The earliest encounter between the forces of Hoysala Balla III and the Tuluva army is recorded in an inscription from Hangagavi, Honnali Taluk, Shimoga District. Dated in Saka 1240, Kājayuktī, Pushya su. 10, Monday = A.D. 1319, January 2, Tuesday (and not Monday), it records the death of Sangiya-nāyaka, son of Yibbarā-nāyaka, in a battle fought on behalf of the Hoysala ruler against Basavadeva, the ruler of Chandavura below the Ghats. The Hoysala forces were led by Sākya-sāhapi, the brother-in-law (mayuduna) of Baicheya-dappāyaka. The record says that before he was himself killed, Sangiya-nāyaka had successfully routed the Tuluva forces (Tuluvara kaḍisi).

Chandavura below the Ghats is the same as modern Chandavar, a village in the Honavar Taluk of North Kanara District. The above inscription clearly suggests that Basavadeva was assisted in the battle against the Hoysala forces by the ruler of the Tuluva country by which is meant the Klupa ruler. And in A.D. 1319 the Klupa throne was occupied by Soyideva. An inscription from Sirali near Bhatkal, also in the Honavar Taluk, throws interesting light in this regard. The record is in two parts, the first one dated in Saka 1225, Krōdhī,
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Chaitra su. 1, Monday = A.D. 1304, March 8, Sunday (and not Monday). It refers itself to the reign of Pāṇḍya-Chakravartti, arīrāva-basavasāṅkara Viরa-Ajāyīdēvarasa. The epithets are typical for the Āḷupas and Ajāyīdēvarasa was probably a prince of the family put in charge of the administration of the region around Sirāli by the then Āḷupa king, Baṅkidēva II.

That the Āḷupas of that period were in actual possession of the southern extremes of the North Kanara District is proved by the second part of the Sirāli inscription which, dated in the cyclic year Prajāpati, Mārgasira ba. Amāvāse, Saturday, Solar eclipse = A.D. 1331, November 30, refers itself to the reign of Sōyidēvarasa whose reign was discussed towards the end of the previous chapter. Basavadeva, the ruler of Chandāvara, was in all probability a feudatory of Āḷupa Sōyidēvarasa for the Hanagavaḍi inscription specifically declares that Sāṅgiya-nāyaka routed the army of the Tuḷava king (Tuḷava bala).

The Hanagavaḍi record thus furnishes the earliest recorded encounter between Ballāla III and Sōyidēva. The battle of Chandāvara was most probably fought by Ballāla as one in a chain of military expeditions meant to bolster up the prestige and power of the Hoysala empire which had suffered a distinct set-back as a result of his subjugation by the Muslim invader Malik Kafur. At any rate, epigraphical evidence shows that the Āḷupas neither lost in territory nor did they acknowledge Hoysala suzerainy as a result of this battle.
But, early in the fourth decade of the fourteenth century Ajavakheda lost its territorial independence, never again to retrieve it. Vira Ballāla III, whose long reign was remarkable for its many wars, thoroughly overran the Klupa kingdom and his inscriptions start appearing in South Kanara from A.D. 1333 side by side with those of other local rulers, including the Klupas.

The earliest inscriptions of Ballāla III as yet discovered in South Kanara is from Nīlāvara, Udipi Taluk and is dated Saka 1255, Āṅgirasa, Phālgupa ba. 10, Mīna 16, Thursday = A.D. 1333, March 11, f.d.t. 14. It records that in the presence of Chikkāyi-Tāyi, the senior crowned queen (Pañ-ṭada-piriy-arasi) of Āṇḍya-Chakravartti, arirāya basavasam-kara, rāya-gajāmukasa, Prahāpa-Chakravartti Hoyisapa Vīra Ballāla, while Mahāpradhāna Vayijappa-dappāyaka, Ajappa-sāhapi, all the pradhānas, the hāhattara-niyāgas and the araṇu-kōla-hali were in attendance, the body called Nīruvāra-14 made a gift of the taxes on a piece of land to the temple of Durgā-Bhagavati of Nīruvāra. Nāgarasa was made the administrator (atikāri) of the grant thus made.

Chikkāyi-Tāyi, who ruled over South Kanara in the name of her husband, is obviously a princess of the Klupa house. Berrett accuses Ballāla III, during his times the most powe-
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ful ruler in the south, of condescending to become one of the many husbands of Chikkāy-Tāyi who, according to him, must have married again and again as permitted by the aśīva-santāna or matriarchal law of succession! It has, however been pointed out above that the Ājupas do not appear to have adopted the aśīva-santāna system at any time during their existence as a royal family. The only instance we have in the long list of known Ājupa rulers is the reign of aśīva-Bānki-deva. Even here, his reign was only a challenge to those who had succeeded to the throne by the universal law of direct succession.

Another Hoysala inscription from Hosāla, Udipi Taluk, is dated Śaka 1255, Śrīmukha, Māgha ba. 14, Kumbha 10, Thursday = A.D. 1334, February 3. This record introduces Ballīa III, queen Chikkāy-Tāyi, Mahāpradhāna Vajjappa-dappāyaka and Ājappa-sāhapi in the same words as found in the Nīlavara inscription discussed above. Among those attending upon the queen are included herein, besides the bāhattaras-niyōga and the eraṭu-kōla-bali, Lōkanātha-dēva of the line (bali) of Dattaūva, Virupanāthadēva and the halaru of the mūrkaśëri of Bārakūru. The damaged portion of the inscription seems to record some grant made to the deity Vīsāvēsvara.

5 ARSIE., 1931-32, No. 262. The date given herein is, however, incorrect and incomplete.
We have shown towards the end of the previous chapter that an inscription from Hiriyangaḍi, Karkala Taluk, dated February 9, A.D. 1334, refers itself to the reign of Lōkanāṭhadēvarasa who, as indicated by the titles and epithets accorded to him in the record, belonged to the Sāntara family. He is obviously the same as the Lōkanāṭhadēva of the line of Dattāluva, referred to in the Hosaḷa inscription. His connection with the line of Dattāluva (c. 1230–1250 A.D.) may be explained by the suggestion that the latter may have given away in marriage one of his daughters to a Sāntara ruler and that Lōkanātha was one of the descendants of such an alliance. The Hiriyangaḍi inscription further states that Lōkanāṭhadēva's parents were Bommidēva and Siddalādevi. The absence of any records belonging to Bommidēva's reign in South Kanara itself suggests that he did not belong to the Tuḷu country.

The Bailūru (Udipi Taluk) inscription is dated Śaka 1257, Bhāva, Mīna 23, Friday = A.D. 1335, March 18, Saturday (and not Friday). This record also introduces Bāllāḷa III and his queen, whose name is spelt herein as Kikkāyi-Tayi, in terms identical with the records discussed above, and registers the grant of income from certain taxes to Vāsudēva-muḷiḷa by the queen in the presence of Mahāprachhāṇa Vaijappadātpayaka, the Nakhara-hāṇjamēṇa of Bārakuru, the araṇṭ-kōla-

---
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hali, all the pradhānas and the bāhattara-niyōgīa. The inscription also states that the tax-money thus granted was realised from the village of Bailūru as per rules of village administration (grāma-marīyāde).

It has been shown in the previous chapter that the Kulapa ruler Soyidēva's reign ended sometime in A.D. 1335. He, as well as his successor Kulasēkhara whose reign will be discussed below, ruled from Bārakakanyāpura. At the same time, inscriptions prove that Chikkāyī Tāyī also ruled over the Kulapa kingdom from the same city. It is, thus, obvious that the Kulapas, in order to minimise the devastating effects of Hoysāla occupation, had, to some extent, compromised with their status as the sole rulers of the Tulu country. This is only better proved by the presence of inscriptions belonging to the reigns of the Kulapa kings and Chikkāyī-Tāyī all over the Tulu country and, in some cases, in the same village too.

The next Hoysāla inscription is from Bārakurū itself and is dated Saka 1258, Dhatu, Vaiśākha su. 1, Māsha 19, Saturday = A.D. 1336, April 13. After introducing Ballūla III and his queen Kikkāyī-Tāyī in the usual phrases, it refers to Mahāpradhāna Vaiyājappa-dappāyaka and to the pradhēnika (ministership) of Ajāmā-sāhāpi. The inscription records

7. SII., VII, No. 312. The name of the queen has been wrongly read here as Kishpāyī-Tāyī.
the gift of land, by Sovappta and Bakapna, to the god Saumya-
deva and associates the three sajjis of mūrukāri and the 150
alama with the gift.

A much damaged inscription from Hatyaṅgaḍi, Coondapur
Taluk, records some grant (details lost) made by Ballāḷa III
to the god Ṛṣisvaradeva. Dated in Saka 1260, Isvara, Phāḷgūṇa...
... Thursday = A.D. 1338, February-March, this inscription
makes no reference to his queen Kikkāyi-Tāyi.

We may now turn our attention to the history of the
Ajnapas. When Sōyideva ended his reign in about A.D. 1335,
he was succeeded on the throne by Kulasēkharadēva Ṛipendra-
dēvarasa II whose earliest available inscription, from
Handāḍi, Udipi Taluk, is dated Saka 1261, Bahudhāṅya = A.D.
1339, January-March. This record gives Kulasēkhara, the
sovereign epithets Paṇḍava-Chakravartti and arirāya-zai-āṅkusa
and expressly states that he was ruling from his prin-
cipal palace at Bārakahanyāpura. This clearly proves that
like Sōyideva, Kulasēkhara also ruled as an independent
king even while Ballāḷa III was holding his sway over the
same kingdom through his queen Chikkāyi-Tāy. The inscrip-
tion records some grant to the god Sōmanāṭhadēva by all the
ministers (samasta-pradhānas) of Kulasēkhara.

The next inscription of Kulasēkhara, from Nīḷavara,
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Udipi Taluk, is dated as late as in Saka 1267, Tārapa, Mārgasira ba. 3, Vṛṣchika 27, Thursday = A.D. 1344, November 23, Tuesday (and not Thursday). This inscription records a gift of land by the king, in the presence of the samastapradhānas, to the goddess Bhagavati of Nūrvāra.

In between the Hanḍā and Mālavara inscription of Kulasṭkhara, we have one record belonging to the reign of Ballāla III. This record, from Mūḍabidure, Kārkaṭa Taluk, is dated in the cyclic year Vīshu, Makara 15, Thursday = A.D. 1342, January 10. It gives Ballāla III a long string of epithets such as saṃstā-bhuvana-vikhyāta, Sōma-kula-tīlaka, Pāṇḍya-Mahāśnādhirāja, Paramabhaṭṭāraka, Pāṇḍya-Chakravartti etc., and states that he was the son of Narasiṃha-aḍhīndra-dēvarasa (i.e. Narasiṃha III = A.D. 1254-1292). The inscription which specifies punishments for acts of violence in that region, was set up jointly by Hariyappa-dāppayaka, the brother-in-law (mayduṇa) of Māharājadhāna Dēvappa-dāppayaka, Māḍagaha, the son of Hosabaḍaḥa, the Āṭikārī Dēvati-śiva, the six ballāḥus of Sālike, the five horahinavaṇu, the eight saṭṭhas of Bīdīre-nagarā, the four ajamats, the araḍu-kōla-bāḷi, the nāgu and the nakara.

While the above inscription makes no reference to Ballāla III's queen Chīkkāyī-Tāyī, an inscription from Māḷaḍupu, Udipi Taluk, dated in Saka 1265, Tārapa, Pushya su.1., Dhanus 9, Monday = A.D. 1344, December 6, makes no mention of...
Balla Jā III and, on the other hand, refers itself to the reign of queen Chikkāyī-Tāyi and her son (avara-kumāra) Kulasekharadeva. The reason for the absence of Ballāla III’s name in the inscription is obvious. Ballāla had been most cruelly put to death by the Muhammadans at Madura on the 8th of September, 1342.

Though, with the death of Ballāla III, the Hoysala empire itself ceased to exist, his queen Chikkāyī-Tāyi’s sway over South Kanara continued uninterrupted. The Mēlaṭupu record gives to Chikkāyī-Tāyi, for the first time, all the sovereign Ājupa epithets which had hitherto been borne by her deceased husband: Pāṇḍya-Chakravartti, arirāya-hasava-saṅkara and Rāya-gai-āṅkusa. The record refers to the joint rule of the queen and her son though the latter receives no epithets whatever. The inscription then mentions their subordinate Vīra-Lōkanātha-devarasa who receives a string of epithets such as para-nāri-sahōḍara, Rāya-murāri and para-bala-sādhaṇa. This inscription thus reveals two important facts, namely that, at the death of her husband, queen Chikkāyī-Tāyi made her son Kulasekhara a joint ruler and that Lōkanātha-devarasa, though given imperial titles in the Hiriyangaḍi record discussed above, was only a feudatory of Hoysala Ballāla III and later of his queen and son. The inscription, which is
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badly worn out in parts, seems to record gifts of land.

The latest available inscription of Chikkayi-Rayi, from Kanyana, Coondapur Taluk, is dated in the Cyclic year Sarvadhari, Mithuna 11, Friday = A.D. 1348, June 6. This indifferently engraved record confers on the queen the usual epithets of Parigya-Chakravartti, ariraya-basaya-sankara and Raya-gaj-mukasa and mentions her son (kumara) whose name is very illegibly engraved. It is, however, likely that he was Kulasakhara, already mentioned in the Maladupu inscription. The record registers a grant of land by the queen to a certain Appa-hebbaruva.

The destruction of the Hoysala empire did not result in a vacuum but heralded the rise, on its very ruins, of another power, that of Vijayanagar, the like of which the south had never seen before. Harihara I, one of the founders and the first of its rulers, had started the kingdom on a humble note in A.D. 1336. At that time, the kingdom of Vijayanagara lay only over a part of the defunct Hoysala empire. It is well known that the urgent need for a united stand by the Hindu powers against the merciless onslaughts of the Muslim invaders contributed to the rapid growth, in strength and in territory, of the Vijayanagara empire without much military exertions on the part of its rulers. Within a decade of the founding of Vijayanagara (1336 A.D.), the Tulu country also fell in line and became, thereafter, a permanent part of the empire.

15 ARSIE, 1930-31, No. 360. The tithi 11 has not been read in this report.
We have no means of determining whether a show of force on the part of Vijayanagara was necessary for the final annexation of Tujuva. While the inscriptions of the Ajupas, as will be seen below, continue to display the political and administrative independence of those rulers right till the end, queen Chikkāyi-Tāyi appears to have acknowledged the suzerainty of the Vijayanagara emperors. This is learnt from an inscription from Śrīṅgēri, Kadur District, Mysore State, dated in Śaka 1268, Pārthiva, Pālguna ba. 1, Thursday = A.D. 1346, March 9, in the reign of Harihara I. This epigraph, after recording gifts to Bharatiṅirtha-sripāda and his disciples, also records the gift of villages to the parichārakas of the same ascetic, by Pāṇḍya-Chakravartti, ariya-basava-śāhkara, Rāya-gai-Aṅkuṣa Vīra-Kikkāyi-Tāyi. The villages thus granted were situated in the Sāntaliga-nādu, thus revealing for the first time that Chikkāyi-Tāyi's sway extended even beyond the Ghats into the territory of the Sāntaras.

We have shown above that the latest available date for Chikkāyi-Tāyi's reign is furnished by the Kanyāna record. Hoysala Ballāla III, who had annexed Tujuva in about A.D. 1333, to which year his earliest inscription from South Kanara belongs, ruled over the region till his death in A.D. 1342. His queen Chikkāyi-Tāyi, who had been associated with him right from the start of his sway over South Kanara, ruled in all probability up to about A.D. 1350. Their son Kulāṣa-khara to whose joint reign the Mēlaḍupu (A.D. 1344) and, perhaps, the Kanyāna (A.D. 1348) inscriptions make a reference, is not

heard of again. It is, therefore, likely that he did not continue to rule after the decease of his mother.

It was made obvious in the chapters above that the Tuju country was subjected to invasions from outside, though only occasionally. Epigraphical evidence shows that the Ajupas acknowledged the suzerainty, though only for brief periods and, then again, half-heartedly, of the early Kadambas, Badami Chalukyas, Pallavas of Kānchi, the Rāṣṭrakūṭas and the Chalukyas of Kalyāṇa. We had seen that the Chōlas had for a brief period in the eleventh century occupied the Ajupa kingdom and that the Hoysalas had carried their arms into Āḷuvakīhēga more than once under Viśṇuvardhana. While these invasions were in the nature of mere raids and failed to have any lasting effect upon South Kanara, the invasion by Ballāla III proved to be of an entirely different nature. Though he permitted the ancient Ajupa family to continue its independent sway over Āḷuvakīhēga, he made the region a part of his empire and established a second line of administration, run by his queen Chikkāyī-Tāyi with the assistance of generals and ministers. The most important of these was Mahāpradhāna Vaiyappadappāyaka who figures in the Hoysaḷa inscriptions of South Kanara from A.D. 1333 to 1336. He and Ajāṃa-sāhapi, who was one of the ministers (pradhāṇa) of Chikkāyī-Tāyi must have helped in the establishment of Hoysaḷa power over the Ajupa territory.

At least one record informs us that Ballāla III stationed a standing army at the capital city of Bārahakanyāpura (Bāra-
This inscription is from Aladahalli, Arsikere Taluq, Hassan District, Mysore state and is dated Saka 1161 (wrong for 1261), Bahudhanya, Vaisakha su. 2, Wednesday = A.D. 1338 April 22. From this record, we learn that, at the given date, Ballalā III was on a visit to his military establishments at Bārakuru (Ballalā-dēvaru Bārakuru-dāminda hiyaṁ gayum etc.). More than any other evidence, this epigraph clearly shows that Ballalā III's invasion of South Kānara was not a mere raid but resulted in the annexation of the territory to his own empire.

The Last Āḷupā Rulers

We may once again turn our attention to the history of the Āḷupas. The Handagi and Nīlāvara inscriptions of Kulasekhara, who succeeded Sōydeva in about A.D. 1335, were discussed above. They are dated respectively in A.D. 1339 and 1344.

Kulasekhara's inscription from Kumrugōdu, Udipi Taluk, is dated Saka 1267, Pārthiva, Āsvayuja su. 10, Tula 7, Thursday = A.D. 1345, October 6. The king receives herein the epithets Pāṇḍya-Chakravarti, aritiya-bhāsavī-sāṅkara and Rāya-gaj-iṅkusa and is stated to be ruling from his principal...
palace at Barakuru. The inscription records a gift of land to one Parapali-nayaka, made by the king accompanied by all his ministers (samasta-pradhanas) and Narapanayaka.

Another inscription from Handadi, Udipi Taluk, which furnishes the latest known date from Kulasekhara's reign, is dated Saka 1267, Parthiya, Phalguna ba. 6, Mina 9, Tuesday = A.D. 1346, March 14. The king is given the usual epithets and is stated to be ruling from Barakuru. The inscription records a gift of land by the samasta-pradhanas and others to one Amra-OrambaJLi and ends with Kulasekhara's signature.

During the closing years of Kulasekhara III's reign and during the reigns of his successors, South Kanara had come under the rule of Vijayanagara emperors. But while the Hoysala queen became a subordinate of the Vijayanagara emperors, inscriptions of the Alupas reveal that they continued to enjoy the same amount of political and administrative independence as in the days of Hoysala Ballala III. Because of this and also in order to avoid confusion in the narrative, it is proposed to discuss hereunder reigns which succeeded that of Kulasekhara II instead of studying this period of Alupa history as part of South Kanara's history under Vijayanagara.

The latest available inscription of Kulasekhara II, discussed above, and the earliest available inscription of his successor to be discussed below, both belong to A.D. 1246. Kulasekhara II, therefore, reigned from A.D. 1335 to 1346.

19 Ibid., No. 603.
According to Saletore Kulasekhara II was succeeded by 
Vīra-Pāpyadēva II. In order to substantiate this view, 
Saletore assigns four stone inscriptions to the reign of Vīra-
Pāpyadēva. The earliest of these is from Brahmāvara, Udipi 
Taluk and is dated Saka 1268, Vyaya, Mārgasirā su. 11, Satur-
day = A.D. 1346, November 25. But, as assumed by Saletore, 
this record does not refer itself to the reign of Vīra-
Pāpyadēva but to that of Vīra-Pāpya-Dhananīaya Bankidēva 
Nīpāndrādevarasa. It is, thus, obvious that Kulasekhara's 
successor was Bankidēva III. The grant portion of the ins-
cription is badly worn out but seems to record a gift of 
land.

The second inscription which Saletore assigns to the 
reign of Vīra-Pāpyadēva, is from Śrīnēri and has already 
been discussed while writing on the reign of Chikkāyi-Tāyi, 
queen of Ballāja III. This inscription does not re-
fer to any Vīra-Pāpyadēva, and the epithets Pāpya-Chakra-
varṣiti, añfrāya-hāsa-Rākṣa and Rāya-sai-ākūsa are applied 
to Kikkāyi-Tāyi herself. We have shown above that this queen 
receives these epithets in her inscriptions from South Kanara. 
Saletore also makes the wrong statement that Kikkāyi-Tāyi was 
the queen of Vīra-Pāpyadēva whereas she was the queen of 
Ballāja III.

The third inscription attributed to Vīra-Pāpyadēva
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is from Mangalore. The correct reading of the date given in this record is S 1281, Vikāri, Mina 1, Sunday = A.D. 1359, February 24. The rest of the record is so badly worn out that it has not been possible to make out the name of any king.

The fourth inscription from Attavara, Mangalore Taluk, is dated Saka 1288, Parābhava, Mesha 10, Thursday = A.D. 1366, April 4, Saturday (and not Thursday). This record makes no mention of any reigning king but refers to a grant made in ancient days (ādi-kāladalu) by king Kulasekhara.

It is thus obvious that Kulasekhara II was succeeded by Bankidēva of the Brahmāvara inscription. No other records of his reign have come down to us. The earliest available record of his successor Kulasekhara III belongs to the end of A.D. 1355. Bankidēva II may, therefore, be considered to have reigned from A.D. 1346 to 1355.

The earliest inscription of Kulasekhara III is from Handādi, Udupi Taluk, and is dated Saka 1277, Manmatha, Dhanu 27, Thursday = A.D. 1355, December 24. The king is given the epithets Pāṇḍya-Chakravarti, arirāya-bhasava-Sāṅkara and Rāya-gaj-āṇkusa and is stated to be ruling from Pārakūra. It refers to one Vālavarasa and the samastas-pradhānasa and records a gift of land by the king.

24 Ibid., No. 178.
The only other inscription belonging to the reign of Kulasëkhara III is from Mûgabidure, Karkala Taluk, and is dated Saka 1306, Kali 4484 (other details of date are lost) A.D. 1383-84. This inscription endows the ruler with sovereign titles such as saṃasta-bhuvana-vikhyāta, Pâppya mahâraja-hirâla, Paramásvara and Parama-bhâttâraka. This record further informs us that the king was seated on his jewelled throne at Bidire (i.e. Mûgabidure) and that he was a worshipper at the feet of the Jaina pontiff Charukirttideva.

Kulasëkhara III may have ruled from A.D. 1355 to about 1390. He was in all probability succeeded by Vîra-Pâpşyadeva II who is, however, mentioned in his only available inscription without the usual dynastic appellation Jûpañârâ. This inscription from Mûgabidure, dated in Saka 1318 (expired), gives the king all the sovereign titles which his predecessor had borne in the record discussed above, thus making it certain that Vîra-Pâpşyadeva belonged to the Jûpa dynasty. It records a grant of land made to the goddess Durgeđâvi.

According to Saleatore one Vîra-Pâpşyadeva III ruled from A.D. 1397 to 1441 and was succeed by one Vîra-Kulasëkhara-di-eva IV for whom he gives the dates 1441-44 A.D. Saleatore
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27 Ibid., No. 221
makes out this theory on the strength of two inscriptions one from Mügabiduré and the other from Mangalore. It has been shown above that both these records belong to the reign of Kulasākhara I who ruled from about 1160 A.D. to 1220 A.D.

Vira-Pápyadéva II is therefore the last of the known Ájupa rulers and his Mügabiduré inscription belonging to A.D. 1397, and discussed above, is the latest Ájupa inscription which has as yet been brought to light. It may be concluded from this that the ancient house of the Ájupas had met with its end by 1400 A.D.

We had seen above that though the Western Chālukyas of Badami, the Rashtrakūtas, the Pallavas, the Chālukyas of Kālīyāna, the Cholas and the Hoysalas had thrust their power on the Ájupas, the latter had always maintained their political independence during their long sway over the Tuju country. But, in the fourteenth century, the conqueror in the form of Hoysala Ballāla III, came to stay as a ruler of the Ájupa kingdom. Again, towards the end of the first half of that century, the Ájupa kingdom was subjected to the power of Vīṣṇuāhagara. Actually, though only for a brief period, South Kāñcārā was simultaneously ruled by three powers, those of the Ájupas,
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of the Hoysala queen Chikkāyi-Tāyi and of Vijayanagara. It is
a tribute to the diplomatic skill of the Āḷupas that they
succeeded in maintaining their throne at Bārakūru side by side
with those of the Hoysalas and Vijayanagara. A comparative
assessment of the political power which the Āḷupas wielded
during this period will be brought to light in the chapter to
follow.

The previous chapter contained, at the end, a genea-
logical tree from Vimalāditya (c. 870-900 A.D.) to Sāyidēva
(c. 1315-1334 A.D.). The genealogical table of the rulers
who followed is given below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Āḷupa</th>
<th>Hoysala</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sāyidēva</td>
<td>Chikkāyi Tāyi m. Ballāla III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c. 1315-1335 A.D.)</td>
<td>(A.D. 1333-1348)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kulāssēkhara II</td>
<td>Chikkāyi Tāyi m. Ballāla III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A.D. 1335-1346)</td>
<td>(A.D. 1333-1348)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bankīdēva III</td>
<td>Kulāssēkhara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A.D. 1346-1355)</td>
<td>(A.D. 1344-1348)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kulāssēkhara III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A.D. 1355-1390)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vīra-Pāṇḍyadēva II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c. A.D. 1390-1400)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>