CHAPTER FOUR

THE MEDIEVAL ĀLUPAS

KUNDAVARMA

The earliest dated inscriptions from South Kanara, two in number, belong to the reign of Kundavarma Āluṇḍra, the nephew and successor of Datt-Ālupa. Of these, the latter inscription from the Manjunātha temple at Kadiri, Mangalore Taluk, which has already been referred to, is written in Sanskrit verse and ērantha characters and is both important and interesting.

This inscription consists of nine stanzas, all of them in the Anushtubh metre. Verses 7 and 8 give the date as the Kali year 4068, after the expiry of nine months (i.e. in Makara), when guru was in Kanyāraśi, during the latter part of the day when the nakshatra was Rōhipī. Though the given details of date are insufficient for verification, the intended date most probably is Monday, the 13th of January, 968 A.D. Stanza No. 6 introduces the king Kundavarma-Āluṇḍra as of good qualities, as the 'Lord of the earth' (mahīpati), and as a bee at the lotus feet of Lord Śiva (Bālachandra-sīkhamani). Stanzas 1 to 5 are in praise of the ruler. They state, among other things, that he was like a glowing sun to the lotus that was the Lunar race (Sōmavāṁśa); that the earth was protected by the strength of his arms;

1 SII., Vol.VII., No. 191.
that he had renounced the sin of drinking; that his character
was ennobled by (the establishment of) agrahāras for hrāhmanas;
that he set aside the traitor Dattājīupa and took from him,
by force, the kingdom; that he was like Karpa in charity,
like Arjuna in valour, like Indra in wealth and like Bṛi-
haspati in knowledge. Stanza No. 9 records that, on the date
referred to above, this Kundavarma installed the image of
Lokēśvara at Kadiriṣa.

This image of Lokēśvara has been identified elsewhere with Bōdhisatva Avalokītesvara of the Buddhist
pantheon on the strength of the iconographic features of the
said image. But, neither before nor after the reign of
Kundavarma do we come across any reference in available
Ajupa inscriptions to Buddhism and Buddhist deities. What
is more, the Kadiri inscription extols Kundavarma as Bāla-
chandra-sikhē-mañjā pāḍāyinda-bhrāmaraṇaḥ i.e. the bee at the
lotus feet of Śiva, Bālachandra-sikhē-mañjā being only an epi-
thet of Śiva. The image of Lokēśvara is, therefore, very
likely to be that of Śiva. The Buddhist iconographic features

2 Transactions of the Archaeological Society of
South India, Vol. I, p. 34; Ancient Karnātaka, Vol. I,
History of Tuluva, p. 383. While unhesitatingly identifying
Lokēśvara with Bōdhisatva Avalokītesvara, Saletore, in the
same breath, says that Kundavarma was 'thoroughly Saivite
in his faith' and that Bālachandrāsikhāmapi was a Śaivite
ascetic (ibid., p. 401).
of the image may be attributed to the influence of Buddhism on Saivism; in this connection, the nātha-pāṃtha of Gūrakha-nāth may be taken as an example. It is known that this nātha-pāṃtha was deeply influenced by Buddhism. The naming of the Kadiri temple after Mañjunātha, referred to as such as early as in an inscription of Pāṇḍyamahādevī, of the 12th century, must be attributed to the continued prevalence of some sect of Saivism, influenced by Buddhism, at Kadiri.

The other dated inscription, which comes from Vēpur, Kārkāla Taluk, is incomplete and the name of the king is lost. It is, however, dated Śaka 890, Prabhava = A.D. 967–968, thus leaving no doubt as to the fact that it belonged to the reign of Kundavarma. It ascribes to the ruler the interesting epithet mīra-lauchaḥbhā-nātha, thus bringing closer the dynastic names of Kūpa and Pāṇḍya. The association of the Kūpas with the latter dynastic name has already been discussed. The other epithets borne by the king are saiva-lauchaḥbhāra, naya-vinaya, Viṇa-Lakṣmīvāsa-vakṣhasthāja and bhṛṣaḥya-chintāmāni. After this, the writing is lost. No other records either belonging or assignable to the reign of Kundavarma have come down to us. We may tentatively assign a reign period of 30 years to Kundavarma from about 950 A.D. to about 980 A.D.

3 Barīth: Religions of India, p. 213
4 This inscription is included in App. B of ARIE for 1964-65, still under preparation.
Though the two available inscriptions of Kundavarma do not ascribe sovereign titles to him, it is unlikely that he was a feudatory of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas. The Rāṣṭrakūṭa feudatory Indapayya’s rule over Ajvakheda is only a stray instance and suggests the short life of their supremacy over the Mūlka kingdom. The period subsequent to the end of Indra III’s reign in 927 A.D. and before the accession of Krisna III in 939 A.D. was marked by internecine feuds in the Rāṣṭrakūṭa empire which must have resulted in the weakening of the central power at Mānyakheda. During the period of this confusion, and probably during the reign of Datt-Mūlka himself, the Mūlka had declared their independence. Kundavarma was, in all probability, succeeded by Jayasimha I.

Jayasimha I

This ruler is represented by an undated inscription from Tāḷḷangere, Kasargode Taluk, now in Kerala State. As for its date, the learned editor of this inscription observes: “The specimens of the Grantha and Kannaṇḍa scripts in the record may be compared respectively with those in the Grantha

6 A History of South India, II edn., p. 170.
inscriptions of the 10th century, e.g., Udayāndirām Plates of Bāpa Vikramāditya and the Kannāḍa inscriptions of the same period, e.g., the Devihsōur inscription of Śaka 894 and the Sogal inscription of the reign of Taila II: Śaka 902.

That the Grantha and the Kannāḍa scripts of the inscription under study can individually be assigned on palaeographical grounds to the end of the 10th century A.D. leaves no doubt that the epigraph must be assigned to this very period.

It should, however, be pointed out that the Kannāḍa scripts in the above inscription also bear marked resemblance to the Kannāḍa scripts in the records of the early decades of the eleventh century, e.g., the Kulenur inscription of Jayasimha II: Śaka 950. The Taḷāṅgere record may thus be assigned to the end and the beginning of the 10th and 11th centuries respectively.

The Sanskrit verse, with which the inscription commences, traces the descent of king Jayasimha to Gautama, his son Saradvat, his brother Santanu, his son Kripa and, after many other kings had adorned the lineage, Śalya. Jayasimha, to whose victorious reign the inscription makes a reference, is described as the crest-jewel among the Kshatriyas and as the

9 Ibid., Vol. III, p. 76 and plate.
11 Ibid., pp. 1 ff. and plate.
12 Ibid., Vol. XV, pp. 329 ff. and plate.
The inscription then records the gift, made by the king, of a piece of land situated in the vicinity of Puttur to one Mochabbarasi as kanyādāna i.e., gift to a damsel. This land was barren and rocky and was converted into a fertile field by Mochabbarasi. She constructed a house there, laid a garden and had a moat dug around the place. Towards the end, the record declares that the right of succession to the ownership of the land should devolve on the female issues in the lineage of the excellent Jāgavve and not on the male children; and that, in case there were no female offsprings, the right will pass to the male children.

The inscription itself does not help us in ascertaining the family to which Jayasimha belonged. But in view of the gap which otherwise follows the reign of Kundavarma and also in view of the fact that an Ájupa king ruling during the end and the beginning of the eleventh and twelfth centuries also had the name of Jayasimha and, above all, in view of the fact that South Kanara was under Ájupa sway both before and after the period to which the Taḷāgänge inscription belongs, Jayasimha may be safely considered as a member of the Ájupa family and as Kundavarma's successor.

Since it has been suggested above that Kundavarma may have ended his reign in about 980 A.D., we may assign a period of about 80 years from about 980 A.D. to about 1010 A.D. for the reign of his successor Jayasimha I.

The absence of paramount titles has been taken else-
where as an indication of Jayasimha's subordination either to the Rāṣṭrakūṭas or to the later Chālukyas of Kalyāṇa. This view does not seem to be correct. It has been shown above that Jayasimha's predecessor Kundavarman called himself mahipati ('Lord of the Earth') and that the Āḷupas appeared to have utilised the weakening of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa power after the death of Indra III in 927 A.D. to declare their own independence even during the reign of Datta-Āḷupa. We have nothing on record to show that the Kalyāṇi Chālukyas ever interested themselves in the Āḷupa kingdom prior to the reign of Vikramāditya VI (A.D. 1076-1126).

On the other hand, danger came to the Āḷupas at this time from an unexpected quarter, the Chōlas of the Tamil country. In the year A.D. 985, the Chōla throne came to be occupied by Rājarāja I who, during his reign for the next three decades, inaugurated a period of unprecedented greatness, social as well as military, in the history of South India. In the course of his many conquests, Rājarāja did not spare the Āḷupa kingdom too. His Balmuri inscription in Kannada, belonging to his 28th regnal year and dated Saka 934, Paradāvin = A.D. 1012-13, declares that when Rājarāja started on the march, his general Pāṇchava-mahānyya displayed the might of his arms by seizing Tuḷuva and Koṅkaṇa, pursuing after Maleya and pushing aside and passing over Chēra. The

13 Ep.Ind., Vol. XXIX, p. 207
14 Ep.Carm., III, Sr.140.
famous Larger Leiden Plates of Rājarāja I, dated in his 21st regnal year (c. 1006 A.D.) say—

\[
\text{Jitvā sa Pāṇḍya-Tuḷa-Kēraḷa-Simhalendra-}
\text{Satyāravāśī-nripatīnu-nīja-bāhu-vīryvāt} | \\
\text{ādāya tat-kari-turāmgama-ṛatna-rāṣṭrāpya-} \\
\text{ṇīa dasāpī yaaasaā dhavaḷī-chakara} \]

'Conquering the kings of the Pāṇḍya, Tuḷa and Kēraḷa (countries and) Simhalendra and Satyāravāśī and others by the power of his arm and taking possession of their elephants, horses, gems and kingdoms, he caused to glow all the ten quarters with his fame.'

The victorious general Peñchava-Mahārāja, who conquered, among other countries, the Tuḷuva, is none other than Rājendra I, the famous successor of Rājarāja I. An undated Ālupa inscription of this period, which will be discussed in detail presently, indicates that the Chōla invasion was not a mere raid but resulted in the temporary occupation not only of the Tuḷu country but of many other adjacent principalities.

Bankiṇḍava-Alupendra

The initiative in ridding the Ālupa kingdom and its neighbouring regions of Chōla supremacy was taken by Banki-

Ep. Ind., Vol. XXII, pp. 213 ff., and plates (Verse 31).
This fact is brought to light by an undated inscription from Bārakūrū, Udipi Taluk which palaeographically belongs to the first half of the 11th century. This inscription refers to the above ruler twice and on both occasions lauds him as the nīna-svāmi (de facto Lord) and declares that he established his de facto reign over the Tuḷu-viṣhaya (Tuḷu-viṣhaya-ṇāpuṇa-ṇīveṇa niḷīṣa). Further down, the inscription records the important fact that Baṅkīdeva forced the Chōla to retreat (māri-māla-vande Chōlana dandaṁ hom-kandaṁ aryaviṣṇu aṭṭi) i.e. 'having turned back and pursued the army of the Chōla who had come upon him with hostility'. The inscription also claims that the feet of Baṅkīdeva were worshipped by the kings of the seven hills (maḷay-āḷu) and the Kombu. Of these, the former probably included the rulers of principalities on the Western Ghāṭs while the latter represented Coorg. The last 8 lines in the record are much worn out but they refer to the reign of a Śaṃṭara king, who had placed 120 mandalikas and mahāmandalikas to the care of Baṅkīdeva's shoulders, over the kingdom of Sāntali-1000.

It is obvious from the contents of this record that a number of chieftains, including the Śaṃṭara ruler, placed themselves under the leadership of Baṅkīdeva in their bid to

16 SII., VII, No. 327.
17 Even to this day Coorg has retained the name of Bhū-Kombu in local traditions. Also see Ep.Carn., Vol.I, Coorg Inscriptions, Revised edn., p. 1.
free their territories from the Chōla yoke. This was not an easy task and invited a fresh Chōla invasion. The Tiruvāḷangāḍu plates of Rājendra I say that Rājendra fearlessly crossed the Sahya mountain and immediately attacked the Lord of the Kāraḷa country. The plates further say that in the fierce battle which ensued, several kings were ruined. It is learnt through other inscriptions that Rājendra's conflict with the Kāraḷa king occurred in his sixth year i.e. in 1018 A.D. The reference to Sahya and to the defeat of several kings suggests that either before or even during the conquest of Kāraḷa, Rājendra encountered the armies of Bāṅkideva and his allies. That the war itself was staged on a bigger area than the kingdom of Kāraḷa is substantiated by the Tiruvāḷangāḍu plates themselves through the claim that Bāṅjendra annihilated the country protected by the austerities of Parāṣu Rāma (Śhrīm-pateḥ tapā-rakshitām prithviḥ chhityāo). Kāraḷa formed only a part of Parāṣu Rāma kahētra.

The establishment of Bāṅkideva's dā-facto reign (nījajña) over the Tulu country may thus be roughly assigned to about 1020 A.D. He and his allies could not have been powerful enough to have actually expelled the strong Chōlas forces. The latter may have been called in for more urgent service elsewhere for Rājendra, like his father, was a relentless conqueror.

It is not possible to identify the Sāntara ruler who
figures in the above inscription. During the period in question, either Ammapadeva or his son Tailapadeva was on the Sāntara throne, as will be seen below.

Another stone slab from Barakūru repeats the text of the above inscription but is lost beyond the 8th line and hence reveals nothing new. We have, however, another source of information for the reign of Bankidēva in the Hāmcha inscription of A.D. 1077 of the reign of Kalyāpi Chālukya Tribhuvanamalla (Vikramāditya VI) and his feudatory Nāmi Sāntara. This record informs us that Bīraladēvi, the daughter of the Sāntara ruler Ammapadeva, was given in marriage to Banki-yājiva and that the latter gave his younger sister, Mankabbarasi, in marriage to Tailapadeva, son of Ammapadeva and younger brother of Bīraladēvi. We have so far only one inscription belonging to the reign of Ammapa which is dated A.D. 1007 and which mentions him as Oḍd-Ammapa. He was succeeded first by his son Tailapadeva and then by his grandson Bīru or Vīra Sāntara whose earliest known inscriptions belong to A.D. 1062. Thus, the Sāntara throne was occupied during the first five or six decades of the eleventh century by Ammapa and his son Tailapadeva. Ammapa, who gave his daughter in marriage to Bankidēva, was the latter's elder contemporary and may have reigned from about 1000 A.D. to 1030 A.D. His son Tailapadeva, who married Bankidēva's younger sister may

19 Ibid., Vol. VII, No. 328
20 Ep. Carn., VIII, Nr. 35.
21 Ep. Carn., VII, Sk. 195
22 Ibid., VIII, Nr. 47, 58, 63.
have ruled from about 1030 A.D. to 1060 A.D. Bankideva's reign itself may be considered to have lasted from about 1020 A.D. to 1050 A.D. The relationship of Bankideva to Jayasimha I is not stated anywhere. It is likely that he was the latter's son.

An inscription, from Varanga in Karkala Taluk, belonging to the reign of Tribhuvanamalla Sāntara, which is the only inscription attempting to give a genealogical account of the Ālupa family, helps us in identifying the immediate successors of Bankideva. It refers to the reigns of four Ālupa kings. The genealogical table gleaned from this inscription is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paṭṭiyodeya</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paṇḍya-Paṭṭiyodeya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kavi Ālupa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paṭṭiyodeya</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kulasēkhara Ālupa.

Saletore was not aware of the fact that the Varanga inscription refers to the reigns of two Paṭṭiyodeyas. He, therefore, made Bankideva the grandfather of Kavi Ālupa and introduced Paṇḍya Paṭṭiyodeya as the latter's only predecessor after Bankideva. That portion of the Varanga record which

23 ARSI., 1928-29, No. 526
refers to Kavi Ajupa's predecessor's reads:

Sama-vamsad-oj-anaka-simbhasanapantaom Paatiyodeya

dharmamadim saharmmadim rakshasdan-allam-baliya

Paapy-Paatiyodeyam raja-am-gaydu etc.

It is thus clear that Paapy-Paatiyodeya was preceded on the
throne by Paatiyodeya. These two names, however, do not
appear to have been proper names of the two kings and it will
be seen below that Paapy-Paatiyodeya's proper name was Jaya-
simha. We have also seen above that some of the early Ajupa
rulers were endowed with the epithet Paatiyodeyon i.e. 'the
possessor of Paati', Paati being another name for the city of
Pombuchcha. Again, the reference to Kulasakara as Paati-
yodeya in the Varanga inscription itself clearly shows that
Paatiyodeya was only an epithet of the Ajupas.

The Humcha inscription of A.D. 1077, referred to
above, says that Biradeva or Vira Santara, the son of Taila-
padeva married Achaladevi, the daughter of Ajuwara. We have
shown above that the earliest inscriptions of Vira Santara
belong to 1062 A.D. Besides Mankabbarasi, the younger sister
of Bankidesva, Tailapadeva had also married Keleyabharasi,
the daughter of Ganga Palayadeva and of this latter queen
was born to Tailapadeva his son Vira Santara. Saletoore has
25 suggested that Achaladevi's father was none other than

25 Ancient Karnataka, Vol. I, History of Tuluva,
pp. 229 ff.
Bankideva himself. It is, however, unlikely that Bankideva gave his daughter in marriage to the son of his own brother-in-law. Moreover, the sādarika custom to which Saleto alludes in this connection, is not applicable here, for the mother of Vīra Sāntara was not Bankideva’s sister Kankabbarasi.

It is better, on the other hand, to identify Alvara, father of Achaladēvi, with Paṭṭiyōdeya, Bankideva’s successor. Alvara may have been another name of Paṭṭiyōdeya. For some unknown reasons, the early name of Ajuvarasa was changed into Alvara during this period. A few other Ālupa rulers, who came after Paṭṭiyōdeya, also had the other name of Alvara besides their own names.

A much damaged inscription from Udiyēvara belongs to this period. It is dated Śaka 990, Viḷāmbi, Chaitra 15, Saturday = A.D. 1058, March 14, F.D.T. 05. The legible portion of the record makes no reference to any Ālupa ruler but mentions Māhānandalēśvara Rāya Sāntaradēva who may be identified with Vīra Sāntara who, as stated above, had married the daughter of Paṭṭiyōdeya alias Alvara. The inscription also mentions the tender of Rāyasāntara’s war horses (danda-sāhapi) whose name, however, is lost.

---

26 MII., Vol. VII, No. 278
27 vida. ibid., where it has been wrongly read as Rāya Sāṭiratā
Saletore has assigned this record to the reign of Bankideva on the assumption that the wrong reading Rāya Sātirāṭṭa refers to Bankideva. He also makes the unacceptable suggestion that Mahāmandalēvara and . . . risapa-dapāsā should be changed to read Mahāmandalika and dakshīna-bhujā-danda and then applied as titles to Bankideva. These suggestions are disproved by the correct readings pointed out above.

The Varāṅga inscription offers lofty praises to Paṭṭiyodēya. His fame had penetrated deep into all the quarters; he was incessantly engaged in the destruction of the vice and the protection of the good and had thus made the (Sanskrit) maxim Rāja-rakṣēdaya dharmam pass off for a Kannāga one. No dated references are available for his reign. He may be considered to have reigned from about 1050 A.D. to 1080 A.D. and may be considered to have been the son of his predecessor Bankideva I.

Before proceeding to the next reign, we may discuss the information contained in an inscription of the Goa Kadambas and in Bilhana's Vikramāṅkakāvatārī about the Āḷupas. An inscription, from Halsi, belonging to the joint-reign of the Goa Kadamba rulers Sivachitta and Vishpuchitta of the 12th century, while eulogising their ancestor Jayakesin I (A.D. 1050-1080), says -

Assembling the Kadambas and conquering Śaluka, he established the Chālukya in his kingdom and became a most successful king.

The beginning of the verse obviously refers to Jayakesiśa's assistance rendered to Vikramāditya VI in defeating his brother Somesvara II before his accession in 1076 A.D. From the composition of the above stanza, we are led to believe that Jayakesiśa's invasion of the Śaluka kingdom had been accomplished even before 1076 A.D., when Pañjäyogṣeya was on the Śaluka throne.

It may be that the vanquished Śalukas dared not invite further invasion upon their territory for, the Vikramāṅka-

31 dāvacharita informs us that Vikramāditya VI helped in increasing the prosperity of the Śaluka who had renounced the fancy (for independence) (Śalukādram-svadāta-vikramas-

tyakta-chāpalam-asāya-avardhayat). The allegiance of the Śalukas to the Kalyāpi Chālukyas, however, appears to have been of a very superficial nature. For, as will be seen below, the Śaluka rulers continued to receive sovereign titles in their epigraphical records.

30 vide, The Kadambakula, pp. 122-33
31 Chapter V, verse 26.
An undated inscription from Pola in the Mangalore Taluk belongs to the reign of Pāṭṭiyoḍeya's successor, Pāṇḍya-Pāṭṭiyoḍeya. This inscription is to be assigned, on palaeographical grounds, to the end of the eleventh century. It mentions the king as Pāṇḍya-Pāṭṭigadeva and endows him with sovereign titles such as sāmasa-bhūvana-vikhyata, mahāraja-dhirāja, paramāvarya and bhaṭṭāraka.

Another interesting inscription, from Karāḍi in the Tiptur Taluk of Tumukur District, Mysore State, belonging to the reign of Hoysala Vishnuvardhana (A.D. 1110-1150) and dated in Śaka 1036, Jaya, Chaitra su. 1, Saturday = A.D.1115, February 27 has a bearing on the reign of Pāṇḍya-Pāṭṭiyoḍeya. In order to correct the wrong interpretation given to it so far, it is necessary to quote the relevant portions of the text hereunder:

... Sattī-Śāṃkhaśa-śrī-śāsiradalu nīgaravikki Jayasimha-Śāṅkhas samuṣṭa-galagavai kādi galubandu Karividi-Hiriyaru gavagūtanam gavyuttan-ira Śaka-kālāda 1036 Jaya-sāṃvata-saḍa Chaitra-sūtra pāḍha Voḍha-vāra-tūdū Śīranaśa Halikara-śvavyakama ... handu jamma ....... tumva yāveda bhuja-bhājīm tāne kādi palaraṇiridu tumva-magulabhi sa-īkā-prāptan-āda. ...........

32 ABST. 1927-28, No. 374. Saletore (History of Tuluva, p. 99) attributes this record to the previous reign because he was not aware of the fact that the Vāraṅga inscrip-
While rendering the above passage in English, Lewis Rice misunderstood the expression अजुवक्षेत्राव-अर्जु-सासिरादालु मिकोलाक्ष्यकि to mean 'on the अजुवक्षेत्र people taking prisoners in the thousand.' He also misread the expression जायसिंह-अजुवनः नम्बलु and took it to mean 'in front of जायसिंहावु.' These mistakes have inevitably misled scholars in their subsequent assessment of the historical import of this inscription both with reference to the Hoysalas and the अजुवा.

Saletore, for instance, concluded that the अजुवा invaded Hoysala territory, took prisoners in the Thousand and, in the battle which ensued, killed सेत्ति गावुप्त who was at that time holding the office of गावुप्त in Karividhi-Hirur.

William Coelho correctly suggests that सेत्ति-गावुप्त was holding the office of गावुप्त in Karividhi Hirur after his return from his victorious encounter with the अजुवा but he sticks to the wrong statement that the above encounter took place in front of जायसिंहावु.

Derrett, in his turn, identifies the Thousand (Sāstrī) with Sāntalige-1000 and suggests that the region was invaded by the अजुवा.

Citation records two separate reigns of पाप्पियोयेया and पाप्पियोयेया.

33 Ep. Carn., XII, Tp. 31
34 Ibid., Translations, p. 59
36 Hovasa La Man, p. 30
37 The Hoysalas, p. 46.
As a matter of fact, Ajuvakhēdav-arpūṉāsiraśada
nicaḷav-ikkī actually means 'having pressed against [the
territory of] Ajuvakhēdā-6000. It is thus clear that
Seṭṭi Gāvupaḍa was not defending Hoysala territory or the prin-
cipality of Sāntalīge-1000 against Kūpa invasion but that he
had led an invading army into the Kūpa kingdom itself. The
inscription informs us that his expedition into Ajuvakhēdā-
6000 was successful and that, on his return from the same,
he had been holding the office of gāvupaḍa in Kariviḍi-Hirūr
until his death in the battle against the cattle-raiders,
which must have taken place not long before the date to which
the record belongs. The epigraph gives us another important
information, namely, that Seṭṭi-Gāvupaḍa's Kūpa adversary was
Jayasinga-Kūvara (or Kūvarasā). The reading Jayasina-Kāūn-
varana munde and the meaning attributed to it make no sense
whatever.

The date of the inscription, thus, refers to Seṭṭi
Gāvupaḍa's death in a different and later battle. His tussle
with Jayasinga Kūva had taken place sometime before Seṭṭi
Gāvupaḍa had assumed the office of gāvupaḍa in Kariviḍi-Hirūr.
There is also epigraphical evidence to prove that the Hoy-
salas invaded the Kūpa kingdom sometime before A.D. 1107, even
when Vishpwardhana was only a prince. This evidence is fur-
nished by an inscription from Birahaḍagalli, Hadagalli Taluk,
Bellary District, Mysore State. This epigraph is dated in

38 SHL., Vol. IX, part I, No. 118.
Chalukya Vikrama year 31, Sarvajit, Chaitra Amavasya, Suryagraha = A.D. 1107, March, 25, Monday, f.d.t. .36 and records gifts by a number of persons who were in the service of Chalukya Vikramāditya VI. One such donor is Vira Vishnu Tribhuvana Poysaladēva (i.e. Vishnuvardhana himself), eulogised in the record as having conquered, among other countries, Tulu-dēsa by the mere raising of his eyebrows (Tulu-dēsam ... bhram-bhāngadim kopu). The next verse in the same record again refers to his conquest of Tuḷaunaḍu. Setti Gavunda being only an official under the Hoysalas, as is shown by the Karāṇḍi inscription, the Hīradaṭagalli inscription obviously refers to this very same invasion of Aḷuvakheḍa-6000 by Setti Gavunda. At any rate, Setti Gavunda’s invasion did not result in the loss of territory for the Aḷupas, for Hoysala records of this period say that the Hoysala kingdom was bounded on the West by Aḷuvakheḍa. Also, it appears that Vishnuvardhana carried out this invasion more as a feudatory of Vikramāditya VI than on his own and must, therefore, be deemed as having preceded a second invasion to be discussed below.

The reign of Pāṇḍya-Pattiyodaya is represented by another undated inscription from Kariyangala in Mangalore Taluk. On grounds of palaeography, this record also is to be assigned to the end of the eleventh century. It refers to the king as Kumara-Pāṇḍya Jayasingarasa, describes him as samastabhuvana-vikhyāta and Sāma-kula-tilaka ascribes to him the

39 vide, Ep. Carn., V. Bl. 199
sovereign titles Pāṇḍya-mahārāja-dhirāja, pāramāśvara and pāramahāṭṭāraka. It records the gift, by the king, of a piece of land called Pāṇḍikara to the goddess Hoḷala-Bhaṭṭaraki.

This assumption of sovereign titles by Jayasimha shows that he was an independent ruler. The genealogical details contained in the Varāṅga inscription and the palaeographical similarities of the inscriptions of Pāṇḍya-Paṭṭiga-deva and Jayasimhasara, discussed above, leave little room for doubt as for the identification of these names with one and the same ruler. We may tentatively assign a reign period of 30 years from about 1080 A.D. to 1110 A.D. for Pāṇḍya-Paṭṭiyaṇḍiya alias Pāṇḍya-Paṭṭiga-deva alias Jayasimhasara. Since another Jayasimha had ruled over the Sūpaka kingdom a century before him, this ruler becomes Jayasimha II.

Kavi Ajupendra

We learn from the Varāṅga inscription, discussed above, that the next Sūpaka ruler was Kavi-Ājupendra. His earliest inscription, from Udiyāvara, is dated Saka 1036, Jaya 1 A.L. 1114-15 and is badly worn out and illegible but contains

40-41, Vol. VII, No. 290

41 Cf. ibid., where the cyclic year is wrongly given as Vijaya. The subscript v in sva(sti) in the line above was mistaken therein for vi at the beginning of the second line.
reference to Kumāra Udayādityarasa and the setting up of the memorial stone. Kumāra Udayādityarasa was obviously a prince of the Ḫūpa house and may have been a son of Kavi Ḫūpēndra.

42 See ibid., where the reading given is ‘raiyada [Iul ma[ṇḍa] ... Udayādityarasa. Saletore was misled by the wrong reading quoted above when he asserted (History of Ṭ='') pp. 99 and 101) that this Udayādityarasa was the father and predecessor of Kavi Ḫūpēndra. He also assigns (ibid., pp. 101 ff.) a total of seven inscriptions to the reign of Kavi Ḫūpēndra. Of these only four belong to the reign of this king. The rest of the inscriptions are to be assigned as follows:

1. Uppūru Inscription (ARSÍR., 1928-29, No. 488): this record belongs to the reign of a Pāṇḍya-deva and does not mention the epithet Pāṇḍya-chakravarti as claimed by Saletore. On palaeographical grounds it is to be assigned to the 13th century.

2. Likewise, the Beḷuvāyi inscription (SII., Vol.VII No. 237) belongs to the reign of a Pāṇḍya-deva and is, palaeographically, of the thirteenth century.

3. The Koṭakārī inscription (ibid., No. 380) also belongs to the reign of Pāṇḍya-deva-varasa and to the 13th century.
The next inscription belonging to the reign of this ruler is from Kọṭakēri in Bārakūru and is dated as late as in Saka 1062, Siddhārti, from the month of Vaisākhā, probably = A.D. 1139, April 1 onwards. This inscription gives the king the only epithet of bhujā-hāja. It records the establishment by the king of the Śrāvaniya-nīvāda-sāla in the temple of Markapēsvara and the gift of 30 gold pieces called Pāṇḍya-gādyāpa, being the income from certain taxes, along with the interest amount, to Tolaṇa of Sūrala, obviously for maintaining the above niyāda-sāla. The reference to Tolaṇa in the record is interesting. Sūrala is the same as modern Surali in Udipi Taluk, the region around which came under the rule of a family of Chieftains known as the Tolaṇas during Vijayanagar times.

To the period in between the dates of the Udiyāvara and Kọṭakēri inscriptions of Kavi Ujpeṇdra belong two dated inscriptions, one from Vēpūr in Kārkaṇa Taluk and the other from Ujipāṇi in Mangalore Taluk. Of these, the Vēpūr inscription, dated Saka 1040, Viḷāmbi, Karttika, Amāvāsyā, Wednesday = A.D. 1118, November 15 (the weekday being Friday) refers to the reign of Mahāmāndalīśvara Sēvyagellarasa over Pūnejīke and Chāluṅka. The Ujipāṇi inscription, which is

43 SII., Vol. VII, No. 381
44 Ibid., No. 285
45 ARSTE., 1929-30, No. 531.
much damaged, is dated Saka 1041, Viśambī, nyāla in Mākara, Wednesday, Uttarā-nakṣattra, Purppimāse. The details of date given are irregular but the intended date fell between A.D. 1118, December 25 and A.D. 1119, January 22. This record also refers to the reign of SēvyagELLarasa over two regions (eraḍu-nela), probably Pūnjālike and Chālūlike. Pūnjālike was the region around modern Pūnjaḷakiṭṭe near Vēpur which, in the 17th century, was under the sway of a queen named Madurakadevi and was then known as Pūnjalikeya-rājya. It also finds mention in an earlier inscription, of the 15th century, as Pūnjāliya-rājya. The other region, Chālūlike, may have stood for the area around Ujipāṭi, the findspot of the second inscription of Sēvyagella.

Sēvyagellarasa was apparently a local chieftain and a feudatory of Kavi Ḫulpendra. This suggestion is supported by the title Mahāmaṇḍalāsvāra given to Sēvyagella as against the sovereign titles which the Ḫulpas were wont to receive. It has already been pointed out that Kella is an ancient family name.

We have two more records belonging to the reign of Kavi Ḫulpendra, one from Basarūru in Coondapur Taluk and the other from Kōṭakēri in Bārakēru.

46 SII., Vol. VII, No. 255
47 Ibid., No. 257
48 Ibid., Vol. IX, Part I, No. 393
49 Ibid., Vol. VII, No. 376.
The Basaruru inscription is dated Saka 1077, Bhava, Dhanus, Saka Ramana probably = A.D. 1154, November 25, Thursday. This record ascribes to the ruler the epithets bhuja-bala and Pāṇḍya-Chakravarti and registers the grant, by one Maunayogi, in the presence of the Nakhara, of gold pieces called Pāṇḍya-gadyāpa for conducting worship to the deity Nakharēśvara of Basurepura (i.e. Basaruru, the findspot of the inscription) in Būṣaṇapuja.

The Kōpekēri inscription is dated Saka 1077, Yuva, Karkaṭaka, Prathema, Monday = A.D. 1155, June 27. In this record the king receives the full array of sovereign titles, namely, Pāṇḍya-Chakravarti, bhuja-bala, Samasta-bhuvanāśraya, Prithvīvallabha, Mahārājādhirāja, Paramēśvara and Paramahāttāraka and is stated to be ruling from the capital city of Bārakanyā pura (i.e. modern Bārakūryu.) It records the gift, by one Sājirāpa, a native of Kashmir, of the purchase-money of a land in Pannīrpallā for conducting service to the deity Mārkapālēśvara. The inscription then makes the interesting stipulation that the grant thus made should be looked after and protected by the king (grīmud-arasari), the minister (pradhāna), the heryāda, the māgara-samāha and the queen Pāṇḍyamahādevi who was ruling over the village (guru). Pāṇḍyamahādevi's relationship with Kavi Ājupendra is not stated in the record. She may have been a queen of Kavi Ājupendra.

We get references to Kavi Ājupendra's reign in inscriptions from outside the Tuluva too. The most important of these is, of course, the invasion of the Ājupa kingdom.
by his militant Hoysala contemporary, Vishnuvardhana. We have seen that even as early as in 1107 A.D., when he was only a prince, Vishnuvardhana claimed to have conquered Tuluva by the mere raising of his eyebrows. Some years later, for reasons not stated anywhere, Vishnuvardhana invaded the Aḷupā kingdom for a second time. His inscriptions belonging to 1117 A.D., when he had been king for seven years, eulogise him as uttpātita-ghaṭṭa-kapāṭa (‘the feller of the door leading below the Ghaṭa’) and Tulu-nṛpāṭā-hridaya-vidalana-napakāli (‘he who burst the hearts of the Tulu kings in the game of war’). An inscription of Narasimha I (1152-1173) dated in A.D. 1155 informs us that Vishnuvardhana’s general who conquered the Tulu king was mahāpradāna, senādhīpati, hiriya-haḍavala Bākimayya. Since Vishnuvardhana ascended the throne in A.D. 1110 and since the claim for his second Tuluva-conquest is made in 1117 A.D., it is apparent that the Aḷupā king who had to face this invasion was none other than Kavi Aḷupendra. That this Hoysala invasion did not result in any territorial annexation is proved by the fact that the very same inscriptions which record Vishnuvardhana’s conquest of the Tuluva, also record that his possessions were bound on the west by the Bārakapura-Ghaṭṭa and also omit to include the Tuluva in the long list of his permanent conquests.

50 Ep. C are., Vol. V, Part I, Bl. 58 and 71
51 Ibid., Hn. 69.
An undated inscription of Jagadēkamalla II (A.D. 1138-1155) from Hēmāvati, Anantapur Taluk and District, Andhra Pradesh, mentions his feudatory Mahēmapdarśvara Irungōlachōlaēva as the husband of one Ālpadēvi whose virtues are therein eulogised. Irungōlachōla appears as the feudatory of the Kalyāpi Chālukyas as early as in 1125 A.D. and up to 1140 A.D. His queen Ālpadēvi, as her name indicates, may have hailed from the Āḷupa house, and she was perhaps either the sister or the daughter of Kavi Āḷupēndra.

Since the earliest and latest available dates for Kavi Āḷupēndra fall in 1114-15 A.D., and 1155 A.D. respectively, he may be tentatively taken to have reigned from about 1110 A.D. to 1160 A.D.

The reference in Kavi Āḷupa’s Kōṭēkēri inscription to Bārakūru as the Āḷupa capital is interesting. While this record belongs to A.D. 1155, his earliest inscription, of A.D. 1114-15, is from Udiyāvara. In view of this, it may be suggested that sometime during his reign, after A.D. 1114-15, Kavi Āḷupa shifted the Āḷupa capital from Udiyāvara to Bārakūru.

52 SII, Vol. VI, No. 555
53 Ibid., Vol. IX, Part I, No. 333
54 Ibid., No. 234.
According to Saletore Kavi Alupendra was succeeded by Jagadevarasa. He bases this assertion on an inscription from Bairapur, Sagar Taluk, Shimoga District. This record is dated in the 19th regnal year of Vira Santaradeva, Tarapu, Vaishaka su. 5, Thursday in the reign of Bijjapadava. The latter is obviously the same as Kalachuri Bijjala in which case the cyclic year Tarapu and the month of Vaishaka fell in 1164 A.D., March-May. The other details of date given in the record are, however, irregular. That portion of the inscription with which we are concerned is unhappily worded but definitely pertains to a battle in which the forces of Kiriya-dapandavaka Aralaya, the governor of Banavase-12000, Birarasa, the chief of Hosagunda, Singidova of Hombuchcha, the Alupa king from below the Ghapu and Jagadevarasa were involved.

Vira Santara's inscriptions, so far discovered, range in date from 1157 A.D. to 1191 A.D. Singidova of Hombuchcha and Jagadevarasa were the grandson of Vira Santara and their records fall within the known dates of their grandfather and, in the case of Jagadevarasa, even beyond. Birarasa of Hosagunda was a feudatory of Vira Santara and is identical with Birarasa of an inscription of 1179 A.D.

55 History of Tuluva, pp. 112 ff.
58 Ibid., Vol. VII, Part I, Sh. 116
59 Ibid., Vol. VIII, Sh. 20.
A passage in the Bairāpur inscription which reads *Ghatada-kolgana Alvaramu Jagadevarasan-olag-āgi* has been mistaken to mean 'including Jagadevarasa, the Ālupa king from below the Ghāṣ'. The correct import of the passage, however, is 'including Alvarasa from below the Ghāṣ and Jagadevarasa'. Thus, while Jagadevarasa of this inscription is only a prince of the Sāntara house, the Ālupa king is merely referred to as Alvarasa.

In view of the statement in the Varāṅga inscription that Kavi-Ālupendra was succeeded by Kulasekhara Ālupa, it is only proper that Alvarasa of the Bairāpur inscription is identified with Kulasekhara.

Like his predecessor, Kulasekhara also had a long reign. The inevitable conclusion is that both Kavi Ālupendra and Kulasekhara were quite young when they were raised to the throne.

The earliest available inscription for the reign of Kulasekhara is from Basaruru in the Coondapur Taluk and is dated in the cyclic year Manmatha, Makara 18, Monday. On palaeographical grounds, the cyclic year Manmatha is to be referred to A.D. 1175-76, and the given details of date regularly correspond to A.D. 1176, January 12. This record endows

---

60 Unable to reconcile his theory with the information contained in the Varāṅga inscription, Saletore (*History of Tuluva*, p. 123) merely says that the absence of Jagadevarasa's name in the genealogical account contained in the Varāṅga inscription is 'for the present inexplicable'!

the ruler with all the sovereign epithets and titles of the 
Asupas, viz., samastabhuvanavikhyāta, Sāmakulatilaka, Pāpyā-
mahārājāhānirāja, Paramāśvara, Paramabhāṭhāraka and Pāpyā-
Chakravarti. The other details of the record are badly 
damaged but the inscription seems to register some gift made to 
the god Nākharśvaradēva of Basurū-pattapa.

Next in date among the known records of Kulasekhara 
is the inscription from Mangalore, dated in the cyclic 
year Rāttākṣi, Mēsha 13, Sunday. On palaeographical grounds, 
the cyclic year is to be referred to A.D. 1204 and the given 
details of date regularly correspond to April 4, Sunday. This 
inscription records the interesting fact that the king, who 
was ruling from the principal palace at Māṇgaljūru, called Bhūva-
śrāraya, gave (as a fief) to his nephew (aḷīva) Bankidēva, the 
division known as Mugaru-nāḍa and that, on that occasion, the 
uncle and his nephew made some gifts to the god Bankēśvaradēva.
The record ends with the statement that good will come to the 
donors, Kulasekhara and his nephews Bankidēva, Bāmmedēva and 
Kulasēkhara. We learn from this inscription that Māṇgaljūru, 
which had been the capital of the Āḷupa kingdom during the 
7th-8th centuries, was once again made one of the capital cities 
by Kulasekhara.

62 Ibid., Vol. VII, No. 185. Here the date has been 
wrongly read as 12 instead of 13. Saletope (History of Tuluva, 
pp. 148 ff.) takes much pains to assign this record to A.D. 
1444. But the palaeography of the inscription and the details 
of the date given therein go against his theory.
Two more inscriptions belonging to Kulasēkhara's reign have been found at Mūḍabidure in the Karkala Taluk. Of these, the earlier inscription is dated Saka 1127, Krodhana, Māsha 17, Sunday = A.D. 1205, April 10 and refers to the king as Pāpya-Chakravarti Kulasēkhara-Kṛṇindrādeva. It mentions his mahāpradhāna, whose name is lost, and seems to record a gift of land by three persons to Durgādevi.

The other inscription is dated in the Kali year 4315 (expired) 4316 (current), Kesava-māsa 1, Vaṣādevāra probably = A.D. 1215, April 25, Saturday. This inscription is badly worn out but seems to record gifts to the goddess Durgādevi.

The Varāṇga inscription informs us that Kulasēkhara's queen was Jākalamādevī and that she had a tank dug out at Varāṇga and performed acts of charity. The Varāṇga inscription is a Jaina record. In A.D. 1246 and 1247, we hear of a Jākala-Mahādevī ruling over the Kalasa-Kērkaḷa principality from her capital at Kēlaṣa, very near the borders of the Aḷupa kingdom and situated in the Chikmagalur district. The Kalasa-Kērkaḷa rulers were Jains by religion. It is not, however, possible, in the present state of our knowledge, to say if Kulasēkhara's queen was a princess of this minor ruling family and whether she is to be identified with the Jākala Mahādevī referred to above.

64 Ibid., No. 222
65 Bp. Carn., Vol. V, Mg. 65, 66 and 70.
Since Kavi Ājupēndra has been taken to have ended his reign in about 1160 A.D., and since Kulasekhara's latest record is dated in 1215 A.D., the latter may be deemed to have reigned from about 1160 A.D. to 1220 A.D.

The Varāṅga inscription provides us with the interesting information that Kulasekhara was succeeded by Kupḍaṇa, the younger brother of Vīra-bhūpāla who was himself the younger brother of Tribhuvanamalla Śāntara. The last mentioned is the same as Vīra Śāntara whose known inscriptions, as has been pointed out above, range in date from 1157 A.D. to 1191 A.D. The inscriptions of the Śāntaras do not tell us anything about his younger brothers, Vīra-bhūpāla and Kupḍaṇa.

The text of the Varāṅga inscription, however, is clear and unambiguous in its narration. After referring to the reign of Tribhuvanamalla Śāntara, to whom it bestows a long string of titles and epithets, the inscription says —

66 Such succession of long reigns, as suggested for Kavi Ājupēndra and Kulasekhara, are not unknown to South Indian history. The sixtyfour years of Pallava Nandivarman II's reign (A.D. 731-95) was followed by 50 years of his son Danti-varman's reign (735-845 A.D.). Pāṇḍya Neṣṭuṇjaṇaiyaṇ (756-815 A.D.) and his son Śrīvallabha (815-862 A.D.) ruled respectively for 59 and 47 years.
The record then gives him the titles Pundita-Pandya and Pandya-Dhananjaya and says that he made a grant of the great city (mahā-pura) of Varāṅga in his Ālva country (tānu-Ālva-desa-n). It also records a grant of land by Kupḍapārsvisvara. It is thus clear from the Varāṅga inscription that Kulasekhara was succeeded by Kupḍapa of the Santara lineage.

Saletore, on the other hand, says that Kulasekhara's successor was Kṛṣṇamālī-Chakravartī. This is not the proper name of a ruler but is given in the Varāṅga record as one of the many epithets of Tribhuvanamalla Santara, the eldest brother of Kupḍapa.

The circumstances which raised Kundana to the Śrīupa throne are not revealed by the Varāṅga inscription. It may be that he had married a princess of the Śrīupa house, probably the daughter of Kulasekhara and may have gained the Śrīupa throne when the latter died without any eligible candidate directly belonging to the Śrīupa dynasty.

No other records pertaining or referring to the reign of Kupḍapa have come down to us. He, however, did not reign for long for there was another ruler on the Śrīupa throne as early as in A.D. 1235. Kupḍapa may, therefore, be considered to have reigned from about 1220 to 1230 A.D.
Vallabhadeva Alupendra alias Dattalpandra II

Kupḍaṇa's successor was Vallabhadeva-Ālupendra whose reign is represented by a much worn out inscription from Vāḍḍarṣe, Udipi-Taluk. This record gives him the epithets of Rāṇḍya-Chakravartti and Rāya-gaḷ-āṅkusa. It is dated in the cyclic year Māmantha, Kanya 13, Monday. On palaeographical grounds, the year Māmantha is to be referred to A.D. 1235-36 and the given details of date regularly correspond to A.D. 1235 September 10.

Besides giving the name of the king as Vallabhadeva, the inscription also refers to him as Oḍḍamarājā. This helps us to identify the Ālupa king Dattalpandra Śrīmāra Oḍḍamadēva who figures in the undated inscription from Muḍabidure which, as has been pointed out earlier, Saletore had wrongly assigned to 959 A.D. with Vallabhadeva-Oḍḍamarāja. The palaeographical features in the two records clearly show that the Vāḍḍarṣe inscription of Vallabhadeva Oḍḍamarāja and the Muḍabidure inscription of Dattalpandra Śrīmāra Oḍḍamarasa belong to the same period and reign.

68 ARSIE., 1931-32, No. 295.
69 SII., Vol.VII, No. 315. The published text contains the wrong reading Dattalpandra Śrīmāra Oḍḍamadēvīgala. Saletore (History of Tuluva, p. 93) accordingly took Dattalpandra Śrīmāra to be the king's name and Oḍḍamadēvi to be the name of his queen. The correct reading, however, is Dattalpandra Śrīmāra-Oḍḍamadēvarasaru.
The Mūgābidūre record states that the king was ruling from his principal palace at Bārahakanyāpura. It records the gift of a cultivable field to Gaganāsivāchārya, hailed therein as born in the family of Dūrvāsamunīndra, by two bodies known as the halaru or hattukēri of Bārakūru and the Nakhara.

To the reign of the same ruler belongs another undated inscription from Hungund, Hungund Taluk, Bijapur District. (The inscribed slab is now kept in the Prince of Wale's Museum, Bombay). It mentions the ruler as Dattālpendravarasa, endows him with the epithets Pāpīya-Chakravarti and Rāvasaīṭhakṣuṣa but makes no reference to his reign obviously because Hungund and the region around were well outside the sphere of his sway. The inscription records a gift, by the king, of land in Kanyāna to Gaganāsivāchārya, born in the family of Dūrvāsa-munīndra, for conducting services to the god Vighnēśvara. The presence of the record in a place so far removed from the territory of the Ajupas suggests that Gaganāsivāchārya, who had earned the respect and reverence of Dattālpendra had established himself at Hungund.

Dattālpendra's successor was on the throne as early as in A.D. 1254 and so the former may be considered to have reigned from about A.D. 1230 to 1250.
Dattāḷpāṇḍra's successor bore the name Viśa-Pāṇḍya-deva Āḷpāṇḍra-deva. The earliest of his inscriptions from Kōṭa in Udipi Taluk is dated Saka 1177, Ananda, Bhāḍrapada ba. 30, Kanyā 16, Sunday = A.D. 1254, September 13. It states that the king, who is given the usual epithets of Āḷpāṇḍya-Chakravarthi and Āḷpāṇḍya-vasava-saṁkara, was ruling from his palace at Bārahakanyāpura. It records that some grant (details lost) was made by the 'Thousand' of Kōṭa and Mayda-verggaḍe while the king was seated in audience in the presence of all his ministers (aṇeṭa-pradhanarum-ira) including his nephew (aḷīya) Bāṅkideva and his brother-in-law (mayduna) Oḍḍamadeva Balla-verggaḍe.

A second inscription of his reign, from Brahmāvara, Udipi Taluk, bears the date Saka 1177, Ananda, Āśvayuja su. 15, Kanyā 30, Monday = A.D. 1254, September 28 and records that, while the king was in audience in his palace at Bārahakanyāpura in the presence of all his ministers (including those mentioned in the previous record) and priests (purōhitara), the 102 mahājana of Brahmāvara were directed to pay to the royal treasury.

71 ARSI., 1928-29, No. 509
72 Ibid., No. 485
73 Ibid., No. 490
(arasina) 700 gadyāpas once in three years.

Another inscription from Nilāvara in the same Taluk, dated in Śaka 1181, Pṛṇga, Phālguna ba. 5, Sunday, Mīna 2 = A.D. 1258, February 24, records that the 'Three hundred' of Niṇuvara were directed to pay every year 100 gadyāpas to the king, 30 gadyāpas to the ādikārī and 30 gadyāpas to the village. This record also states that the king was ruling from Bārahakanyāpura in the presence of all his ministers, including mayūna Odāma- dēva and Narasinga-heggenade and saints (pišhi) and priests. The ruler receives the same epithets as above.

Two other inscriptions of Vīrapāṇīyadēva, one from Koṭēsvara, Coondapur Taluk, dated Śaka 1183, Durgamati, Mārgasira su. 6, Tuesday, Dhanus 3 = A.D. 1261, November 29 and the other from Coondapur itself, dated Śaka 1184, Dundubhi, Śrāvapa ba. 13, Sīma 16, Sunday = A.D. 1262, August 13 state that the king was jointly ruling with the Queen Mother (piša-arasī) Paṭṭamahādevi. That she was the mother of Vīrapāṇīyadēva is revealed by an undated record from Hāneshalli, Udipi Taluk which introduces the king as her son (piša-arasī Paṭṭamahādevīyara suputra-śaha etc.).

73 Ibid., No. 490
74 SII., IX, Part I, No. 396
75 Ibid., No. 396
76 ARSI., 1931-32, No. 241.
Of these, the Kōpēśvara inscription gives the king the usual epithets, mentions his pradēnas, including mayduna Oḍḍamasriśeśa, Narasinga-VERGGADE and Māradamadhikāri and records a grant of 180 gadāpās by the 'Three hundred', of Kuḍikūr, Poḷali-heggaṇe and Kōṭi-maṇḍapa. The Coondapur inscription omits the epithets; it fixes the revenue of Coondapur at 140 gadāpās. The Hānehallī inscription, besides giving the usual titles and referring to sakala-pradēnas, also mentions the queen Ballamahādevī and records a gift of paddy to the god Sōmanāthadeśa. All these records state that the king was ruling from Bārahaṇyapura.

Virapāṇyadeśa's inscription from Hāraḍi, Udipi Taluk, is dated Saka 1184, Dundubhi, Tulā 5, Wednesday = A.D. 1262, October 2, Monday (and not Wednesday). The record is much damaged but mentions the pradēnas including mayduna Voḍdamadeśa and Narasinga-heggaṇe and also the Capital Bārahaṇyapura.

An inscription from Puttige, belonging to his reign, is dated in the cyclic year Prabhava, Simha = A.D. 1267, July 29 - August 28, and gives him a long list of sovereign epithets and titles such as samsara-bhuvana-
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78 Tulā 5 was a Wednesday in Saka 1185, Rudhirödgar = A.D. 1263, October 3.
79 ARSIE., 1928-29, No. 500
The inscription registers a contract while the king was ruling from Bārahakanyāpura with all his ministers including Oḍḍamadēva and Narasiṅga-hēggaṇē.

Next in date is his inscription from Bainḍūrī, Coondapūr Taluk, which is dated in the cyclic year Āṅgiras, Mēsha 12, Saturday = A.D. 1272, April 5. It seems to record a gift of paddy to the god Bāṅkēśvarādeva.

His latest available inscription, from Kuttupāḍī, Udīpi Taluk, is dated in the cyclic year Bhava, Kanyā. The details of the date are lost. The record belongs to A.D. 1274, August 29 - September 27. It records an agreement of peace entered into by the people of Māṅgōḍu in the presence of the mahāpradhānās Narasiṅga hēggaṇē and Oḍḍamādēva.

To this period belongs an undated inscription from Kōjēkērī in Bārakūrī, Udīpi Taluk. It records that Vīra Jagadēvarāsa, Paṭṭamahādevī and Pāḍyadēvarāsa were ruling jointly from their capital of Bārahakanyāpura when a gift of land was made for conducting services to the god Mahādeva.

---
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Saletore wrongly assigns this record to the first half of the 12th century and to the reign of Kavi Kupendra with whom he has sought to identify Panṣya-dēvarasa. He also makes Paṭṭamahādevi the queen of Kavi Kupendra.

Neither the palaeography of the Köṭekeri inscription nor the known historical facts support the above suggestions. We have seen above that the Hanehalli inscription specifically states that Viraṇapāṇḍyadēva was the son (anputra) of Paṭṭamahādevi. Paṭṭamahādevi and Pāṇḍyadēvarasa of the Köṭekeri inscription should be identified with Paṭṭamahādevi and her son Viraṇapāṇḍyadēva of the Hanehalli inscription. This is well borne out by the palaeography of the two records.

This leads us to the identification of the other joint ruler, Vira Jagadevarasa. He is given in the record feudatory titles such as samadhitapāṇcitamahāsabda and mahāmanḍalasvara and also receives many of the typically Sāntara epithets including Uttara-Mudhurādhīvara, Paṭṭi-Pambuccha-purasvarādīvara, Mahāgra-vamsa-lalāma, Padmāvatīdēvi-lahanā-varaprasāda, Vānara-dhvaja, Mriga-lāṅghchhānaṁ etc. These epithets undoubtedly prove that Vira Jagadevarasa hailed from the Sāntara house. He was obviously a feudatory of the Hoyasalas.

The reasons which made him a joint ruler of the Tulu country are not given in the record or elsewhere. It is likely that Paṭṭamahādevi, who was probably the queen of

83 History of Tuluva, pp. 234 ff.
Vallabhadeva alias Dattalpendra II, was the sister of Vira Jagadévarasa. At the time of her husband's death, her son Virapandyadeva may not have come of age and she may have asked for her brother's help in ruling over the kingdom. Virapandyadeva appears to have been very young at the time of his accession in about 1250 A.D., for, when he died after a reign of about 25 years, it became necessary for his queen to rule as regent in the place of her young son Nágadévarasa. The Köjaköri record should therefore he referred to the early years of Virapandyadeva's reign.

A damaged inscription from Uppuru, Udipi Taluk, which refers to the reign of a Pándya-Chakravarthi Pándyadeva should also be referred to Virapandyadeva's reign on palaeographical grounds. It is dated in the cyclic year Pingala, Kumbha 3, Sunday = A.D. 1258, January 26, Saturday (and not Sunday) and records a gift of gold by some persons including one Parapalínayaka. Besides these, damaged inscriptions from Păduru, Udipi Taluk and Kópêswara, Coondapur Taluk, refer themselves

---
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to the reign of Viṣṇupāṇḍyaḍēva.

Since the earliest and the latest known dates for Viṣṇupāṇḍyaḍēva fall in A.D. 1254 and 1274 respectively, he may be considered to have reigned from about A.D. 1250 to 1275.

_Ballamahādevī_

As we had stated above, Viṣṇupāṇḍyaḍēva died leaving behind his queen Ballamahādevī and a minor son, Nāgadaśvarasa. The inscriptions clearly show that his queen succeeded him and betook all the sovereign titles used by the Ḫupas.

Her earliest inscription is from Nīlavara, Udipi Taluk, and is dated Saka 1201, Ṣvara, Kanyā 15, Sunday. The cyclic year Ṣvara, however, fell in Saka 1199 and the given details of date regularly correspond to A.D. 1277, September 12. The inscription records gifts by the queen to the goddess Nīruvāra-Bhagavatī. She is merely addressed here as _pattada-nirivarasi_. Ballamahādevī was ruling from her principal palace at Barahakanyāpura along with all her ministers (samasta-pradhānaru), the dāsi-purushas, the bāhattara-nyogis and the priests.

An inscription from Keñjuru, Udipi Taluk, dated in Saka 1200 (wrong for 1203), Vishu, Tula 7, Sunday = A.D. 1281.

89 _ARSI_, 1928-29, No. 491.
October 4, Saturday (and not Sunday) refers to pāṭādadapiriyarasī Ballamahādévi as born in the family of Mānā-bharaṇepśvara and as the mistress of the Western Sea. It states that she was reigning from Bārahakaryāpura in the presence of Bānkīdēva of the line of Dattājya, Narasinga-heggaḍa, mahāprādhāna Sōmappa-sēnabōva, Bāmma-sēnabōva, kumāra Bijjappa-araśa, mahāprādhāna Perupasēnabōva and the dāsa-purushas.

91 A badly damaged inscription from Hērāqi, Udipi Taluk, dated in the Kali year 4304, Chitrabhanu, Saka 1204, Sinha = A.D. 1282, July 28-October 28, gives the queen the epithet Pāṇḍya-Chakravartī.

92 Her inscription from Mūḍa-Alevūr, Udipi Taluk, dated in the cyclic year Tārāpa, Bhādrapada ba 10 probably = A.D. 1284, September 6, Wednesday and endows her with sovereign titles and epithets such as sāmaśa-bhuvana-vikhyātam, Sōma-kula-tilekaṇa, Mahārajādhiraṇa, Paramāśvaram etc. It refers to her son Pāṇḍyadēvarasa and to adhikārī Dāsappa-sēnabōva.

93 Another inscription from Koḍavūr, Udipi Taluk, dated in Saka 1210, Sarvajit, Tula 24, Wednesday = A.D. 1287, October 22 records the remission of taxes by the queen on a land at Kuḍevūru.

94 An inscription from Kachchhūru, also in the Udipi

91 Ibid., No. 291. The name of the ruler is wrongly read here as [Oḍamarājā]dēva.
Taluk, dated in the Cyclic year Sarvadhāri, Sravapa ba. 5, Monday = A.D. 1288, July 19 states that one Nidumbarāya made gifts of a garden and a house to one Śankarabhaṭṭa for conducting services to the god Markandēśvara when Ballamahādevī was ruling from Bārahakanyāpura along with her five ministers (pañchaprādhānās).

Sometime around this time, Nāgadēvara, who must have been a minor at the time of his father Viśnupāḍyadeva's death in about 1275 A.D., came of age and also came to be actively associated with the responsibilities of the crown. An inscription from Basarūru, Goondapur Taluk, dated in Śaka 1213, Kṛṣṇa, Magha ba. 10, Kumbha 20 (wrong for 21), Thursday = A.D. 1292, February 14, refers itself to the reign of Nāgadēvara, son of viśnupāḍyadeva Ballamahādevī. It records a gift of garden-land to the god Nakharēśvara by the king when he was ruling from Bārahakanyāpura with all his ministers, priests, the dāsipurusas and the nakhare of Basarūru.

That Ballamahādevī did not cease to be the reigning queen with the accession of her son is proved by an inscription from Manipura, Udipi Taluk, which, while referring it-
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self to Ballamahādevī's reign, makes no mention of her son Nāgadēvarasa though it is dated in the cyclic year Nandana, Tulā 1 probably = A.D. 1292, September 28, Sunday. The Manipura inscription provides us with the latest known date for Ballamahādevī. It is likely that she did not rule for long after this date. We may therefore assign her a reign-period from about 1275 A.D. to 1292 A.D.

The epithet Mānabhānapārvadāvā-vāma-ānvayavā given to Ballamahādevī in the Këñjuru inscription discussed above has led to a suggestion that she may have been a princess of the Pāpīya dynasty or that she may have belonged to the family of Mānabhārana, the Ceylonese king who was defeated by Chōla Rājadhirāja I (A.D. 1018-54). It is, however, unlikely that the Pāpīyas, whose rule was at that time confined to the tiny kingdom of Kīlukhēḍa, contracted marital alliance either with the Pāpīyas or with the distant ceylonese kings. On the other hand, Ballamahādevī appears to have belonged to a leading family of Kīlukhēḍa itself and may have been the sister of Oḍḍamadēva who appears in the records of Vīrapāpodyadeva not only as his pradhāna but also as his maidūna (i.e. brother-in-law.). Oḍḍamadēva is mentioned in the Kōte and Brahmāvara inscriptions of 1254 A.D., discussed above, as Oḍḍamadēva-Ballaverggaule. Mahādevī stands for 'queen' and verggaule denotes office. Thus we get Balla as the proper names of Vīrapāpodyadeva's queen and brother-in-law.

97 Ibid., 1931-32, p. 61
The fact that after Vişalakīrti, his queen Ballamahādēvi and later his son Nagadēvarasa succeeded to the throne clearly shows that the system of matriarchal succession (known in the Tulu country as aliya-sāntāna) had not come to be adopted by the Śrūpas.

We had seen above that the Basarūru inscription provides the earliest known date for the reign of Nagadēvarasa (A.D. 1292, February 14). The next inscription belonging to his reign is also from Basarūru and is dated in Saka 1220, Kumbha 20, Thursday = A.D. 1298, February 13. This much damaged inscription refers to the samasta-pradhānah and seems to record some grant to the god Nakarēsvaramāhādeva.

The succession of Ballamahādēvi and later of Nagadēvarasa to the throne vacated by Vişalakīrti did not go uncontested. We had seen above that the Kēṭe and Brahmavara inscriptions of Vişalakīrti, belonging to A.D. 1254, mention one aliya Bankidēva. The Kēṇjuru inscription of Ballamahādēvi states that, besides ministers and officials, Bankidēva of the line (hāli) of Dattālva was in attendance in her court. Dattālva was the predecessor of Vişalakīrti on the Śrūpa throne. These were in all probability related as father and son. Since two inscriptions of Vişalakīrti address Bankidēva as the king's aliya, it is very likely that the latter was the son of Dattālva's daughter and Vişalakīrti's sister.
Encouraged by the prevalence of *ajiya-santāna* in South Kanara and, perhaps, among some of the minor ruling families of the region, *ajiya* Bankideva appears to have contested the right of Ballamahādevī and Nāgadevarasa to succeed to the throne left vacant by his uncle. His open revolt against this arrangement could not have taken place before A.D. 1281 when he is mentioned as present in the court of Ballamahādevī. The earliest reference to his reign is found in an inscription from Brahmagara, Udipi Taluq, dated in Saka 1209, Vyaya, Mārggasira su. 10, Tuesday = A.D. 1236, November 26, f.d.t. 30. This record, however, gives Bankideva the subordinate title of *mahamandalesvara* though he also receives the sovereign epithets *arirava-basava-sankara* and *Virapāpyadhanaṇaṇja* and is referred to as ruling the kingdom (*rājyavan-śa*).

His other inscription which falls into a date when he was not the sole ruler of *Kuvakheda* is from Kurnādu in Mangalore Taluq and is dated in the cyclic year Durmukhi, Simha 27, Thursday = A.D. 1296, August 24, Friday (and not

---


99 *SII.*, VII, No. 202, for instance, gives seven generations of succession by *ajiya-santāna* for a family of local chieftains. It is dated in Saka 1351, thus enabling us to carry forward the earliest name in the given genealogy to the 13th century.

100 *ARSIE.*, 1928-29, No. 494. The inscription has been wrongly assigned to one *Vīra-Paṇḍyadeva* and the year wrongly read as Saka 1269 in the above report.
Thursday). It states that Bankidēva was ruling from his principal palace at Mangalūru and with all his ministers, Kopḍey-adhikāri, Pakarasa etc. It is thus obvious that from at least A.D. 1286 onwards, Bankidēva had set up a rival seat of power with his capital at Mangalore while first Ballamahādevī and then her son Nāgadevarasa continued their reigns over the northern parts of the kingdom from Bārahakanyaṇapura.

Since the earliest and latest known dates for Nāgadevarasa fall in A.D. 1292 and 1298, he may have reigned from about A.D. 1290 to 1300. It is possible that he was finally ousted by Bankidēva for the latter's subsequent reign was without a rival.

The next available inscription of Bankidēva is from Mangalore and is dated Śaka 1225, Subhakrit, Mōsha 7, Sunday = A.D. 1302, April 1. The king receives herein the epithets Pândya-Chakravartti and Bāvagaḷāṇkusa and is stated to be ruling from his palace at Mangalūpaṇa. It records the interesting fact that the king, at the time of offering pinda for the merit of Mōchala-mahādevī, who was his/sister (ṣaka)...
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and had died some time ago, (munna), made a gift of land and its incomes to one Vamana with the stipulation that the gift be utilised for conducting services to the deities Brahma Vishnu and Mahesvara.

Balakidéva's inscription from Kariyangala, Mangalore Taluk, is dated in the cyclic year Krodhi, Simha 5, Sunday. On palaeographical grounds, the cyclic year is to be referred to Saka 1226 and the given details of date correspond to A.D. 1304, August 2. It records that during Balakidéva's reign, when Dharadaréva was holding the office of atikéri Boppapi made a gift of the land called Kalkuța, which formed a part of his brahmadaiva, to the god Holala-déva.

His inscription from Papamburu, also in the Mangalore Taluk, is dated Saka 1227, Visvāvasu, Mithuna 1 = A.D. 1305, May 27, Thursday. It is much damaged but seems to record a gift of land to the god Nagaréśvarada-Gaapati by Nāgasivāchārya.

An inscription from Sujör, Mangalore Taluk, dated in Saka 1228 (wrong for Saka 1227), Visvāsu, Simha 18, Sunday = A.D. 1305, August 15, refers to Pāṇḍya-Chakravartti, Rāyaśajin-

103 ARSIE, 1927-28, No. 377. The date is wrongly given here as Simha 15 and the week-day A (= Aditya-vāra) is omitted. See also History of Tuluva, p. 123.
105 ARSIE, 1930-31, No. 338.
Kusa Bankidēva Ajupendraḍēva as ruling from his audience hall called Bhuvaṇārājya in the principal palace at the capital city of Mangalāpura. It records several gifts by the king to the god Timirēśvara in gratitude for favourably answering his prayers for rains at the time of drought (anāvṛśita).

Apart from the above dated inscriptions, another record from Kadiri, Mangalore Taluk, which is badly worn out and whose date is lost, but which refers itself to the reign of Parama-Chakravarti, Rāyasalaṅkusa Bankidēva, is to be assigned to the same reign on palaeographical grounds.

The earliest known date for Bankidēva's reign is furnished by the Brahmāvara inscription, referred to above, which belongs to A.D. 1286. The earliest known date for his successor, as will be seen below, falls in A.D. 1315. We may, therefore, tentatively consider Bankidēva to have reigned about from A.D. 1285 to 1315.

Sūyidēva Ajupendraḍēva

Bankidēva was succeeded by Sūyidēva Ajupendraḍēva, whose earliest inscription, from Bārakūru, Udipi Taluk, is dated Śaka 1238, Rākṣasa, Mārggasira (wrong for Niya-Kārttika) su. 13, Viśnukīrtī 13, Monday = A.D. 1315, November 10. This inscription is very interesting but, at the same time, problematic, for it mentions Bankidēvarasa of the line (hali) of Dattāḷva as one of the donors, the others being
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the samasta-pradhānas, the dāśpurushas the araṇ-kōla-baḷi and the bāhattara-nīyōgīs, who made several gifts of gold to the god Sōmanāthadēva of Mapigārakārī, a part of the capital city of Bārahakanyāpura from where Sōyidēva was reigning. We have seen above that the Keṇjūru inscription of Ballamahādēvi of 1281 A.D., refers to Sōyidēva’s predecessor Bāṅkidēva as of the line (baḷi) of Dattālva. His reference in the Bāra­kūru inscription of Sōyidēva, not as the reigning king but merely as one of the donors, may at best be explained away to mean that Bāṅkidēva, for reasons not known to us from any source, had vacated the throne in favour of Sōyidēva at a date not far removed from that of the Bārakūru inscription under study. This record endows Sōyidēva with the epithets Pāṇḍya-Chakravarthī and arrīvārīvasavasākara.

Next in date is an inscription from Hāvanje, Udipi Taluk, dated in Saka 1240, Pingāla, Chaitra su. 1, Tuesday = A.D. 1318, March 4, Saturday (and not Tuesday). The record is badly damaged but refers to Kūṭaluva-dapāga-māyaka, the samasta-pradhānas, the araṇ-kōla-baḷi and the bāhattara-nīyōgīs. The king receives the same epithets as found in his Bārakūru inscription.

108 Cf. ibid., and History of Tuluva, pp. 135-36 where the name Dattālva has not been read, though the letters are clear on the impression examined by me.
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His Uppunda (Coondapur Taluk) inscription is dated in the cyclic year Bundubhi, Jyeshtha su. 15, Monday = A.D. 1322, May 31. It is very badly damaged.

The next in date is his inscription from Avarse, Udipi Taluk, dated in the cyclic year Rudhirdgari, Kanya 12, Saturday = A.D. 1323, September 10. It gives the ruler the two epithets mentioned above, refers to Mahapradhana Singapa-sahapi and records a gift of land to Madhava-kalkura by Baahapa-heggade and Alla-setti.

The badly-damaged Paebettu (Udipi Taluk) inscription, dated in Saka 1246, Raktakshi = A.D. 1324-25, refers to the Mahapradhanas Sovappa-senabova and Singapa-sahapi and the halawu of hattu-kola-bali and records a gift of money by the king to the god Ksvaradeva.

Soyidova's inscription from Hosako, Coondapur Taluk, is dated Saka 1247, Raktakshi, Ashadha su. 7, Thursday = A.D. 1324, June 22, F.D.T. 66. This much damaged records mentions the Mahapradhanas Sovappasenabova and Singapa-sahapi and Vijhapa, the bahattara-niyagi and records some grant made by them.

An inscription from Paquvari, Coondapur Taluk, dated
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in Śaka 1246, Raktākshi, Śīśa 17, Wednesday = A.D. 1324, August 14, Tuesday (and not Wednesday), mentions Mahāpradāna Sovappa-sena and Lōki-yāḍaha, the aḥikārī of Bayidura-nāgu and records a gift of land to the god Sōmanathadēva. Bayidura-nāgu was the region around the modern village of Bayīdūru in Coondapur Taluk. While narrating the boundaries of the gift land, the inscription refers to the land (hāju) of Dātu-nāyaka of the lineage (haḷi) of the Tōlahas. The rise of the Tōlahas into a minor ruling family during the later Vijayanagara period and after has been noticed earlier in this chapter.

Another inscription from Kāp, Udīpi Taluk, dated in Śaka 1247 (wrong for 1246), Raktākshi, Kanyā . . . = A.D. 1324, August-September, records some grant (details lost) made by the aṇga-kōla-haḷi and the bāhaktara-nīyōga.

Soyiḍēva's Mūḍa-niḍāmbūru (Udīpi Taluk) inscription is dated in the cyclic year Prabhava, Āśāṭha ha. 3, Karkaṭaka 9 (wrong for 11), Tuesday = A.D. 1327, July 3, Wednesday (and not Tuesday). It records a gift of land to the god Tārāguḍeṇḍaōa by Mahāpradāna Śīṅgapa-sāhāṇi, Boppapa-adhikārī, Koḍakala-nāyaka of Naḍapu and the āru.

The latest date for Soyidēva's reign is furnished by the Kuḍupu (Mangalore Taluq) inscription which is dated in the cyclic year Bhāva, Kumbha 22, Wednesday = A.D. 1335, February 15. This record gives the name of the king as Soyirāya and gives him, the three epithets, Pāṇḍva-Shakravartti,
To the period of Soyidéva's reign belong two other dated inscriptions from South Kanara. Of these, the Varânga (Karkala Taluk) inscription, dated in Saka 1254, Kângirasa, Mithuna su. 10 (i.e. Mithuna, Miśa-Jyesthha su. 10) Thursday = A.D. 1332, June 4 has been wrongly attributed to Soptisvararâya. The correct reading of the name, however, is Sövisvararâya and, therefore, the king mentioned in the record is none other that Soyidéva or Soyirâya. This record, which is badly worn out, gives the ruler epithets such as Pâḍita-Pâḍya, Pâḍya-Dhânañîya and arîrayabasvasānikara. It mentions the official sarvâdhikâri Narasingâ.

The other inscription is from Hiriyanga, also in the Karkala Taluk, and is dated Saka 1256, Bhâva, Phâlguna su. 5, Wednesday = A.D. 1334, February 9. This record refers itself to the universal reign (prithvi-râja) of Lokanâthadâvarasa who, while receiving imperial titles such as samasta-
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bhuvanśāra, Bhīṣṭhīvallabha, Mahārājaśhīráśa and Rāja-
dhīráśa and Rājaparamēśvara, also receives the feudatory
title Mahāmangalāśvara. Besides, he calls himself a devotee
of the Jaina preceptor Charukīrttipāṇḍitadeva who, according
to this record, was Ballāla-rāja chittā-chamatkāra (an ob-
ject of admiration for the Hoysaḷa emperor). Lōkānāthaśadēva
also receives epithets, typical of the Śantarās, such as
Paṭṭi-Pambucchāpuraśarādhiśvara, Mahākṣeravalsaśama, etc.,
clearly indicating that he belonged to the Śantarā dynasty.

It may, therefore, be concluded that Lōkānāthaśadēva was the then
ruling king of Sāntalīga-1000, the hereditary possession of
the Śantarās, and that he was a feudatory of the Hoysaḷa em-
peror who at that time was Ballāla III (A.D. 1291-1342).

It will be seen in the next chapter that by the date
of the Hiriyāṅgadī inscription, South Kanara had come to be
occupied by the Hoysaḷas. It is likely that Lōkānāthaśadēvarasa,
being a loyal feudatory of Ballāla III, was permitted to add the
Kārkaḷa region to his own principality of Sāntalīga-1000. His
reign over this region appears to have served as a fore-runner
for the establishment of the rule, over the Kārkaḷa terri-
tory, of the later Śantarās of Kaḷasa during the Vijayanagara
period. (See Chapter VI).

Sōyidēva's earliest known date falls in A.D. 1315 and
the latest in A.D. 1335. Since the earliest known date for
his successor falls in A.D. 1339, Sōyidēva may be deemed to
have reigned from about A.D. 1315 to 1335.
During the last years of his reign Soyidēva had to tolerate a second line of administration headed by the queen of Hoysaḷa Ballāḷa III. This Hoysaḷa invasion marked a turning point in the history of South Kanara which once and for ever came to lose its political isolation. When the Hoysaḷas were removed from the political arena, the Āḷupa kingdom did not regain its independence, but came to form a part of the empire of Vijayanagara. It is only meet that this important development in the history of South Kanara is delineated in a separate chapter.

The previous chapter contained a genealogical table of the early Āḷupas, upto Dattāḷupa I. Hereunder is given a table of succession for the rulers who reigned thereafter:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vimalāditya</th>
<th>(c. 370-390 A.D.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Āḷva Rāpanjaya</th>
<th>Dattāḷupa I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(c. 900-930 A.D.)</td>
<td>(c. 930-950 A.D.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kundavarma          Eñjaladēvi married to
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(c. 950-980 A.D.)</td>
<td>Chāgi Sāntara</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

121 The nature of relationship between the preceding and succeeding rulers is generally not stated in the epigraphs themselves. The vertical stroke in between two given names of rulers is intended to show only direct succession and not the
Jayasimha I  
(c. 980-1010 A.D.)

Chola Occupation  
(c. 1010-1020 A.D.)

---

Bankideva X = Biraladevi  
(c. 1020-1050 A.D.)

Maṅkabharasi married Šāntara Tailapadeva

Paṭṭiyodhya alias  
Āluvarasa V  
(c. 1050-1080 A.D.)

Pāṇḍya Paṭṭiyodhya alias Jayasimha II  
(c. 1080-1110 A.D.)

Kavi Āluṇḍra = Pāṇḍyamahādevi  
(c. 1110-1160 A.D.)

Kulasēkhara I = Jākalamādevi  
(c. 1160-1220 A.D.)

Kupḍapa (c. 1220-1230 A.D.)

relationship of father and son unless it has been so stated in the body of the thesis.
Vallabhadēva alias
Dattālupa-II married Paṭṭamahādēvi
(c. 1230-1250 A.D.)

|__________|

Vīra-Pāṇḍyadēva
(c. 1250-1275 A.D.)

|__________|

His queen
Ballaṁahādēvi
(c. 1275-1292 A.D.)

|__________|

Nāgaḍēvarasa
(c. 1290-1300 A.D.)

A Daughter

|__________|

Baṅkidēva II
(c. 1285-1315 A.D.)

|__________|

Sōyidēva
(c. 1315-1335 A.D.)