```
Aditya Deva
   /
  Ghediraja
  /
Palamandevapandya
   /
IrukkaVelal
  /
Rayapandya
    = Somaledevi alias Sowaledevi

Panditapandya  Virepandya =
   /
      1 Gangadevi
   /
      2 Vijayadevi
Tailapa

Kāmadēva alias Vijayaṇḍyaphāpa

Palamandya II Panditapandya II
   /
      Odeya
      /
Vijayaṇḍya II
```
Chronology

We will now try to fix the chronology of these Pandya chiefs on the basis of the available data from the inscriptions. These chiefs became prominent in the latter half of the rule of the Chalukyas of Kalyana and continued to be their subordinates till the end of the Chalukya dynasty. Subsequently they became the subordinates of the Kalschuris who were the successors of the Chalukyas to the Kalyana throne. The rule of these chiefs came to an end with the rise of the Hoysalas who succeeded them in occupying Nolambavadi the hereditary home region of these chiefs.

The earliest Pandya chief for whom we have a date is Rayapandya. His earliest known date is 1079 A.D. It comes from an inscription in Milgunda in Harapanahalli taluk of Bellary district, he is called Tribhuvanamalla Pandyadeva, obviously because he was a subordinate of Chalukya king, Tribhuvanamalla Vikramaditya VI. In an inscription from Bagali from the same taluk and district which is also dated in 1079 A.D. we come across a Pandya. Though he is not called Tribhuvanamalla Pandyadeva here, it is clear that he is the same as Tribhuvanamalla Pandya above.
Since the earliest known date is 1079 A.D., we might surmise that he might have begun his career in about 1075 A.D. almost simultaneously with his overlord, Vikramaditya VI. Since we do not have any known date to his predecessors, we might tentatively assign the conventional period of 25 years to each one of them thus:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ruler</th>
<th>Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Irukkavēla or Phondipāṇḍya</td>
<td>1050-1075 A.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palamāṇḍyapāṇḍya</td>
<td>1025-1050 A.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chēdirāja</td>
<td>1000-1025 A.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adityadeva</td>
<td>975-1000 A.D.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus it appears that the Pāṇḍyas started their career almost simultaneously with the revival of Chālukya power in Karnataka under Tāla II.

Like his master Vikramaditya VI, Kayapāṇḍya also had a long rule. He figures in large number of inscriptions right upto 1127 A.D. In all these inscriptions he is referred to as Tribhuvanamalla Pāṇḍyadeva. As noted above he started his career almost along with his master. His career also ended almost along with him in 1127 A.D.

There is one inscription at Bēgali which is dated in the 33rd year of rule of the Chālukya king Vikramaditya VI.
It states that Tribhuvanamalla Vīrapāṇḍya was ruling Vaiśeṣika at this time. It also mentions Vijayapāṇḍya as his subordinate. This date can be equated with 1108 A.D. But as seen above this date falls well within the period i.e. the period of Vīrapāṇḍya’s father Hayapāṇḍya. It is indeed difficult to explain this situation. It is to be noted here that though the inscription is dated in Chālukya Vikrama year 33, it does not refer itself to the reign of the Chālukya king. It straightaway starts with the prasasti of Vīrapāṇḍya. It is therefore possible that there is a mistake in the date. It is not unlikely that Vikramadītya was not ruling at that time and may be the inscription can be ascribed to Chālukya Vikrama year 93, rather than 33, keeping this cyclic year constant, in that case the inscription can be assigned to 1163 A.D. which goes well with the date of Vīrapāṇḍya.

Hayapāṇḍya was succeeded by his son Vīrapāṇḍya, but it is indeed difficult to say when he succeeded. As seen above, the latest date for Hayapāṇḍya is 1127 A.D. but the earliest date for Vīrapāṇḍya is 1142 A.D. It is indeed difficult to explain the gap of about fifteen years in the Pāṇḍya history. Rice, and following him Dinkar Desai, give the same dates to Irukkavōla and calls him Tribhuvanamalla Pāṇḍya. But really there is no ground for such an assignment.
at all. Dinker Desai thinks that Virapandya's brother Pandita-
pandya ruled during this period. But there is not a single
inscription dated otherwise assignable to Pandita pandya.
During these twelve years, major portion was covered with the
rule of Somesvara III and from 1142 A.D. the rule of Chalukya
Jagadekamalla commenced. There is only one inscription which
refers to Virapandya and describes him as a subordinate of
Bhulokamalla, Somesvara III. But this inscription also is
dated 1143 A.D.21 by which time Bhulokamalla Somesvara's rule
was over and Jagadekamalla II's rule had commenced. It can
be surmised on the basis of the above inscription of Somesvara
III, that Virapandya did serve Bhulokamalla also. May be, he
started his career much earlier than 1142 A.D.22 which is
his earliest known date so far. It may also be noted that
in some inscriptions he is called Tribhuvanamalla Virapandya
and in others, Jagadekamalla Virapandya. He might have
acquired this title from his father Rayapandya, and he got
the title Jagadekamalla since he served Jagadekamalla II.
But it is indeed inexplicable why he did not take the title
of his overlord Bhulokamalla under whom also he must have
served.

Like his father Virapandya had a long rule. His
latest known date is 1162 A.D.23 This means that he held
Like his father, Virapandiya had a long rule. His latest known date is 1162 A.D. This means that he had at least a rule of about twenty years. During this period there were major political changes when Taila III the son and successor of Jagadekamalla II was overthrown by Kalachuri Bijjala in about 1166 A.D. Virapandiya must have continued to serve Taila III after the death of Jagadekamalla II and after the usurpation of the throne by Kalachuri Bijjala, he changed his allegiance to the latter. There are inscriptions to show that he accepted the suzerainty of Bijjala.

The next Pandya ruler was Vijayapandiya, the brother of Virapandiya. His earliest known date is 1164 A.D. Thus we may put the commencement of the rule of Vijayapandiya in 1163 A.D. His latest known date is 1187 A.D. Towards the end of his career Kalachuris were thrown out of power and Chalukya Somesvara IV once again established supremacy of the Chalukyas in about 1182 A.D.

We have two more names in Pandya genealogy viz., Panditasandiya II and Vijayapandiya II as the son and grandson respectively of Vijayapandiya. Obviously they had no chance to rule because of the changing political conditions. This was a period of turmoil in the history of Karnataka.
Kalechuri had almost given a death blow to the Chalukya power though Somesvara IV succeeded in overthrowing the Kalechuris he could not sustain the power for long. The Chalukya subordinates, the Seunas in the northern region and the Hoysalas in the southern were vying with each other in occupying the land of their master. Chalukya Somesvara IV could not withstand the pressure from both the sides. He retired to Benavani leaving the coast clear for the contenders. All these events took place towards the close of Vijayapandya's rule. In the process the smaller feudatories became the victims of these powerful contenders and as HK 5628 puts it, Hoysala Ballale II occupied Nolambavadi which marked the eclipse of Pandya chiefs of Uchchangi. On the basis of the above discussion the tentative period of the rule of these chiefs is shown in the genealogy given below:
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The Pandyas of Uchchangi were a prominent feudatory family under the Chalukyas of Kalyana. They are so called because they were the governors of the province of Nolambavadi, the head-quarters of which was Uchchangi in the Bellary district. This Nolambavadi which consisted of 32,000 villages occupied a fairly large area covering considerable portion of Bellary and Chitradurg districts. Being semi-independent rulers with a jurisdiction over a vast area these Pandyas played an important role in the growth of the kingdom by conquering on behalf of Chalukyas of Kalyana many unruly chiefs and the neighbouring rivals while maintaining peace within their jurisdiction. They contributed as well to the economic growth and cultural development of the region. Thus they occupied a very high position among the feudatory chiefs of Karnataka.

We have now noted that Adityadeva was the first member of the family. An inscription speaks of him as the originator of the Pandy family.29 Nothing is known about him except the name. We have tentatively ascribed the date 975 A.D. to 1000 A.D.
Adityadeva's son was Chediraja. Dg 41 explains the name saying that he got this name because of his chastising the Chedi rulers. But the historicity of this statement is really doubtful. We have given him the date 975 A.D. - 1000 A.D. which makes him a contemporary of the first ruler of Kalyana Chalukya family Taila II. We know from other sources that Taila had a tough time with the Paramara king, Munja, but we do not know anything about his conflict with the Chedi rulers.

On the basis of a statement in the Miraj plates of Jayasimha II, Bhandarkar held that Taila subdued the Chedis. Hirelal and Banerjee felt that this Chedi king was Yuvarajadeva II of the Kalachuri family of Tripuri. If Taila fought against him it was, as shown by Dr. Gopal, a fight against his own brother-in-law which is unnatural. Further, Fleet's revised interpretation of the expressions in the Miraj plates indicate that it was Paramara king Munja who subdued the Chedi king and not Taila II. Thus Taila II had hardly anything to do with the Chedi king. In this context there is hardly any reason to think that the Pandyas being subordinate of Taila II had a conflict with the Chedi king. It looks as though the explanation of the name Chediraja in
Dg 41 is an imagination of a later poet who composed the inscription at a much later date, in A.D. 1148.  

Dinker Desai believed this statement and held that Chēdirāja defeated the Chēai king Kṛṣṇa. But the chronology does not permit it. In a figurative way Dg 39 indicates that though this chief had a particular fancy for the Pandya kingdom though he was the ruler of the whole world. No significance need be ascribed to this fanciful statement. Relying on the inscription from Arasikere taluk, Dinker Desai further held that Chēdirāja helped Chālukya Vikramaditya VI in wresting the kingdom from his elder brother Sōmesvare II. Even though Dinker Desai ascribes this feat to Chēdirāja in his oldage, the chronology as we have now fixed does not at all permit this surmise. Further, it is not certain if this inscription belongs to the Pandyas of Uchchahangī at all.

The next Pandya chief was Palamāndapāndya, also known as Palatta and Palantapāndya. There are no specific details about the rule of this king except the conventional description of his being a hero and fighter etc. Dg 39 however, ascribes him the feat of his giving them respectively their kingdoms to Chālukyas and Chōlas. The statement is indeed enigmatic. During this period the contemporary Chālukya king
was Somesvara I and he did have many conflicts with the Chola kings, but it is not clear if Palantapandya really helped Somesvara in this fight against Cholas. If at all, the statement may only be interpreted to mean that he played the role of a friend of both, bringing about a sort of compromise between the Chalukya and Chola rulers. But there is no corroborative evidence to this effect. Further, we know that the Chola Chalukya conflicts continued for long.

About Irukkavela, the son and successor of Palantapandya we have no information at all except that he was also known as Phondi Pandya as shown above. This chief is identified with the next ruler, Tribhuvanamalla Pandya by Dinker Desai. But as shown earlier, Desai's contention has no basis. For Irukkavela we have tentatively ascribed a period i.e. 1050-1075 A.D.

The next Pandya chief, the son of Irukkavela was Rayapandya. He was known as Tribhuvanamalla Pandya as well as Tribhuvanamalla Rayapandya. Dinker Desai takes Tribhuvanamalla Pandya and Tribhuvanamalla Rayapandya as two separate chiefs and places them in the position of father and son. But the overlapping of dates does not permit this surmise. It is proper to hold that Tribhuvanamalla Pandya and Tribhuvanamalla Rayapandya were one and the same.
It may be stated that the real history of the Pāṇḍyas starts with Rayapāṇḍya, as a subordinate of Vikramāditya VI. He came to limelight as his loyal subordinate and took active part in the political activities.

The term Tribhuvanamalla in his name is obviously an honorific title borne after his master, Tribhuvanamalla Vikramāditya VI. His proper name obviously was Rayapāṇḍya and in a few cases he is called simply Pāṇḍyasēva.

As observed earlier, the career of Rayapāṇḍya started almost coevally with that of his master Vikramāditya VI and ended also almost at the same time as his master's. Thus it can be observed that Rayapāṇḍya served him throughout his career and obviously played a leading role in all his activities, more so in his military exploits.

Two events loomed large on the political horizon during the period of Vikramāditya VI. These were the conflict with the Chōlas on account of the Vengi region, and the revolt of the Hoysalas. In both these conflicts Rayapāṇḍya appears to have played a leading role. It is worthwhile here to know a little about the background of the Vengi region. The Vengi region covering roughly the coastal Andhra under the control of the Eastern Chālukyas was originally a part of the kingdom
of the Chalukyas of Badami. Kubja Vishnupardhana, the brother of Pulakesi II was stationed as the governor of this region. Later, with the fall of the Chalukyas of Badami, this region developed into an independent kingdom and this is how the rulers of Vengi region were called the Eastern Chalukyas as they were the scions of the Chalukyas.

By the time the Rashtrakutas succeeded the Chalukyas of Badami, the Eastern Chalukyas were practically independent of any overlord and the conflicts between them and the Rashtrakutas commenced. With the eclipsing of the Rashtrakutas, and the rise of the Chalukyas of Kalyana, such conflicts came to the fore with the concerted efforts of the Chalukyas to have a hold on the Vengi region from the days of Jayasimha II. In the days of Vikramaditya VI this struggle went on successively favouring them once and eluding them at other times. A new dimension was added to the struggle with the stepping in of the Cholas, and with the similar intentions of establishing a hold over Vengi. Thus, for the Chalukyas it was now a two pronged fight, one being Vengi chiefs and other, the Cholas. We know Vikramaditya VI fought with the Chola king right from the days of his being a prince and even after establishing himself as an independent ruler, when Chola contemporaries were Vira Rajendra Chola and Kulottunga Chola or Kulottunga I.
Vira Rajendra Chola helped Vikramaditya in his attempts to get the Chalukya kingdom for himself and even gave a daughter of his in marriage to Vikramaditya VI. After his death there was some conflict in succession to the throne in which Eastern Chalukya king Rajendra succeeded in occupying the throne under the name Kulottunga. On his accession to the Chola throne, the Vengi kingdom became a part of the Chola empire. This naturally was disliked by Vikramaditya VI who took steps to keep up his claim over Vengi by opposing Kulottunga. Thus in the wake of coming to the throne i.e. in 1176 A.D. he led an expedition against Kulottunga which resulted in a severe battle but with no effect. It is here, it seems that Tribhuvanamalla Rayapandya played his signal role in fighting the enemy viz., Kulottunga alias Rajendra alias Raja. This explains his title Rajiga Chola Manobhanga. Later, only after the end of rule of Kulottunga did Vikramaditya succeed in occupying Vengi as it is known from his inscription.
Perhaps Tribhuvanamalla Pandya did help him in his military ventures.

Another major event which involved Tribhuvanamalla Pandya was Vikramaditya's confrontation with Hoysala Vishnuvardhana. The rule of Vikramaditya was on the ascent and a new development was taking place in the southern part of his
kingdom. The Hoysalas who rose to power as feudatories of Chalukyas in the 10th Century A.D. slowly grew from strength to strength and in the beginning of 11th Century A.D. built up their power and tried to assert as an independent power. Vishnuvardhana was an ambitious chief. He tried to build himself up and his victories over the smaller chiefs whipped up his ambitions. This encouraged him to take bigger strides and make inroads into the main line of the Chalukya kingdom. In fact his elder brother Ballala I had also entertained such a desire. There are many Hoysala records which claim resounding victory to these brothers in their battles against the feudatory chiefs of the Chalukyas, such as the Kadambas and the Pandyas. This was a period of comparative peace in the Chalukya kingdom as the conflict with the Cholas had almost come to an end and there were no disturbances in the kingdom. This atmosphere perhaps encouraged the Hoysala brothers who tried their military strength on the feudatories. Vikramāditya was noticing with silence the offensive activities of these chiefs but was not in a hurry to take some action. This was perhaps because he did not take those military adventures to be a serious danger and he did not also intend to rub them on the wrong side, because of their vulnerable position as a buffer state between his own and
that of the Cholas. But when the menace reached alarming proportions he was not slow in reacting. He sent his favourite Paramara Jagadeva whom Vikramaditya had appointed as the governor of Kulenupaka region. Jagadeva tried to curb the unruly subordinates but the two brothers appear to have gained an upper hand. This event naturally encouraged them and they planned further march against many other chiefs, the Chalukyas fell a victim to them. They made themselves bold to attack Holambavadi of the Pandyas. The Hoysala records claim the occupation of Holambavadi for the Hoysala chiefs. But the claim appears to be a little too exaggerated.

A battle was indeed fought at Dumme in 1116 A.D. between the Pandyas and Hoysala Vishnuvardhana. Dr. Gopal concludes that Tribhuvanamalla Pandya was killed in this battle. But as we know, Tribhuvanamalla Pandy continued to rule till 1129 A.D. The Hoysalas appear to have had an upper hand in the battle though they were not able to occupy Holambavadi as such.

There appears to have been a new angle to this story. The activities of the Hoysala chiefs appear to have encouraged the Pandyas also to become independent though there is no clear evidence in this respect. References to their subjugation by the Chalukya general lends justification to this surmise.
The situation grew to this extent and there was widespread confusion in the Chalukya kingdom. Vikramāditya took stern steps and showed the unruly chiefs their proper place. He sent his trusted general Sindā Āchūgī who chalked out a systematic programme to put down the unruly chiefs. He fiercely attacked the Kadamba chiefs of Goa who not only submitted but also sought the friendship of the ruling king. Vikramāditya also responded favourably and gave him in marriage his daughter, Maṅaladevī. It was then the turn of Pāṇḍya, who of course could not withstand the onslaughts of Āchūgī. Tribhuvanamalla Pāṇḍya appears to have realised his mistake and renewed his loyalty to his master. This must have earned him the favour of the king and the governorship of the Sāntalige province in addition to the traditional Nolambavādī. As for Hoysala Vishnvardhana he had to eat his humble pie and retreat to his original home region. It is to be noted that at one stage Nāyapāṇḍya was even bestowed upon the governorship of the province of Kadambalige region.

An inscription of Tailapa II, a Nāγal Kadamba chief dated 1109 A.D. speaks of a Bākhaledēvi who is described as Pāṇḍya Mahādevī. The record states that a grant was made together by Tailapa and Bākhaleshavādī. Dinker Desai thinks that this Bākhaleshavādī was the queen of Tailapa and he
further concludes that this lady was probably the sister of Tribhuvanamalla Pandyá. While it is possible to think on the basis of the context that Bachaladóvi was the queen of Tailepa, there is no indication however to conclude that she was the sister of Tribhuvanamalla Pandyá though it is not impossible. Both the Pandyás and Kadambas were the feudatory chiefs and such an alliance between the two was natural.

We knew from an inscription\textsuperscript{41} that Rayapandiya had a queen — Sevaladóvi. As observed earlier Ray Pandya was most prominent of the Pandyá chiefs. Because of his active association with and assistance to Vikramaśitya VI, he was able to expand his jurisdiction over not only Sāntalige-1000, but also Hasavadi-140. An inscription even adds that he was ruling over Kadambalige-1000 also, which however appears to be doubtful.

Inscriptions also mention his subordinate officers.

An inscription of 1126 A.D.\textsuperscript{42} mentions Udayāditya belonging to the Raya mukkha-kula as being a subordinate of Rayapandiya. One of his titles Holambavadi-Gonda, especially indicates his loyalty to Holambavadi i.e. the governor of Holambavadi who was Rayapandiya himself.

His another title Dakshina-Diga-Gadiyankamalla is indicative of his important role in the southern region of
the Chalukya kingdom. As regards the family name Rana Mūrkha-kula it may be noted that the name occurs in other inscription also as Renamūrkha-kula. The name appears to be a mistake for Rana mukkhya i.e. foremost on the battlefield.

This Udayaditya is stated to have been governing Arāhata-12 and Jagalavur-70 and Haduvagere-500. The Headquarters were at village Chimmachanur. He is stated to have constructed the temple of Chōlesvara probably at Chimmachanur and made grants of a village Medugurate situated Chulungal-70 which was a part of Hadavagere-500.

An inscription of 1124 A.D. speaks of Adiyamarasa as a trusted subordinate of Rayapandya. He is described as Rayapandya-Rāhya-Samuddheeraṇa i.e. the upholder of the kingdom of Rayapandya.

An inscription of 1106 A.D. speaks of a Dākarasa as a subordinate of Rayapandya. He is stated to have made certain grants to the temple of Allālēsvara at the Agrahāra Bada. Five years later Rayapandya himself made certain grants probably to the same temple and is known by the same inscription.

An inscription of 1101 A.D. seems to refer to the same chief though the name is lost. Here Dinkar Desai
calls him Dekarasa while in the English translation of the inscription the name is given as Dekarasa, but the name is missing in both the Roman and Kannada texts of the inscription.

An inscription from Asagodu in Jagalur taluk dated 1111 A.D. speaks of a mahāsāmanta Mallarasas as being in charge of Perijunka of Holambevadi-32000. His another officer Perggade Kommasotti was in charge of Perijunka of Kadambaige-1000.

It is interesting to note that as late as in 1126 A.D. a chief of the Ganga family named Gugarsa figures as a subordinate of Rayapāndya and as the governor of Kukkavadi-300.

A Pallavaraya figures as subordinate of Rayapāndya in an inscription of 1124 A.D. The same chief figures in an inscription of 1125 A.D. as a governor of Belichi-70 and Dumme-12. These references indicate the prominent position that Rayapāndya was enjoying in the Chālukya kingdom.

Rayapāndya had good connections with other chiefs of the region. His wife Sōvaladōvi was the sister of a chief called Vikramaditya whose father is called Bhillavarēya. It is indeed difficult to know any details regarding Vikramaditya though the context in which he is described indicates that he was a prominent chief in the Bellary region. This
Vikramāditya is described as Mātula⁵³ or the maternal uncle of Rāyapāṇḍya’s son Vīrapāṇḍya.

We have noted above the possible matrimonial alliances between these Pāṇḍyas and the Kadambas of Hāṅgal, a smaller Kadamba family from Bellary region it appears that it was also closely associated with the Pāṇḍyas possibly the subordinates of the Pāṇḍyas. A chief of this Kadamba family Ghattiyerasa by name figures as a governor of Kōgali-500.⁵⁴ Between 1112-1121 A.D. his son Chibidōvarasa was subordinate of Rāyapāṇḍya, son of Vīrapāṇḍya, but the inscription mentioning these chiefs do not specifically state that they were the subordinates of the Pāṇḍyas. But the fact that they were in charge of a portion of Nolambavādi, such as Kōgali-500 is indicative of their position.⁵⁵

The next important chief of the family was Vīrapāṇḍya. His earliest known date is 1142 A.D.⁵⁶ whereas the last known date for his father is 1127 A.D.⁵⁷ We have observed earlier that it is difficult to account for this gap of fifteen years. We know that Vīrapāṇḍya had an elder brother called Īnditapāṇḍya, but we have no independent record for him nor can any date be ascribed. From the description we have in Dg. 41,⁵⁸ we can guess that he was more a scholar than a ruler. In the absence of any definite proof it is difficult to
ascibe any period of rule to him. Yet it is not impossible that he might have exercised his authority over his chiefdom in between Rayapandya and Virapandya.

Though it is difficult to ascribe Panditapandya any date, it is interesting to note that he is particularly described as being one among the great scholar-emperors like Sri Harsha, Utpala Bhoja, Vatsa and Vikramāditya. He is said to have acquired all the knowledge through his teacher Madhusūdanadēva. Naturally, therefore, he was known as Pandita suggestive of his scholarship. It is interesting to note that this Madhusūdanadēva continued to be the preceptor of the next ruler Virapandya also.

Panditapandya had a son by name Tailapa who however had no occasion to rule.

Virapandya is comparable to his father Rayapandya in all his activities. Like Rayapandya who bore the title Tribhuvanamalla because of his importance and close association with the Chalukya king Pratāpa Chakravarti Jagadēkamalla.

As noted earlier, the earliest known date for Virapandya is 1142 A.D. There are at least two records which give this date. He might have come to power a few years earlier than this date.
An inscription of 1148 A.D. describes him as governing Nolambavadi and other divisions as Kumāra Vritti. This term has been translated by Rice as ruling these divisions as a minor. As rightly objected by Dinkar Desai to this translation Virapandya could not be a minor in 1148 A.D. when we know that he came to power before 1142 A.D. itself. But Dinkar Desai’s interpretation that Virapandya might have usurped the throne taking advantage of Tailapa, the son of Rayapandya being a minor at that time is not correct. He takes the word Kumāra to mean heir-apparent. Kumāra Vritti does mean a personal fief given to a prince. But it is not correct to say that he was continuing in that position even six years after his coming to power. There is not the slightest indication of his usurpation either. It is quite likely that Virapandya was a Kumāra during the time of Rayapandya and since the latter’s son Tailapa could not assume power, may be, due to premature death, Virapandya might have become the fulfulledged successor of Rayapandya. His earlier position as Kumāra might have been inadvertently used in this later inscription also.

When Virapandya assumed power the political situation in the Chalukya kingdom was slowly changing. As we have seen above, the turbulent activities of the Hoysala chief Vishnuvardhana were curbed by Vikramaditya VI. There were not many
disturbances from that end in the initial stages. However, Vishnuvardhana was biding time though he could not achieve his goal of becoming independent. Taking an opportunity of the death of Vikramāditya he once again started his expansionist activities and led expeditions against the Kadambas of Hāngal and the Pāṇḍyas of Uchchhāngi. He did not succeed fully in capturing them. We have records to show that both the Kadambas and Pāṇḍyas continued to have firm hold on their respective regions. In 1136 A.D. he appears to have captured Bankāpur, a stronghold of the Kadambas, but this had only temporary effect. He however pursued his efforts and one of his records even states that in 1141 A.D. he was ruling from Hāngal. The then ruling king Chālukya. Jagadekamalla II took stern steps against Vishnuvardhana who appears to have been defeated in a battle near Mahālīge in 1143 A.D. This was the last straw on the camel's back and Vishnuvardhana appears to have finally given up his attempts to capture the area north of the river Tungabhadra. It is interesting to note, however, that his inscriptions as for example of 1149 A.D. claim the region as far as Krishna including Nolambavādi, Benavāsi, Hāngal and Huligere under his control.

Certain other developments in the heart land of the Chālukya kingdom also appear to have been a stumbling block
in the way of Vishnuvardhana. In the reign of Somesvara III, the son and successor of Vikramaditya VI we see the meteoric rise of another chief, Keshchuri Bijjala. This chief was in charge of Sholapur region as a feudatory of the ruling king and his predecessors had matrimonial alliances with the Chalukya rulers. The comparative calm in the Chalukya kingdom and his close association with the ruling family obviously roused his ambition to become independent and it is not unlikely that Vishnuvardhana provided him an example in this direction. Slowly building up his strength and taking advantage of the changing situation he struck a severe blow to the Chalukya rule shaking its very foundation. He openly revolted against Chalukya Taila III and uprooting him, himself sat on Chalukya throne (1156 A.D.).

Only in a vague way inscriptions describe the valour of Virapandya and his assistance to his Chalukya overlord Jagadekamalla II. It is quite likely that he did take active part in opposing Vishnuvardhana and stopping him from attacking Nolambavadi and the Kadambalige territories. An inscription for example, says that he conquered Male and gave it to the Chalukya king. This is indeed a conventional description but Dinkar Desai thinks that this was a specific achievement of Virapandya in defeating Hoysala Narasimha but there
doesn't seem to be any substance in the identification. It is however apparent that Virapandya did participate on behalf of the Chalukya king in the latter's exploits against the Hoysala chiefs and the Cholas. It was to his credit that Nolambavadi, which was the target of the repeated attacks by Hoysala Vishnuvardhana, was protected and the danger to the Chalukya kingdom was warded off. It was in fitness of things thus that he was rewarded with a title Jagadekamalla which was the name of the ruling king himself. An inscription avers that though he was the ruler of the southern region, he could not stop the rising rival Kalachuri Bijjala. As seen above the death of Jagadekamalla II also brought doom to the Chalukya kingdom with Bijjala overpowing the next ruler, T Pillar III. Virapandya had no other option but to accept the overlordship of this new ruler Bijjala. That is how we find him governing his territory under Bijjala in 1162 A.D. It also appears that his position was also affected to some extent; for, the inscription mentioning this fact speaks of him as governing not the whole of Nolambavadi but Kogali-500 which was a part of Nolambavadi, and of course Kadamba-1000 also. It is not possible to ascertain as to how or why the remaining portion of Nolambavadi was taken away from him. It is also possible that the mention of his ruling over Kogali, meant to state specifically the rule over that area.
is not necessarily to exclude the other regions of Nolambavadi from his rule.

Inscriptions mention the names of two wives of Virapandya. One was Gangadevi, the daughter of Adityadeva who was a high officer under Jagadeokmalla II. The lady is described as having been known as Sahadevi also. His another wife was Vijayadevi, the sister of a Vikramaditya. Obviously, the two Vikramadityas are different though it is not unlikely that they belonged to the same family. It is however, difficult to identify this Vikramaditya with any one of that name in the known contemporary families. As observed earlier, chiefs of the name Vikramaditya figure in the contemporary Gutta family, but due to chronological difficulties it is not possible to identify any one of them with Vikramaditya, the brother of Virapandya's wife or of his mother. It is further possible that these Vikramadityas hailed from a family in Bellary district.

Virapandya was a prominent ruler of the family though he had to face the onslaughts of the Hoysales and of Kalachuri Bijjala also. An inscription of 1152 A.D. speaks of him as ruling over Puligore-300 in addition to his traditional region, Nolambavadi. His interest towards learning
has been indicated by an eulogistic description in an
inscription, where he has been compared to such scholars of
repute as Sri Harsha, Akshapada, Kapila and Buddha. He is
also been described as mastering Nyaya Vasehika, Sankhya
and other schools of Philosophy. Madhusudana who figured
as teacher of Pandita Pandya has composed this inscription
employing Kannada, Prakrit and Sanskrit languages. 72

The above account shows that Pandita Pandya had acquired
considerable prominence as a feudatory and had authority
over a wide area. Naturally he had subordinate chiefs and
officers under him. One such was Anukapallavaraya who is
stated to have made a grant to God Gavarasvaram of a place
known as Gandarasdityana-Holal which is modern Holal in
Hadagalli taluk of Bellary district. 76

Reference is already made above to Ghattevdva and his
son Chibidovaara of the Kadamba family. 77 A very badly
damaged inscription 78 from Srinivasapurem in Bellary district
speaks of a family, the name of which is missing. It speaks
of three brothers Aditya, Pallavagavunda and Bavmagavunda.
All these appear to have helped Vira Pandya in a variety of
ways. Pallavagavunda is in fact described as Pandya Rejabhuda
i.e. who was responsible for the prosperity of the Pandya
kingdom. Though the title is conventional, it atleast
indicates the prominence these chiefs had attained under Virapāṇḍya.

We have seen above that the father of Gangadevi the wife of Virapāṇḍya was named Ādityadēva. Dinkar Desai takes him to be a subordinate of Virapāṇḍya but this is not correct. This Ādityadēva is described as the mahāpradhāna of the Chālukya king. Thus though he had matrimonial relationship with Virapāṇḍya, he was not his subordinate. Further Desai avers that this Ādityadēva was a minister of the next Pāṇḍya chief Vijayapāṇḍya. But there is no ground for this identity. He was obviously some other Ādityadēva not connected with mahāpradhāna Ādityadēva. Another of his subordinates, mahāmandalēśvara Nachīdevarasa was governing Kōgali-500 in 1147 A.D. This Nachīdevarasa also figures in an inscription of 1149 A.D. wherein he is described as belonging to Kadamba Kula and as a favourite of Ghattidēva. The same inscription speaks of Virapāṇḍya’s mahāpradhāna Vatsarāja of the Kamme family. Perhaps it is this very Vatsarāja who figures in another inscription from Kōgali as Vatsaschemūpa. The inscription is badly damaged and no details are available. The latest known inscription of Virapāṇḍya dated 1162 A.D. mentions a Kallimayya Dandanayaka who was a high officer of taxes in Holambavēdi. Another
subordinate of this chief was *mahāsāṃkta* Soma or Svidēva. He had a son Eddaridēva. He also appears to have been functioning under Vīrapāṇḍya. He figures in an inscription of 1143 A.D.\(^8\)

1162 A.D.\(^8\) is the latest known date for Vīrapāṇḍya and because we have a date for his brother and successor Vijayaśrīśrī in 1163 A.D., we can surmise that his rule ended in 1162 A.D.

The Pāṇḍya genealogy places PālaṃandapĀṇḍya II after Vīrapāṇḍya, but there is no evidence to show that he came to power. Dinkar Desai thinks that the PālaṃandapĀṇḍya was not a direct brother of Vīrapāṇḍya and that he challenged the succession of Vijayaśrīśrī and tried to get the authority himself.\(^7\) In support of his contention he quotes an inscription from Davanagere,\(^8\) which according to him speaks of achieving a smooth succession to the Pāṇḍya throne by an officer called Śenāpati Dandanāyaka. But actually this inscription does not refer to any dispute for succession. Further, the inscription belongs to Vīrapāṇḍya himself and no dispute could have been risen at that time. It is however, certain that PālaṃandapĀṇḍya II did not assume any authority perhaps because he met premature death. As we have noted above, Vīrapāṇḍya himself had to accept suzerainty of
Kalachuri Bijjala, Vijayapāṇḍya had also to continue in the same position. Dg. 439 speaks of this king and mentions his son and grandson Panḍitapāṇḍya II and Vijayapāṇḍya II respectively. But on chronological grounds the inscription has to be assigned to Vijayapāṇḍya alone.90 On the basis of the conventional description of this king, Dinker Desai surmises that Vijayapāṇḍya freed himself from the yoke of Bijjala's authority and conducted himself as an independent ruler. For example, Dg. 591 describes this king at length as the conqueror of the seven Konkanas as having erected a pillar of victory on Kanakāchala, as having been subdued Tembraparnī etc. etc. But it is difficult to find any historical facts in these descriptions.

The period of Vijayapāṇḍya witnessed another upheaval in the political situation in Karnataka when Kalachuri Bijjala succeeded in occupying the Kālyāna throne. There was a lull in the political scene for sometime but trouble was brewing on both the borders of the erstwhile Chālukya kingdom. In the northern region the Sūnas were growing strong and they even did not accept the authority of Kalachuri Bijjala. They were hiding time to extend their authority and become independent. In the southern region the Hoysalas were not keeping quiet with the subjugation of Vishnuvardhana. Vishnuvardhana's son Narasimha I was not able to achieve much
and the Hoysalas had to accept this suzerainty of Kalachuris. But Narasimhan's son Ballala II was of different metal. He was watching the situation with interest. Constant disputes had set in, in the Kalachuris house for rulership after Bijjala II and this led to the weakening of central authority. Ballala did not lose this opportunity of asserting himself. Thus he set aside his father and himself took the reins of the kingdom into his hands. This development had its effect on Pandyā chieftancy also.

The rise of Hoysala Ballala coincided the decline of the Kalachuris. This provided a golden opportunity for Ballala II to push himself up beyond the river Tungabhadra and expand his hegemony. His eye naturally was on Nolambavadi and the fort of Uchchangī which was once captured by his grand father Vishnuvardhana.

After settling that score with Cheluvanas who appeared to have risen against the Hoysala ruler, Ballala turned his attention towards Uchchangī. Earlier, when Vishnuvardhana had launched upon such an expedition, the political situation was different. There was a strong ruler at the centre and his subordinate the Pandyā had not much to worry. No sooner than the excesses of Vishnuvardhana were noticed, the Chelukya
king promptly arranged to curb his activities to his subordinate Sindā Achūgī. But now the situation was different. There was no strong ruler in the centre when Vijayapāṇḍya came to power. Bijjala II was ruling but soon after his exit in 1167 A.D. the centre became weak because of claims and counter claims over the throne. Rayamurāri Sōvidēva succeeded Bijjala, but he was not strong enough to stem the rising tide. This encouraged Ballāla who within a few years of coming to his throne in 1173 A.D. took a bold step to attack Ucchangī. For him, this was only a stepping stone to push forth further and try to expand his kingdom as far north as possible. An inscription of 1177 A.D.92 is the earliest record of Ballāla to mention his victory over Pāṇḍya in the capture of Ucchangī. This inscription does not refer to the operation but simply speaks of his conquering Pāṇḍya and making Ucchangī the capital. Taking into consideration the fact that Pāṇḍya could hardly face the enemy in the absence of the support from the master, Ballāla's conquest must have been comparatively easy. But the achievement was certainly considered very important, obviously because it was an important step in further ascendancy on the Hoysales which ultimately led to the establishment of independent rule of the Hoysales. Possibly this event can be placed in about 1176 A.D.
Ballāla II's inscriptions make much of this victory. Firstly because as pointed above, it was the first major victory for Ballāla and secondly because the invincible nature of the fort. Leaving aside the exaggerations, Uchhāngi was one of the strongest Giridurga or the hill fort so much so as an inscription puts it, as to mark the conquest of this fort he took the title Giridurgamalla. While one inscription puts it that Chōla king had made an unsuccessful attempt for about almost twelve years to conquer this fort, but for Ballāla II it was a child's play.

Ballāla II's inscriptions claim complete victory of Holambavādi and its occupation but though he was able to subdue Śāndya there is reason to show that he did not occupy it as such. We know from other sources that Vijayapāndya continued to have his hold over Holambavādi even after this event. In fact an inscription of 1200 A.D. clearly states that when the Śāndya chief surrendered to Ballāla the latter gave back the kingdom to him.

In a highly exaggerated way, the Hoysala inscriptions describe this battle. When Vijayapāndya was unable to withstand the onslaughts Ballāla escaped in the forest, while another inscription tells us that Vijayapāndya was captured along with his son Gdeya.
It can indeed be gathered from these accounts that so far as the Pāṇḍya was concerned the battle was decisive in the sense that he had to submit to Bāllāla II and continue in a subordinate position though his inscriptions do not specifically say so. The political condition in this period was in a fluid state. The Kalachuri power was on the wane and the Chālukyas had not yet regained their power. The Śeṅgas and the Hoyasalas were still struggling to take the best advantage of the situation. Under these circumstances Pāṇḍya was left to himself to manage his chieftaincy. In fact an inscription very clearly states that Bāllāla almost finished the Pāṇḍyas and took over Nolambavadi. But as pointed above just now, it was not at all a total rout and Pāṇḍya chief could continue for some more time. An inscription of 1183 A.D. speaks of Vijayapāṇḍya as the subordinate of Kalachuri king Ahamavalla. But we know that around this period Sōmēsvara was trying to oust the Kalachuris and he succeeded in his efforts in the next year. Vijayapāṇḍya obviously changed his loyalty to the Chālukyas and we see him ruling over Nolambavadi in 1187 A.D. as a subordinate of Chālukya Sōmēsvara IV.

Basing his arguments on some eulogistic accounts of Bāllāla in the inscriptions of 1197 A.D. and of 1220 A.D.
Dinkar Desai asserts that consequent to Pandyas’s insubordination, Ballala attacked Nolambavadi once again after 1187 A.D. and finally killed Vijayapandya. But there is no ground for such a surmise. For, firstly, there is no inscription of the Pandyas chief dated after 1187 A.D., testifying to his survival. Secondly, the account of his killing Vijayapandya given in the inscription of 1197 A.D. is only poetic description of his conquests which have been mentioned in a row and it might refer to his earlier subjugation of Vijayapandya. Thirdly, the inscription of 1220 A.D. actually belongs to Balla's son Harasimha and Balla's subjugation of Nolambavadi does refer to his earlier conquest rather than a second one. Thus it can be said that Vijayapandya succeeded after the attack of Balla II in 1173 A.D. and continued to rule sometime independently and sometime under the Kalachuris and finally submitted himself to Somesvara IV.

Somesvara IV's coming back to power did not alter the state of confusion in the region. The pressure on either sides from the Seunas and the Hoysalas forced Somesvara IV to leave Kalyana. At this juncture Ballala appears to have proceeded further again and established his hold over Nolambavadi, possibly in about 1190 A.D. Nolambavadi continued to be under the Hoysalas till the end of the dynasty. Possibly the end of Vijayapandya came in about 1190 A.D.
We have seen that Vijayapandya had three sons, Odeyya, Panditapandya II and Vijayapandya II. In view of the occupation of Nolambavadi by the Hoysalas, obviously they could not come to power. Thus Vijayapandya II was the last of the Pandyas to govern Nolambavadi. After him it became a part of the Hoysala kingdom and the northern most part of that kingdom.

Vijayapandya enjoyed a fair amount of independence taking advantage of the fluid political condition. He was served by quite a few subordinate chiefs and officers who helped him in maintaining peace and order in his territory.

A prominent family of the feudatories was that of Sindas of Belgutti which was closely associated with the Pandyas. It is interesting to note that these Sindas are described as Anuvarti i.e., the associates or the followers of the Pandyas. It should be noted that ordinarily when a subordinate is to mentioned the expression Tatpad海淀 Padmapaśīvi i.e., the worshipper at the feet of, is used. But that is conspicuous by its absence here. It appears thus that the Sindas were not subordinates as such but were associates on equal footing though the Pandyas appeared to have enjoyed a sort of superiority which position explains the mention of the Sinda chiefs in the inscriptions of Vijayapandya.
The Sind a contemporary of Vijayapāṇḍya was Iśvaradēva II. He is stated to be governing from his headquarters at Ballavura.102

An inscription from Dāvanagore103 highly praises an officer of Vijayapāṇḍya called Viśva Pṛthu-dandaṅātha, in fact he is described as Viśva Pṛthu-dandaṅātha Deva-śrīya sāthīkaraṇa dekshādikshita-dārddanda i.e. the right hand of the king, competent to bring stability to the kingdom of Vijayapāṇḍya. He is described as having conquered many kingdoms for Vijayapāṇḍya. The same inscription mentions a few chieftains claiming to belong to the Kedamba family of Mayūrasarma as being the subordinates of Vijayapāṇḍya. They are Nāgatiyarasa, his brother Harihararasa Kumāra-Kētarasa and Mācharasa. The names of their predecessors are also given. A mahaśāmanta Kamayya-Nāyaka figures as a subordinate of Vijayapāṇḍya in an inscription of 1187 A.D.104 He is described as the ornament of Pāṇḍya kingdom (Pāṇḍya rājya-bharana). A mahāmandalāśvara maṇneṣe Viśvamāṇiyarasa figures as a subordinate of Vijayapāṇḍya in an inscription of 1183 A.D.105 He is described as a great hero, but no specific exploit has been mentioned. We have noted above Vijayapāṇḍya’s mother Sāvaladēvi was a sister of Viśvamāṇiya. It is, of course, difficult in the absence of the evidence to identify this mahāmandalāśvara. A few
other inscriptions do mention some minor chiefs and officers under Vijayagandiya.

The Pandyas held a prominent place among the feudatories of the Chalukyas. Being on the eastern side and close to Vengi, Nolambavadi had to feel the heat of the conflicts between the Cholas and the Chalukyas. The location of their kingdom necessitated them to come into conflict with the Cholas on behalf of their masters and ably assisted their masters in maintaining the territorial integrity of the Chalukya kingdom. The political situation was fast changing in the latter half of their rule and they had to face the effects of such change. We have seen above that they had to exert their best to maintain their individuality though succumbing to the powerful adversaries became inevitable. In accordance with the practice of the day, Pandyas maintained internal independence in the territory though they accepted the authority of their overlords. Being the masters of their own territory they contributed most for the development of their region from the religious, cultural and economic points of view. Art and architecture also developed under their patronage.

The contribution of the Pandyas lay in the development of religious movements also in the region and period concerned.
The predominant religions in this region were Saivism, Jainism, and Vaishnavism. Of these, Jainism appears to be less prevalent in this area viz. Nolambavadi. This is rather a strange phenomenon because Jainism was quite popular in the whole of the Chalukya kingdom, of which Nolambavadi was a part. We have copious references testifying to the growth of Jain religion in the various other parts of the Chalukya kingdom. Somehow that religion does not so much seem to have caught the imagination of the people of this area. On the other hand, there is ample evidence to show that the Saiva religion of the Kālāmukha school was very dominant in this area. There are copious references for construction of Saiva temples, installation of linga, and donations to various teachers of Kālāmukha school for a variety of purposes, like numerous services in the temple, free feeding and also educational activities.

Agali in the Harapenahalli taluk of Bellary district was a famous agrahara in the period tracing its antiquity to the mythical hero Harischandra. The Kālidēva temple of this place was very famous and received grants from different persons. An inscription of this place dated 1079 A.D. makes an interesting reference to the grants made to the temple of Kālidēva and handed over to Śivaśakti Panaḍita the priest of
the temple. The grant was made by Bachaladevi, the wife of an officer called Piriyada-Ferggade. She was the daughter of one Kaliyamageshha who is described as the Mahaprabhu of Arasiyakere which was situated in the division of Bikkiga-70.

The Arasikere is obviously different from famous Arasikere within the Hoysala territory in the present day Hassan taluk. The husband of the donor was obviously an accounts-officer as is indicated by his appellation Kanaka. The same temple and the same priest were recipients of another grant by a wealthy merchant from Mahamaleyla-Vaddavayavahari called Sommurtha Setti in 1113 A.D. 107

Bagali was also a Jain centre. An inscription of 1115 A.D. from this place refers to Brahma jinaleya, some grant made to it. 108 It is interesting to note that a lady called Santikabbe coming from Gujarat (Gurjara Santikabbe) made arrangement for regular recitation of the Purana by learned scholars in the temple of Kalideva. This grant was also received by Sivaakshi Pandita in 1126 A.D. 109 Yet another interesting information is that arrangement was made for regular Abhisheka for God Kalidova by supplying one lakh pots of water every year by Bhattara Madivan. 110 He made grants for the maintenance of four persons who brought sacred water, four persons who brought flowers, one person who would hand
over the pots of water and one person who performed the japa. Inscriptions of this place mention some other grants to the temple which was obviously a very famous institution in this place.

Nilagunda, in the same taluk was also an agrahara and an important Shaiva centre. The temple of Rameswara in this place received considerable grants from different persons.

Sivaraja, a military officer of Tribhuvanamalla Rayanaandalu Pandyya constructed a Siva temple at Kamblale in Kalligudal taluk of Bellary district. The temple is highly praised in the inscription as a lofty structure. The fifty two mahaprabhus of this place made grants of land for the continuous worship of the temple.111

Another Siva temple that came to be constructed was that of god Ramesvara at Ravaghatte by a Pandyya officer Kanganna in 1123 A.D.112 He also made grants of land for the temple with the permission of his master. A broken inscription106 from Srinivesapuram in the Harpanahalli taluk of Bellary district speaks of construction of Siva temple by a person called Kora in honour of his brother Aditya Sahani. The deity was named after the latter's name as Aiytiisvara. Vikramaditya, the maternal uncle of Virapandyya was also a
zealous follower of Śaiva religion. He made a grant of land to the temple of Svaśambhu Kalideva at the agrahāra Huvina Hadagalli in 1169 A.D. Huvina Hadagali is modern Huvina Hadagali in Bellary district. An inscription from Uttangi dated 1150 A.D. speaks of the construction of a temple of Basavesvāra by an officer Saudhare-Basayya. The inscription states that many grants were made for this temple by Basayya and others. This in brief is the outline of the activities of the Pandyas of Ochchangi who formed one of the predominant feudatory families in Karnataka.
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