The Mahākūṭa pillar inscription, already referred to, of the Badami Chālukya king Maṅgāḷaśa (597/8-609/10 A.D.), dated in 602 A.D., states that his predecessor and elder brother Puru-Rapaparākrama (i.e. Kīrttivarman I who ruled from 566/7 A.D. to 597/8 A.D.) conquered, besides many other countries, Kūka and Vaiṣṇavaṇṭī. In the course of editing this important record, Fleet observed that Kūka 'may possibly denote the Nāgas, who in early times were powerful in the more western parts of the country that became included in the Chalukya dominions.' Fleet based his above interpretation on the fact that Kūka occurs as an epithet of Śeṣha, the chief of the serpent race. Elsewhere Fleet even went as far as to suggest the possible identity of Kūka with the Nāgarakhaṇḍa division which, as early as in the Baṅgalavīva inscription of Chālukya Vinayāditya (681-696 A.D.), occurs in its Prākṛt form as Nāyaṛkaṇḍa and formed a part of the Banavāsi province. These suggestions of Fleet are not acceptable for more than one reason. Firstly, it will have to be explained why in a list which gives the most widely used names of all the other countries conquered by Kīrttivarman, the little used epithet of Śeṣha, Kūka, is employed to denote a country of the Nāgas and, among them, the

1. Ind. Ant., Vol. XIX, pp. 14-15
Nägarakhaṇḍa division, which only formed a part of the Banavāsi province, was in the possession of the early Kadambas and must have naturally fallen to the Chālukyas at the time of Kṛttivarman's invasion of the Kadamba kingdom which is referred to in the Mahākūṭa pillar inscription as Vaijayantī (i.e. Banavāsi, the capital city of the Kadambas) and in the Aihoḷe inscription of Pulakēśin II, already referred to, by the name Kadamba itself. Secondly, records hailing from the Nägarakhaṇḍa region itself do not choose to associate the name of that territory with the epithet of Kūka.

Saletore rightly identified the Kūka of the inscription with the Kūpa kingdom and rulers of South Kanara. For doing so, however, he borrowed Fleet's equation of the Kūka to the Nāgas and, necessarily therefore, went to some length to suggest that the Kūpas were of Nāga origin. He says—"The Nāga origin of the Kūpas . . . . . is proved by two facts— the figure of a hooded serpent which is found in an effaced Kūpa stone inscription in the Gollara Gapapati temple at Mangalore, and the ultra-Saivite tendencies of which the Kūpas have given abundant proof in their inscriptions." The Kūpa inscription referred to by Saletore is dated in the early years of the fourteenth century and should not be utilised to fix the nature of origin of a family whose records start appearing at least from the middle of the seventh century A.D. Again a

4 Ancient Karnāṭaka, Vol. I, History of Tājuva, p. 60
5 Ibid., p. 61
6 ARSIE., 1901, No. 17.
perusal of the chapter on Tuluva Saivism by Sale tore himself clearly shows that the Ajupas were, by religion, Saivites but not ultra-Saivites.

On the other hand, what helps us to identify Ajuka with Ajupa is its mention side by side with Vaijayanti. Geographically, the kingdoms of the Kadambas and Ajupas were contiguous territories. They were, therefore, mentioned one after the other in the Mahakuta pillar inscription as they should be. The name Ajupa has many variations. The earliest occurrence of the name as Ajupa, which is obviously a Sanskritised form, is met with in the famous Aihole inscription of Pulakesin II, already referred to. It has already been pointed out that Ajapa of the Halmodi inscription may stand for Ajupa. In certain recensions of the Brahmapa and Yamana purapapas, the name of a country, people or dynasty is given, respectively, as Mika and Alaka. These names have been rightly identified with Ajupa. An early and perhaps more exact mention of the name as Ajupa occurs in the undated Vaddarse inscription of Ajuvavarasa which, on palaeographical grounds, belongs to the middle of the seventh century A.D. This form of the name appears to be more exact because we find it given in the record as the proper name of the king himself. It is interesting to note, in this connection, that the Padma-purapapa mentions the name of

---

7 Ep. Ind., Vol. VI, p. 6, text, line 7
8 D.C. Sircar: Geography of Ancient and Medieval India, p. 31 and note 2.
a people or country as Ayava. A variant of the form Ayva is Ayva as is found, for instance, in the name of the king Maramm-Ayvarasar. In a similar manner, Ayupa is sometimes written as Ayva, especially in the formation of the compound form Ayap-andra. Among all these variants, the form Ayva, by virtue of its occurrence in the earliest available inscription from South Kanara itself, is fit to be taken as the original and the most exact as against the rest. The other variants appear to have resulted from attempts at sanskritising what was originally of Dravidian origin, namely Ayva. This takes us to the etymology of the dynastic name Ayva, Ayva, Ajuka, Ajupa etc.

With reference to the name Ajupa, R.G. Bhandarkar observed - "The name of the royal family seems to be preserved in the name of the modern town of Alupai on the Malabar Coast." Hultsch rightly rejected this view when he said - "This is very improbable, because Aluvay (Alwye) is situated in Travancore, while the inscriptions of the Ajupas are found in South Kanara, Kaçur and Shimoga." In the same breath, Hultsch offered what even to-day appears to be the best explanation for the name Ayva-Ajupa in these words - "The original meaning

9 ARSIE., 1931-32, App. B, No. 296. It is being edited by me in the pages of Epigraphia Indica.

10 Padma-purāṇa, Vol. I, Chapter VI, verse 55
11 Ep. Ind., Vol. IX, p. 22 and plate
12 To quote only two instances, SII., Vol. IX, part I, Nos. 395 and 396.
of the word Šija or Šiva is probably 'a ruler', from the Dravidian root Īl 'to rule'." Salter's objections to this view stem from his wrong belief that the earliest variant of the name Šija is Šuka, of the Mahākūta pillar inscription, which is an epithet of Śesha. We have shown above that Šiva, as it occurs in the earliest epigraph from South Kanara itself, is the original form of the name and that Šija, Šuka etc. are variants resulting from attempts at Sanskritisation.

As to how this name came to be applied to the dynasty, we get no clues from the inscriptions themselves. The fact that at least four Šija kings had Šivarasa as their proper name seems to suggest the possibility of its having been the name of the originator of this family whose existence and career history has failed to record. In this regard the famous Saṅgama dynasty of Vijayanagara is an instance at hand. It may also be that Šiva represented the political status of the family at earlier periods. The parent Dravidian root, on which the name Šiva has been built, is Īl which becomes āl in Kannada by the addition of the characteristic euphonic vowel to the base. Kittel gives the following meanings for Īl=āl: a servant, a

16 A Kannada-English Dictionary (Mangalore, 1894), qv. Īl.
soldier, a messenger; to possess, to govern, to rule; manliness, bravery. The last two of the meanings given, being qualities in men, support the possibility of Ajuva having been the proper name of the family's originator. The rest speak of status and office. It may well be remembered in this context that the famous Pratihara dynasty of North India is known to have derived its name from the fact that earlier members of that family served as imperial door-keepers. Any final conclusion on the exact etymology of the name Ajuva = Alupa, as applied to the dynasty of South Kanara, will not, however, be possible in the absence of concrete epigraphical evidence.

To go back to the political history of the Alupas in the last quarter of the sixth century, we have seen that, according to the Mahakuta pillar inscription, Kirttivarman conquered Ajuka and Vaijayanti i.e. the Alupa kingdom and the Kadamba country. Whereas according to local traditions and the Halmidi inscription, the Tulu Country was under Kadamba Mayura-varma and his grandson Kakusthavarma respectively, the Mahakuta inscription, by its separate mention of Ajuka and Vaijayanti, clearly implies that the Alupas had by then become independent of the Kadamba power. No other source mentions the nature of relationship that existed between Kirttivarman and the Tulu country nor do we know the name of his Alupa contemporary.

Salotore, however, has suggested, on a mistaken premise, that the Alupa contemporary of Kirttivarman was Maramma Alvarasar. The mistaken premise is that the Udyyavara inscription of this Maramma Alvarasa is, from the language point of
study, as old as about 575 A.D. It will be shown below that this Udiyavara inscription belongs, on sound palaeographical grounds, not to about 575 A.D., but to the middle of the ninth century. The language of the inscription is only as archaic and its writing as late as two other inscriptions of this king, also from Udiyavara.

Subsequent history of the Chalukyas and the Ajupas shows that the conquest of the TuJu country by Kirttivarman was not in the form of a mere raid but resulted in the subordination of the Ajupa rulers to the imperial power at Badami. Though this Chalukya supremacy is not directly referred to for the reign of Kirttivarman's successor Mahgalesa, the recording of the former's conquest in the Mahakuta pillar inscription of the latter king clearly shows that the Ajupas continued their allegiance even in the subsequent reign.

The next reference to the Ajupas as the feudatories of

17 Raychaudhuri: Political History of Ancient India, p. 631, footnote 3.
19 SII., Vol. VII, No. 283. Saleatore's silence on the palaeography of the inscription in question leads us to believe that he had no opportunity to examine the writing either in situ or through estampages.
the Badami Chalukyas is to be found in the famous Aiho inscription of Pulakṣīn II (609/10-642 A.D.), already referred to. The nineteenth verse of this inscription reads—

\[
\text{Gaṅgā-Āḷupāndra-vyasaṇāṇi sapta} \\
\text{hitvā purāṇa-āśa-sampādāṇī} \\
\text{yasyānuḥbhāvā-āpanatāś-sad-āśaṃ} \\
\text{āśaṃ-śāvāṇita-pāṇa-saṃpādāḥ.} \\
\]

"Although in former days they had acquired happiness by renouncing the seven sins, the Gaṅga and Āḷupa lords, being subdued by His dignity, were always intoxicated by drinking the nectar of close attendance upon him." 

Though Saletore’s observations on this verse are vague, he seems to suggest that the Āḷupas ‘raised the banner of revolt against King Mangalēśa who was elsewhere preoccupied and that they had to be conquered afresh by Pulakṣīn II. This conclusion, however, is not warranted by the import of the above stanza. The actual implication of the claim that the ‘Gaṅgas and the Āḷupas were ALWAYS intoxicated by drinking the nectar of close attendance upon him’ appears to be that Pulakṣīn’s

21 *Ind. J.,* Vol. VI, pp. 5-6
22 *Ibid.,* p. 10. The translation is by F. Kielhorn, the editor of the inscription.
greatness and great prowess were enough to ensure the continued allegiance of the two royal houses. The claim made in the Harihar plates of Vinayāditya (681-696 A.D.), the grandson of Pulakēśin II, that the Ājupas were hereditary subordinates of the Chālukyas lends support to our view that Kīrttivarman’s conquest of the Tuḷa country resulted in permanent subjugation of its ruling house.

We may discuss here the problem of assigning the Maru-jiṟu copper-plate grant of the 8th year of a Satyāsraya-Prithvīvallabha. Engraved in 7th century Telugu-Kannada characters, the record, in corrupt Sanskrit, is of importance to early Ājupa history. It records a grant of the village Marupūra to a number of brāhmaṇas, by the emperor, for the sāṅkalpa-siddhi of the preceptor of the chief queen Kadamba-mahādevī and for the eternal merit of Ajukā-mahārāja who had gone all the way from Maṅgalapura to take upon himself the overlordship of Kallūra at the behest of the emperor.

For purposes of assigning this grant, the editor of the above record took into consideration only the reigns of Maṅgalaśa and Pulakēśin II and concluded, on the strength of the reference in the grant to the seizure of Pishṭapura by Satyāsraya-Prithvīvallabha, an achievement ascribed to Pulakēśin II in his famous Aihoḷe inscription, that the Marupūra grant belongs

24 Ind. Ant., Vol. VI, pp. 92-93.
25 Andhra Pradesh Govt. Archaeological Series, No. 6, pp. 11-39 and plates.
26 Ibid., pp. 16 ff.
to the reign of Pulakesin II only. Accordingly, he equated the
details of date given in the record, viz., year 8, Jyeshtha Amavasya,
Solar eclipse to A.D. 616, May 21, on which day there
was a solar eclipse. A.D. 616 was not, however, the 8th year
of Pulakesin II who is known to have ascended the throne in A.D.
609/10. The long discussion into which the editor enters in
order to remove this discrepancy is not convincing. Moreover,
Pulakesin II is taken to have reduced Pishṭapura only shortly
before A.D. 630-31, the date of his Koppāram plates. Also,
the earliest direct reference to his conquest of Pishṭapura
occurs only in his Alhoje inscription of A.D. 634-35.

On the other hand, the details of the above date given
in the Māruṭur grant, if referred to the reign of Pulakesin II's
son and successor Vikramāditya I, who ascended the throne in
A.D. 654-55, regularly correspond to A.D. 663, May 12. The
reference to the capture of Pishṭapura by Prīthvīvallabha may be
interpreted to mean that Vikramāditya I was obliged to re-
invade the territory after the kingdom of Pishṭapura had once
again declared its independence consequent on the death of Pulak-
esin II. Ājuka-mahārāja of this grant is, therefore, to be
identified with Ājuvarasa I.

At the violent end of Pulakesin II in 642 A.D. in the
course of the retaliatory invasion of his capital Vatāpi by his

29. Swamikannu Pillai: The Indian Ephemeris, Vol. I,
part I, p. 224.
Pallava contemporary Narasimhavarman I, thirteen years of darkness crept into Chalukya history. From the midst of that chaos, after years of struggle, the late emperor's son, Vikramaditya, rose in about 654-55 A.D. and attained to great power. To rebuild upon ruins is more difficult than to build anew. Even Vikramaditya, endowed as he was with imperial descent, proven bravery and unrelenting perseverance, could not have achieved this near-miracle of retrieving and rejuvenating a destroyed and disunited empire, lone-handed. On the basis of an inscription of the eleventh century from Nagar in the Shimoga district of Mysore State, it has been suggested that the Ganga

30 Ep. Carn., Vol. VIII, Nagar 35. This inscription belongs to the reign of the later Chalukya king Tribhuvanamalla Vikramaditya VI, and, incidentally, provides a detailed history of the Ganges. With reference to Durvinta this record states that he captured Kāduvetṭi (i.e. the Pallava king) on the field of battle, and set up his own daughter's son (i.e. Vikramaditya, the son of Pulakeśin II) in the hereditary kingdom of Jayasimha, (the founder of the Badami Chalukya line).

31 A History of South India, p. 145. Though objections to this view have been raised on the ground that the Nagar inscription is of a late date (See Karpāṭakada Ārasu-manetanagalu, pp. 141-42), the historicity of other traditional accounts contained in that inscription have nowhere been questioned. It must also be borne in mind that the interpretation which connects Ganga Durvinta with Vikramaditya fits well into the known political history of the Badami Chalukyas for the period
king Durvinita, the maternal grandfather of Vikramaditya, was one such helping hand. Though the inscriptions of Vikramaditya himself do not refer to the assistance rendered by any but his sword and his horse Chitrakaptha in the achievement of his success, it is not improbable that the Kujupas, besides the Gahgas, had a part to play in his triumph. For, as if in reward for this, and for no other convincing reason, we find the Kujupas in possession of the Kadamba-mandala in the second half of the seventh century. From Vikramaditya onwards, Kujupa history emerges from darkness and personalities and their approximate dates fall into firmer shapes. The Kujupa contemporary of Vikramaditya was Kujuarasas I.

We thus see that the first known name of an Kujupa contemporary of a Chalukya emperor, ever since the former were subjugated by Kirttivarman I, is Kujuarasas. However, Saletore, whose mistaken assignment of Maramma Kujurasas as the Kujupa contemporary of Kirttivarman I has already been referred to, picked up two other names from inscriptions and made them the contemporaries respectively of Mangalesa and Pulakesin II, giving them his own names of Sakala Srimat Kujurasas and Kundavarasas. 32

32 The inscription of (Sakala Srimat) Kujurasas is from Udiyavara and is No. 96 of ASIE., 1901. It is published in Vol. VII, under No. 279. As will be shown below, it belongs to the first half of the eighth century on grounds of palaeography. Saletore got the name of Kundavarmarasas, supposed by him to have been the son of (Sakala Srimat) Kujurasas and father of Kujurasas I.
It will be shown in the pages to come that the former, whose proper name was actually Aluvars±, Sakala-srimat being only an honorific phrase, was an Alupa ruler of the eighth century and that Kundavarmarasa, whom Saletore considered, further, to have been the father of Aluvarasa I, was not a member of the Alupa dynasty but was only an official serving under Aluvarasa I.

**Aluvarasa I**

33

The earliest inscription from the territory over which the Alupas ruled the longest, namely South Kanara, belongs to the reign of Aluvarasa I. This inscription is found engraved on a stone-slab of very irregular shape kept in the prakāra of the Mahālingesvara temple at Vadjlrse in the Udipi Taluk. The record is in early Kannada characters and language. It is not dated but could be assigned to the middle of the seventh century on grounds of palaeography which agrees by and large with the palaeography of similar records of the same period. Archaic forms of ra, ya, la and ka are particularly helpful in assigning this inscription to the middle of the seventh century.

The primary importance of this record lies in the fact from an inscription from Kigga in the Koppa Taluk of Kadur district, Mysore State. This has been published in *Ep. Carn.*, Vol. VI as Kp. 38 by B.L. Rice whose wrong reading of a passage, which will be discussed below, led to Saletore's error.

that it is the earliest as yet discovered inscription from South Kanara. The inscription, which is in many places badly worn out and which begins with the statement that it was written by one Kanakasiva, refers itself to the reign of Ājuvarasa who is not given in the record any titles and epithets but only the honorific śrīmatu. It further states that in Ājuvarasa's kingdom (= Ājuvarasarā rājya-vāyuḥā) which may also mean 'during the reign of Ājuvarasa'), while Kandavarmarasa's trusted servant Gupḍappa was administering the division (rāptu muddīma kaya) and while Sattigāri was administering... banna, Aṣakappa was holding the rights of cultivation over the cultivable lands in Vaḍḍaraṇ. Beyond this the writing is badly worn out and damaged and the text is readable only in parts but this much could be discerned that 17 kaṅchu and 1 kāl-gaṅchu (of money) were granted, on the orders of Chiriyappa and Gupḍappa, for expenses towards the feeding of 17 brahmāṇas. The inscription also records the grant of some land, all details pertaining to this being lost. Some wet-land in the village of Naggepāḍi was also granted, perhaps to an inhabitant of that village (Naggepāḍiyān), and the donee appears to have been exempted from paying one tenth of the gross produce of the gifted land as tax.

Ājuvarasa, to whose reign this inscription belongs, is also known from another undated inscription from Kigga in the Koppa Taluk of Kadur district, Mysore State. The historical portion of this inscription reads -

When Áju-arasa, who had the second name of Gunasagara, was ruling over the Kadambamandala and during the headmanship (mudime) of Kundavarmmarasa, Ájuvarasa (his queen) Mahadevi and Chitravahana granted in confirmation the earlier grants to the god of Kilgana free of all imposts.

Like the Vajjharase inscription, this record also is not dated but could be assigned on grounds of palaeography to about 680 A.D. The name of the king and the palaeography of the Vajjharase and Kigga inscriptions are strong enough grounds for concluding that the two records belong to the reign of one and the same Ájuvarasa. The confirmation of this identification, as also the nature of relationship between Ájuvarasa and Chitravahana, are found in the Sorab Copper plate grant of Chalukya Vinayaditya. This grant, issued in 632 A.D., records the gift of the village Sālivoge to the brahmāna Divakarasarman by the emperor Vinayaditya at the request of Chitravahana-mahārāja, the son of Gupasa-
gara-Ajupendra (Gunasagar-Ajupendra-atma-sri-Chitravaha-maharaja-vijnapanaya). Chitravaha-maharaja of the S0rab plates being undoubtedly the same as Chitravahan of the Kigga inscription, his father Gunasagara Ajupendra could be none other than the Ajuvarsa of the Vaddarse and Kigga records.

While editing the Kigga inscription, B.L. Rice committed the error of reading the passage 'Kundavarmanarasam mudime geya' as 'Kundavarmanarasam mudime-gaya' and accordingly translated it as 'on Kundavarmanara coming to his end'. Naturally enough Moraes and Salotore made Kundavarmanara the predecessor and father of Ajuvarsa. The former even went as far as to suggest that Kundavarmanara 'became the vassal of Chalukya Pulikesi II and was appointed by him to rule over the Kadamba-mandala or the Banavasi province.' The wrong reading of the passage concerning Kundavarmanara in the Kigga inscription, coupled with the destruction of the Banavasi Kadambas by Pulakesin II and the subsequent appearance of Ajuvarasa as the ruler of Kadamba-mandala had, no doubt, precipitated these wrong conclusions. If Kundavarmanara is accepted as the father of

36 Ep. Carm., Vol. VI, Translations, p. 82
37 The Kadamba Kula, p. 77
Ajjuvarasa and also as the first Ajupa ruler of Kadambamapdda, it will be difficult to explain how the Ajupas, on whom the Kadamba-maapda was bestowed by Pulakesin II, succeeded in keeping their hold upon that politically important territory for more than a decade of utter confusion, when the capital of their suzerains, Vatapi, was under the occupation of the victorious Pallavas.

The truth is, however, brought home by the correct reading of the above passage as "Kundavarvarasam mudme-gaya" (when Kundavarmarasa was the headman probably of the district around Kigga, the findspot of the inscription). The expression "mudme-gaya" in the sense of 'headmanship' is of common occurrence in inscriptions from South Kanara while "mudme-gaya" is entirely unknown even outside. It is thus obvious that Kundavarvarasa was only a subordinate official in charge of the administration of a district and that he was also alive at the time of the Kigga epigraph was engraved.

We may now study the extent of Ajjuvarasa's territorial possessions. From the provenance of the Vaḍḍarse inscription, we learn that he was the ruler of the Tuḷu country. Kigga, the

39 Strangely enough, in page 323 of Ep.Carn.,Vol.VI wherein the text of the Kigga inscription is given in Kamaḍa characters, the correct reading "mudme-gaya" is found printed! While editing some inscriptions of the Ajupas in Ep.Ind., Vol.IX, pp. 15 ff., Hultzsch gave in p. 21, note 3, the correct reading and interpretation of this text on the analogy of its Tamil equivalent 'nāṭṭu-mudumai'.
findspot of his other inscription, is a village in the Koppa Taluk of Kadur district. In later history, the region around Kigga came to be known as Sāntalige-1000 under the rule of the Sāntaras who had Pombuchchhapura (i.e. modern Humcha, Shimoga district) for their headquarters. It will be shown by and by that the Ālupas laid claims to authority over the Pombuchcha region for generations. The Kigga inscription states clearly that Āluvarasa was ruling over the Kadamba-maadala. Thus we find Āluvarasa holding sway over a fairly extensive area made up of the South Kanara district which, according to later inscriptions, was a 6000 division, the Sāntalige region which was a 1000 division and the Kadambamaadala also known as Banavāsi-40-12000.

It is interesting to note that both the Vajjarsæ and the Kigga inscriptions do not mention any over-lord of the Āluupa king. But Āluvarasa's rule over Kadamba-maadala as also the political career of his son Chitravāhana clearly show that Āluvarasa was closely connected with the house of Bādami Chālukyas. We have already suggested that Āluvarasa may have played an important role in Vikramaditya's struggles for the recovery of his lost empire. Perhaps, by virtue of his great services to Vikramaditya, Āluvarasa had earned for himself the position of an honoured though subordinate ally. 41

40 See map attached.

41 This conclusion is also amply confirmed by the fact, to be discussed hereafter, that Āluvarasa's son Chitravāhana was accepted for the hand of Kunkumādevi, the sister of Chālukya
The position of honour and importance held by Ājuvarasa I in the Chālukya empire is illustrated by the Marujṛti grant which, as has been shown above, was issued on the 12th of May, A.D. 663, in the 8th year of Vikramaditya I's reign. One of the two purposes of the grant, made by the emperor, was the invocation of eternal merit (akshayya-phala) upon Āluka-mahārāja who had travelled all the way from Maṅgalapura, at the risk of neglecting the enjoyment, administration and defence of his own district (sve-vishay-ōnabhōga-rakshana-viđhi-viđhāṇēṇy-āṇāyā) in order to oblige the emperor (mad-arthān). The emperor gratefully recollects the fact that Āluka-mahārāja had gone all the way from Maṅgalapura disregarding the ruggedness of the roads, the long duration of the journey and all the hazards which accompany such a travel (vishama-vikrisht-ādhvāṇa-pravāsa-pratyavāya-dukhān-āghanayan). Āluka-mahārāja went to Kallura in order to accept the overlordship of the region from the emperor.

We have already suggested the identity of Āluka-mahārāja with Ājuvarasa I. The kind references made in the grant to this ruler support our view that Ājuvarasa had earned the gratitude of Vikramaditya by helping him at a time of great stress.

The editor of the above record has wrongly identified Maṅgalapura with 'Maṅgalagiri near Krishpa river'. This place should be identified with Mangalore in South Kanara District, which was the capital of Ālувakēḍa during the reigns of Āļuvarasa I and Chitravāhana I. In fact, such an identification is suggested by the description of the difficulties of a travel from Vijayāditya.
Mangalapura across the Western Ghats to Kallura and Māṟupūra which have been located by the editor in the Guntur District of Andhra Pradesh.

We learn from this grant that Ājuvarasa had the title of Maharāja, a title indicative of subordination. Ājuvarasa's overlordship of Kallura could not have lasted long and must be taken only as an honour conferred on him by the emperor. That he did not stay on at Kallura is suggested by his Kīgga inscription which, because it mentions his son and successor Chitravāhana, should be referred to the last years of his reign.

We may now turn our attention to the probable dates and duration of Ājuvarasa's reign. Since the Vāḍārāsa inscription makes no reference to Ājuvarasa's rule over Kadamba-māṇḍala, it may be referred to a date prior to 654-55 A.D., when Vikramāditya successfully recovered the Chāluṇya throne and by virtue of which the kingdom of the Kadambas came under Āḷūpa sway. Ājuvarasa's reign, therefore, may be taken to have commenced in about 650 A.D., a date which stands supported by the palaeography of the Vāḍārāsa inscription. As for the upper limit of his reign-period, all that we definitely know now is that he was still ruling in A.D. 663, the date of the Māṟupūra grant and that his son Chitravāhana (mentioned as Chitravāha) had already succeeded him when the Sorab plates of Chāluṇya Vira-yaḍiya were issued in 692 A.D. However, the palaeography of Ājuvarasa's undated Kīgga inscription discussed above and his son Chitravāhana's undated record from the same place is the same and could be assigned to about 680 A.D., thus giving Ājuvarasa a
tentative reign period of thirty years. This would make Aju-
varasa the ruler of the Tuju country and the Pombuocha region
from about 650 A.D., and of Kadamba-mpaḍa from about 655 A.D.
to about 680 A.D.

Before proceeding to discuss the next reign, we may dis­
cuss in brief the personnel associated with Ajuvarasa. The
Kigga inscription reads in part 'Aju-arasam Mahādeviyaram
Chitravāhanarum' i.e. 'Ajuarasa, Mahādēvi and Chitravāhana.
Scholars who have given their attention to this inscription have
taken Mahādēvi to mean, the queen or the great queen of Ajuarasa.
Since, however, neither the king nor his son Chitravāhana receive
any titles and are simply mentioned by their names, Mahādēvi
obviously is the proper name of the queen of Ajuvarasa and the
mother of Chitravāhana.

The Vaḍḍarase inscriptions mentions one Satyādityarasa in
a context which is not clear. In view of the names Udayāditya,
Vigayāditya and Vimalāditya borne by some Ajupe kings of the
9th and 10th centuries, it is tempting to suggest that Satyā-
ditya was an Ajupe prince. No other available record of the
Ajupeas, however, mentions this name. The Vaḍḍarase inscription
also mentions a few subordinate officials. Of these, Gupḍappa
who is stated in the record to have been administering the nāma,
probably the district around Vaḍḍarase, the findspot of the ins­
cription, is described as the trusted servant (prāmaṇaya-ś).

---

42 Ep.Ind., Vol. IX, p. 16; The Kadamba Kula, p. 77;
Ancient Karnāṭaka Vol. I, History of Tuḷwa, p. 73
of Kandavararasa. We do not know what position Kandavararasa himself occupied in Ajuvarasa's kingdom. In its more damaged parts the inscription refers to the headmanship (mudime) of Pāduvaliya-nādu. The occurrence of the names of this nādu and Voḍarase (modern Voḍarse) in the same line with only a few completely damaged letters in between, leads to the belief that Pāduvaliya-nādu was the name of the district under Gupḍappa's headmanship (mudime). The name Sattigāri, borne by the headman of . banna is interesting. In later records Sattiga occurs as one of the colloquial forms of Satyasraya. Sattigāri would thus mean 'the enemy of Sattiga' (Satyasraya). Satyasraya being a popular Chāluuka epithet, the appearance of a Sattigāri as an official under Ajuvarasa, a friend if not a vassal of the Chāluukyas, is puzzling and cannot be explained in the present state of our knowledge. Sattigāri was the headman of a subdivision of the district called Pāduvaliya-nādu which was under Gupḍappa's administration. The name of the subdivision is damaged and only the letters banna could be made out from line 7. In line 15, however, immediately after the name of Sattigāri, occurs the word Banne which may be the name of the subdivision. In that case, Sattigāri was the headman of Banna or Banne. Line 16 of the inscription states that the grants were made on the orders of Chiriyappa and Gupḍappa. The latter may have been the same as Gupḍappa, the trusted servant of Kandavararasa and the headman of the nādu. The identity of Chiriyappa and the nature of his relationship to Gupḍappa are not discernible from the epigraph.
Another official mentioned in the record is Ajakappa who is stated therein to be the holder of the rights of cultivation over the cultivable lands of Vaładarase.

The Kigga inscription states that Kundavarmmarasa was the headman (of the district) during Ājuvarasa's rule over Kadamba-mappala. We have already stated that the region around Kigga, which later on became part of Sāntalige-1000 with Pombuchcha for its capital, was under Ājuvarasa's sway. Kundavarmanaruasa thus appears to have been administering the district around Kigga as a subordinate of Ājuvarasa I.

Ājuvarasa I was succeeded in about 680 A.D. by his son Chitravāhana I.

**Chitravāhana I**

We have already discussed the undated Kigga inscription which belongs to the reign of Ājuvarasa I and mentions his queen Mahādevī and their son Chitravāhana I. Another inscription from the same place, the writings in which are the same as in the former from the palaeographical point of view and, therefore, assignable to about 680 A.D., refers itself to the rule of Chitravāhana who is undoubtedly identical with his namesake mentioned in the other epigraph as the son of Ājuvarasa I. The first passage in this record reads "srīmācha-Chitravāhana Pombuchcha-āla", i.e. when the illustrious Chitravāhana was ruling over Pombuchcha. We have already pointed out that Pombuchcha, which is the same as modern Humcha in the Shimoga district, became in the 10th century the headquarters of Sāntalige-1000,
a division consisting of parts of the Shimoga and Kadur districts. While the inscription of Ājuvarasa shows him as ruling over Kadambamappala, that of Chitravāhana speaks of him as ruling over Pombuchcha i.e., the country around Pombuchcha which, as we have already pointed out, formed only a part of the former's territorial possessions at the zenith of his career. This statement in the inscription of Chitravāhana is difficult to explain in the present state of our knowledge. On the one hand, it could be interpreted to mean that Chitravāhana, who had by then succeeded Ājuvarasa at Banavāsi, went on a visit to Pombuchcha and, as would befit the occasion, caused the grant to be recorded on stone. In that case the statement in the inscription would merely mean that the Pombuchcha region was also under his sway. On the other hand, the implication may be that, while Ājuvarasa was ruling over his possessions from his headquarters at Banavāsi, his son Chitravāhana was in charge of the administration of the Pombuchcha region. Even if this were the case, in view of what we know regarding the further career of Chitravāhana, it must be conceded that his appointment as the ruler of Pombuchcha must have come off towards the very end of his father's reign and even while he was very young. The complete absence of any reference to the reign of his father in this record, however, leads to the belief that, in spite of the statement therein that he was ruling over Pombuchcha, Chitravāhana had succeeded to the throne of his father by the time the record at Kigga was written.

Ājuvarasa's close contacts with the imperial Chālukyās were left to be inferred from the fact of his rule over Kadamba-
mapdala and from the Maruturu grant of Vikramaditya I. Chitravāhana's records, barring the undated Kigga inscription, were all, on the other hand, issued by his imperial Chālukya contemporaries, and provide more direct information of the close contacts which characterised the relationship between the imperial rulers and the Ajupas.

The Kigga inscription discussed above states that when Chitravāhana was ruling over Pombuchcha and Nāgappa was serving as the adhikāri of Killa (or, Nāgappa of Killa was the adhikāri), it was stipulated that the paddy, cows' milk and the bullocks endowed to the temple of god Kilgāpesvāra were to be utilised by none but the attendants (of the temple itself). This stipulation and the curse, which follows, upon those who should flout it, suggest that the grants being enjoyed by the temple of Kilgāpesvāra had fallen into misuse.

Besides the undated Kigga inscription, three copper-plate grants, all of them issued by his Chālukya overlords, refer to the reign of Chitravāhana and also vouch for the importance of the Ajupa family in that period of Karpāṭaka history. We have suggested above that Chitravāhana may have ascended the Ajupa throne about 680 A.D. This would place the date of his accession towards the end of Chālukya Vikramaditya's reign. The earliest of the three copper-plate grants was, however, issued only in 692 A.D. in the reign of Vikramaditya's son Vinayāditya (A.D. 681-696). This grant from Sorab, already referred to

45 *Ind.Ant.*, Vol.XIX, pp. 146 ff. The date given in the record is Saka 614 (expired), 11th regnal year of Vinayāditya,
above, records the gift of the village Sālivoge to the brāhmaṇa Divākaraśarmaṇa by the emperor Vinayāditya at the request of Chitravāna-mahārāja, the son of Gupakāra-Ālupendra. The epithet Ālupendra which occurs for the first time in this record became the characteristic dynastic surname of the later Ālupas. Chitravāna being undoubtedly the same as Chitravāhana of the two undated Kīrga inscriptions, the title mahārāja, also borne by his father Ālupara I, is of interest in that only these two rulers of the Ālupa family are known to have had this title. The later Ālupas, as will be seen below, gave themselves high-sounding titles such as adhirājā-ṛāja and paramāśvara. The title mahārāja was in all probability conferred upon Ālupara I and Chitravāhana by the Gālukyas, with whom they entered into very close alliance, as a mark of honour and recognition.

The Sorab plates do not state in as many words that Chitravāhana was on that date the ruler of Kadamba-mañḍala. This fact, however, is easily arrived at by the statement contained in the grant portion of the record that the gift village Sālivoge was situated in the district (vishaya) of Egeolāl in the vicinity of Vaijayantipura (i.e. the ancient city of Banavasi, the headquarters of Banavasi-12000 or Kadamba-mañḍala). The relevant portion of the record reads - 'sri-Vaijayantipur-āpakapā mūravy-ottara-disāvām Egeolāl-nāma-vishaya Sālivoge-nāma-gramah . . . dattah'). The emperor was obviously on a visit to the Banavasi-

Dakshipāyaṇa-sākrānti, Rōhipī-nakṣatra, Saturday which, barring the nakṣatra given, corresponds to the 22nd of June, 692 A.D.
12000 division when he was requested by the ruler of the division, Chitravāhana, to make the grant recorded in the Sorab plates. The plates themselves state that on the date of the grant Vinayāditya was encamped in the village of Chitrāsedu in the Toramara-vishaya (Toramara-vishayā Chitrāsedu-grāmam-adhivasati[ sati]). Obviously Toramara-vishaya and Edevolal-vishaya were two subdivisions of Kadamba-mañgala and the villages Chitrāsedu and Sālivoge were not far removed from Banavāsi, the headquarters of Ajupa Chitravāhana.

The next Copper-plate grant in chronological order which refers to Chitravāhana is from Harihar and was issued in 694 A.D. by the same emperor Vinayāditya. It records the gift of the village Kirukagāmāsi situated in Edevolal-bhōga, a subdivision of Vanavāsi-mañgala, by the emperor, who was at that

46 The Kadamba Kula (p. 77) would have us believe that Edevolal was the hereditary district of Chitravāhana and that it was outside the Banavāsi province which was also under his rule. The expression Vanavāsi-mañgala Edevolal-bhōga occurring in line 28 of the Harihar plates of Vinayāditya, being discussed above, however clearly shows that Edevolal was only a subdivision within the Banavāsi province. As such Edevolal was not the hereditary district of the Ājupas but came under their sway when Kadambamañgala was bestowed upon them by the Bādami Chālukyas.


48 The details of the date given are Saka 616 (expired); regnal year 14, Kārttika, Paumppamāsi corresponding to A.D. 694, October 9.
time encamped in the village of Karanjapatra in the vicinity of Harāshapura, to the brāhmaṇa Isanasarman at the request of Kjūvarāja. The reference to the Ālupa chief merely as Kjūvarāja is of interest. Though Kjūvarāja is only the Sanskritised form of Kjūvarasa, the chief could not be identified, for obvious chronological reasons, with Gajasagara. His son Chitravāhana is apparently mentioned here by his dynastic surname. While in the Sorab plates he is given the title of Mahārāja, the Harihar plates refer to him merely as śrimat-Ālupa-varaṇa.

The eulogy of Vinayāditya, as given in the Harihar plates, makes a direct reference to the hereditary servitude of the Ālupas, a fact which could be inferred from the rule over Kadamba-maṇḍala of Kjūvarasa I and Chitravāhana and which is proved by the Maruṣūru grant discussed above, in these words — 'Pallava-Kalabhras-Kōralas-Haihaya-Vīḷas-Mālavas-Chōla-Pāṇḍya-Adyāh vān-Ālupa-Gaṅga-Adyāh=maṇulai=saṃma-bhṛityatān=niṭāh' i.e. 'By whom the Pallavas, the Kalabhras, the Kōralas, the Haihayas, the Vīḷas, the Mālavas, the Chōlas, the Pāṇḍyas and others were brought into a similar state of servitude with the Āluvas and the Gaṅgas who were hereditary servants'. We have seen above that the Gaṅga king and the Ālupāṇḍra (i.e. the Ālupa ruler whose name is not known) are referred to in the Aihoḷe inscription of Pulakesin II as subdued by the very dignity of the emperor. It could be safely read in between these two statements that the Ālupas, once conquered by Kīrttivarman I, continued their allegiance to the Chālukyas without a break.

The third copper-plate grant , from Shīrgan in the
Dharwar district, gives the latest date for the reign of Chitravāhana, having been issued in 707 A.D. in the reign of Vīnayāditya's son and successor Vijayāditya (A.D. 696-733/4). The contents of this record are important for the history of the Alupas and hence deserve to be studied in detail.

After giving the characteristic genealogical narrative of the Chālukyas and the date, the Shiggaon plates, in lines 31 to 41, read as follows:

Kiṣuvolal-nāma-sthānam-adhivasati vijaya-skandhāvarā
ālupōndram draśtum Vanavāsim-avātyati Vijayāditra-
vallabhōndrā āśādha-psurpaṃśayāṃ Pāṇḍy-āmalā-
kulaśaṃkūrvyvataḥ sakalā-lōka-vidita-mahāra-
bhāvasya ananya-sāhārana-tvāg-śada-sampat-samo-
udhrīta-nīrita-nistīmsa-saṅghāta-vitrasta-visīryamān-
āṃeka-ripu-upipti-matta-mātāṅga-saṅghāstasya Cha-
lukyā-rāju-abhiyuddhi-hetu-bhūtasya Chitravāhana-
narāṇdrasva viṣṇuṇanavā svā-hrīdaya-prahlādakārīnī-
hasti-rāth-ādy-ānkal-dāna-pradāna-nuras-sara-hiraya-
gārbh-āvabhṛta-smāna-pavitrīkṛta-sarīravā Kumkuma-
dēvā Purigere-nagarā kāritaṁ Jīna-bhavanam-uddīsya
nava-karma-khaṇḍa-sphūṭita-sāmskāra-dēva-pūjā-
dānasādī-ādi-dharmma-pravarttan-ārtthām sakal-
ārhat-samaya-tīlaka-śrī-Mūlasamśh-ōḍgha-Sūrasta-
dharmm-bhagā-sūpadesāṃ-gītāsamāna-satryāvāso
Guddigere-gramo dattah [[*]]

50 The details of the date given are Śaka 630 (expired),
Kisuvolal, the sthana where the king was encamped when he set out on his journey to Banavasi to see Ajupendra, is the same as Pattadakal in Hungund Taluk, Bijapur district and, as a crow flies, is over a hundred miles removed from Banavasi in Sirsi Taluk, North Kanara district. When we consider the proximity of the Chalukya capital Vatapi (i.e., Badami) and Pattadakal which are situated in the same Taluk of Hungund and when we consider the great distance between these two places on the one hand and Banavasi on the other, the inevitable conclusion is that the emperor's visit was not the casual result of his presence, for other reasons, in the vicinity of Banavasi but was because of the high standing Chitravahanana enjoyed in his relations with the Chalukyas. The importance of Chitravahanana is amply borne out by the passage in the Shiggaon plates, quoted above. This passage describes Chitravahanana as adorning the pure family of the Pandyas. In spite of the unhistorical legend of Bhuta-Pandya of Tuluva, regnal year 11, Ashadha, PauapamasI corresponding to A.D. 707 June 20, Monday.

51 A few minor errors which had crept into the original plates are ignored in this quotation which is given here with the necessary corrections.

52 The legend is contained in the Gramapaddhati of Tuluva which stands little proved by historical tests. Buchanan also records a tradition, which he calls as the Raya-paddhati, according to which the devils made Bhuta-Pandya Raya rule over Tuluva for forty-two years. The date given therein, however, for this
it is certain that the Ajupas did not owe their origin to the Pāṇḍyas. Though, as will be shown below, two Ajupa rulers, Pri-thivisāgara and Mārama, both of the ninth century, had the epithet Uttama-Pāṇḍya and, in still later times, the Ajupa kings adopted titles such as pandita-Pāṇḍya, Pāṇḍya-gaṇapati, Pāṇḍya-Chakravartin etc., one of the later kings even having the proper name of Vīrapāṇḍya-gaṇa, neither the available inscriptions of Ajumarasa I nor the other records belonging to or referring to the reign of Chitravāhana himself seek to associate the Ajupas with the Pāṇḍya lineage. Since Chitravāhana is the earliest of the known Ajupas to be connected with the Pāṇḍya-kula and since the Shiggaon plates are the first to do so, a resort to contemporary political history of the South may help us solve this Ajupa-Pāṇḍya puzzle.

The Veṇvikkudī copper-plate grant of the third year of the Pāṇḍya king Játila Paśāntaka Neśūnjaśāyana (c. 756-815 A.D.), in a passage relating to the martial achievements of his grand-

---

legendary king is Saka 1175 i.e. 1253-54 A.D.! For a detailed discussion on the merits and demerits of the legend of Bhutāja-Pāṇḍya, see Ancient Karnātaka, Vol. I, History of Tuluva, pp. 347 ff.

53 Ep. Ind., Vol. IX, pp. 22-23, Nos. VII and VIII.
54 See Chapter IV below on the Medieval Ajupas.
father Kōchchādaīyaṇ (c. 700-730 A.D.) says, among other things, "kōng-alaruṇ-nāgur-poliyyav=kuvilagu mayil-agavu=Maṅgalapuram-
annum maha-nagarun-Maḥārāṣṭharaṇ erind=alitt-agai-kādal-vāḷāram,
podu-moli agarri" i.e., 'at the great city called Maṅgalapura,
where the peacock danced with the cuckoo near tanks perfumed with
opening flowers, [Kōchchādaīyaṇ] attacked and destroyed the
Maḥārāṭhas (and thus) removed the word "common property" (with
reference to) the country (bordering) on the roaring seas'.

The great city (maha-nagara) of Maṅgalapuram has been
rightly identified with the modern city of Mangalore in South
Kanara district and is the same as the Maṅgalapura of the Māru-
ṭūru grant. This would mean that Kōchchādaīyaṇ carried his arms
right into the kingdom of the Āḷupas and was drawn into battle
by the Maḥārāṭhas at the city of Mangalore. Salātore mistook
the word Maḥārāṭha for Mārāṭa and sought to establish that
Kōchchādaīyaṇ encountered the forces of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas of
Māṇyakṛṣṭa at Maṅgalapura. This induced Salātore to make the
following remarks - ' . . . . in the reign of Prabhūtvariṣa
Gōvinda III, the Rāṣṭrakūṭa king, an Āḷupa feudatory was punish-
ished with the forfeiture of a part of his territory. The reason is
obvious: on the failure of the Āḷupa ruler (Chitrayāhana II) to
carry out the imperial order against Saḍaiyaṇ Rapadhīra (i.e.
Kōchchādaīyaṇ), the Rāṣṭrakūṭa viceroy, no doubt at the in-
stance of the emperor, became angry and sent a general against

56 Ibid., p. 301, text-lines 65-67
57 Ibid., p. 307
the Alupu king. These views are extremely mistaken and are not supported by the facts of known history.

The Veļvikkudi grant was issued in the reign of Neğiņajaļāiyan, the grandson of Kōcchādaiyaŋ, and is to be assigned, on grounds of palaeography, to the middle of the eighth century. What is more, the Anamalai inscription of Kali year 3871 (expired) gives for Neğiņajaļāiyan the date of 770 A.D., thus rendering Saletore’s date of 795-800 A.D. for the reign of his grandfather Kōcchādaiyaŋ an utter impossibility. Neğiņajaļāiyan (756-815 A.D.) himself, and not Kōcchādaiyaŋ as has been supposed by Saletore, was the Pāṇḍya contemporary of Gōvinda III (792-814 A.D.). Thus on grounds of the palaeography of the Veļvikkudi grant and the date of the Anamalai inscription, Kōcchādaiyaŋ should be considered as the contemporary, not of Raśṭrakūta Gōvinda III, but of Chālukya Vijayāditya (696-733/61 34 A.D.). The date of 700-730 A.D. given elsewhere for the reign-period of Kōcchādaiyaŋ suits the known history of the early Pāṇḍyas best. Thus the political exigencies which compelled Gōvinda III to expel Chitravāhana II from a part of the latter’s territories, which event is graphically depicted in an inscription from Mēvali, were not the ones given by Saletore and quoted above, but were entirely different as will be shown at the proper

---

59 The Pāṇḍya Kingdom, pp. 33 ff.
60 Ep. Ind., Vol. VIII, pp. 318 and 320
61 A History of South India, p. 163. Also see The Pāṇḍya Kingdom p. 41
place in this chapter below. It will be further shown that at the time of his requital by Govinda III, Chitravahana was not in possession of the Tulu country in which was situated the city of Mangalapura.

It thus becomes apparent that Kochchadaiyan defeated the maharathas at Mangalapura in the reign of Vijayaditya. The Alupas being the subordinate allies of the imperial Chalukyas, it is reasonable to suppose that the maharathas who faced the Pandyya invasion at Mangalore were the imperial Chalukya forces stationed in the Alupa kingdom for obvious political reasons. It is not improbable that, this battle having been fought in Alupa territory, Chitravahana had the occasion to exhibit his valour in effectively checking the progress of the Pandyya invader further deep into Tuluva and thereby into Chalukya territory. This may also explain why Kochchadaiyan did not leave behind any vestiges in Tuluva of this raid upto Mangalore. The reason why Vijayaditya himself makes no references to a war against the Pandyas may be because the Pandyya invasion did not involve the actual territories of the Chalukyas. This achievement on the part of Chitravahana I may have prompted the members of his family to associate themselves with the dynastic name of Pandyya as a mark of triumph and glory. The eulogy 'Chalukyavarati-abhiyuddhi-hatu-bhuta' i.e., 'he who was the cause for the prosperity of the Chalukya kingdom' according to Chitravahana in the passage from the Shiggaon copper-plate inscription quoted above, does indicate that he had rendered valuable service to the imperial house at a moment of stress. In the comparatively peaceful reign of Vijayaditya, it is difficult to think of another
exigency by the distinction obtained in facing which an otherwise petty chieftain like Chitravāhana could have brought upon himself such lofty praise.

As has been pointed out above, the Shiggaon plates are dated in 707 A.D. The Harihar plates of 694 A.D., issued in the previous reign, merely mention Chitravāhana I as Āluvarāja. Since the approximate year of Köchchādaiyān's accession was 700 A.D., it may be suggested that the battle of Mangalapura between Köchchādaiyān on the one side and Chitravāhana I and the Maharathas on the other may have been fought sometime between 700 and 707 A.D.

It has been suggested above that Chitravāhana I may have succeeded his father in about 680 A.D. This would mean that Chitravāhana had been ruling for over a quarter of a century at the time the Shiggaon plates were issued. His reign may have commenced at a date not far removed from the date of Vinayāditya's accession in 681 A.D. Records of the period crowd the fifteen years of Vinayāditya's reign with military expeditions against a number of enemy kings. Chitravāhana I may have earned the praise, accorded to him in the above quoted passage from the Shiggaon plates, that he destroyed with the help of his flashing sword the elephants of many an enemy king, by virtue of his having taken an active part in the wars of Vinayāditya.

The object of the Shiggaon plates is to register some grant made by emperor Vijayāditya at the time of his visit to Chitravāhana at Banavāsi, at the latter's request, to the Jaina monastery which was caused to be constructed by Kumkumadēvi at Puri-
Purigere is the same as modern Lakshmēśvar in Shirhatti Taluk, Dharwar District. Among the gifts made to the Jaina monastery was the village Gujjigere which is identical with modern Gujjigiri, about six miles to the west of Lakshmēśvar and situated in the same Taluk and District.

A Jain inscription in this village of Gujjigēri, dated in Saka 998 (expired), Anala = 1076-77 A.D., says - Chānlkya chakravartti-Vijayādityavallabh-śnijay-appa srimat-Κumkuma-mahā-devī Purigerevalu mājisid-Ānesejjēya-basadi i.e. 'the Ānesejje-śaṭā-śrāvastī-śālī caused to be constructed at Purigere by Kumkuma-mahādevī, the younger sister of the Chānlkya emperor Vijayāditya-vallabha'. We further learn from the same inscription that, on the authority of a copper-plate charter, the lands of Gujjigēri were under the control of the Ānesejje monastery built by Kumkuma-mahādevī. It may be concluded from these that the copper-charter was none other than the Shiggaon plates and that the Ānesejje monastery and Kumkuma-mahādevī, the sister of Vijayāditya, were identical with the monastery and its builder Kumkumadevi mentioned in the Shiggaon plates.

Immediately after referring to Chitravāhana's request to Vijayāditya (Chitravāhana-narāṇḍrasya-vijñāpananās), the Shiggaon plates allude to Kumkuma-mahādevī as svabhādāsa-prahlādanakāripi

63 Ind. Ant., Vol. XVIII, pp. 35 ff.
64 Ibid., p. 39, text-lines 20-21.
i.e. 'the delight to his heart'. From the context in which it occurs, this expression should be interpreted with reference to Chitravāhananarāṇḍra. In view of these facts, the learned editor of the Shiggaon plates observes - 'Since Vijayāditya was her brother and since the grant to the Jain monastery caused to be erected by her was made at the request of Chitravāhana, it is tempting to suggest that she might have been the wife of the Ālupa ruler Chitravāhana. The expression sva-hpidaya-prahlādana-kārīpyā applied to Kūmkumadevi in lines 36-37 (of the Shiggaon plates) might refer to Chitravāhana. Thus he might have been related to the king as brother-in-law. And the way in which Vijayāditya's visit to Banavāsi is described might lend further support to this view; cf. Ālupāṇḍra drashtum Vanaśāśīrāyaśa-vati Vijayāditya-wallābhāndrā in line 32. This suggests that the king had gone to Banavāsi as if to pay a courtesy visit to his brother-in-law and not in the capacity of an overlord'.

Thus we find Chitravāhana carrying the fame of the Ālupa dynasty to considerable heights not only by means of his political eminence but also by striking marital alliance with the imperial Chālukyas. In this connection, it may be suggested that the marriage of Chitravāhana with Kūmkumadevi must have been celebrated sometime after 694 A.D. at which date the Harīhar plates speak of Ālupa servitude to Vinayāditya who would have been more respectful towards the family of his son-in-law if Chitravāhana had been such at that date. If this is accepted, it will have

to be conceded, however, that Chitravahana was barely a boy when he succeeded his father in about 680 A.D.

The Shiggaon plates further eulogise that the great power of Chitravahana was known in all the worlds and that his incomparable munificence eclipsed the fame of all other generous men. As for his queen Kumkumadevi, the record says that her body was purified by the sacred bath at the hirtayagarbha sacrifice which was accompanied by numerous gifts of elephants and chariots.

Chitravahana I, like his father Gupasagara alias Ajuvarasa I, was a Saivite. His queen Kumkumadevi, on the other hand, caused to be constructed a Jaina monastery to which some grants were made at the request of her husband. The Shiggaon plates thus give us a glimpse into the spirit of tolerance which moderated the religious leanings of the rulers of those days.

As for Chitravahana's reign period, it has been suggested above that he may have succeeded his father at Banavasi in about 680 A.D. The latest known date for him, 707 A.D., is provided by the Shiggaon plates. If, as has been suggested, he was only a boy at the time of his succession, he may be taken to have ruled until about 730 A.D.

To this period of glory in Aلندا history belongs an undated inscription on a broken pillar planted in front of the Parameswari temple at Polali-Ammunaje, Mangalore Taluk. Beautifully engraved in Kannada characters of the 7th-8th century,
this inscription, which commences with the auspicious word *svasti*, consists of only one stanza in Sanskrit in the Anush-tubh metre. The verse reads -

srimatam vipula-vamsa-vasikita-mahabhujan
Papyyanam-ajupandrapam anyasa-santa-mataram

"The Seven Divine Mothers are the protectors of the illustrious Ajupandras, who attract (the friendship) of emperors because of the greatness of their family and who were (known as) Papyyas."

The reference to the Seven Divine mothers as the protectors of the Ajupas reminds one of the expression Sanka-matribhir-abhivarddhitam, usually found in the inscription of the Badami Chalukyas. The above dynastic eulogy was composed and engraved obviously at a time when the Ajupas were at the zenith of their power as a result of their close and friendly contacts with the imperial Chalukyas.

As for his territorial possessions, Chitravahana I does not appear to have added to those under his father, namely the native kingdom of the Ajupas (i.e. the South Kanara district), the Pombuchcha region and the Banavasi country.

**Note:** The stanza is metrically defective though— all the 8 syllables necessary for the Anush-tubh metre are present.
There is no direct evidence to show who succeeded Chitra-vahana and where and when. Strangely enough, the next dated record mentioning an Alupa ruler does not come from any of their three above mentioned territorial possessions but is from Mallam, a village in the Gudur Taluk of the Nellore District, in Andhra Pradesh. Another surprise in the record is that it refers itself to the reign of Nandivarman II (A.D. 731-95), a member of the imperial Pallava dynasty of Kanchi with which the Alupas do not appear to have had any contacts till then.

This is a stone inscription in Tamil and is dated in the fifteenth year of Nandippottarasar i.e., Pallava Nandivarman II. This ruler is known to have ascended the throne at Kanchi in about 731 A.D. The Mallam inscription would thus belong to about 745-46 A.D. The object of the record is to register some grant made by the Pallava king to god Subrahmanya of Tiruvannamalai in Peyiyur-ilangottam at the request of Aluvarasa when Chalukkiarasar was the executor (apatil). Tiruvannamalai is evidently the same as Mallam, the findspot of the inscription under study, and the division called Peyiyur-ilangottam in which the village was situated was, therefore, the region around Mallam itself.
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There is no doubt that Åjuvarasa of this inscription was the then ruling member of the Älupa family. In this connection, it is interesting to note that an undated Kannada inscription from Udiyavara in Udupi Taluk, South Kanara district, palaeographically assignable to the middle of the eighth century, refers itself to the reign of Åjuvarasa. It will not be far-fetched to identify this Åjuvarasa with his namesake of the Mallam Tamil inscription. Åjuvarasa was in all probability the son of Chitravähana and grandson of Gupasägara. He appears to have been named so after his grandfather Åjuvarasa I and hence will be designated Åjuvarasa II in the pages to follow.

Salezore rightly identified the Nandipottarasar of the Mallam inscription with the Pallava king Nandivarman II (731-735 A.D.) but mistook Åjuvarasar and the Äppati Chalukki-arasar to be none other than Chitravähana I (690-730 A.D.) and Vijayä-ditya Satyärsaya (626-733/34 A.D.) both of whom had ended their reigns years before the date of the Mallam inscription. On the other hand, the Mallam inscription belongs to a date which marked either the end of the reign of Vikramäditya II (733/34-744/45 A.D.) or the beginning of the reign of his son Kirttivarman II (744/45-755 A.D.). The provenance of the Mallam inscription and the presence of the Älupa ruler Åjuvarasa II in a village so far removed from the bounds of Åluvaikëga clearly suggest that the allegiance of the Äluvas had shifted from the house of the Bädami Chalukyas to that of the Pallavas sometime before the date of the record (i.e., 745-46 A.D.), most probably sometime in the closing years of the reign of Vikramäditya II. At any rate, it is un-

likely that the estrangement would have occurred during the reign of Chitravahana I who had married a princess of the Chalukya family. It may also be concluded that, as a result of this estrangement between the Kupas and their erstwhile overlords, the Chalukyas of Badami, the former were, once and forever, deprived of their sway over the Kadamba-mandala. On the basis of the Malavarti inscription of Rashtrakuta Govinda III, which has been already referred to and which is important for the reign succeeding that of Udayasena II, scholars have held that the Kupas vacated in the supremacy of the Western Chalukyas down to the days when the latter were expelled from the Karnataka regions by the Rashtrakutas and that the Kadamba-mandala remained in the possession of the Kupas even after the death of Ballaraja III (1291-1342 A.D.).
after the downfall of their overlords, the Western Chālukyas of Bāḍāmi.

The Māvali inscription states, in brief, that during the reign of Govinda III, while Rājāditya was the governor of Banavasi-12000, Chitravāhana, the ruler of Āluvakheda-6000, having proved disobedient, the enraged Kākarasa marched against him and reduced the fort of Pergguṇji. It is this statement which has been interpreted by Moraes to mean that Chitravāhana II who, as will be seen below, was the successor of Āluvarasa II, was driven out of Kadamba-maṇḍala. This, if accepted, would imply that Āluvarasa II was in continued possession of Kadamba-maṇḍala even as his predecessors, and would run contrary to the import of the Mallam inscription and the statement in the Māvali inscription itself that Rājāditya was the then governor of Kadamba-maṇḍala. Even if the Chālukyas were at that time a waning power, they were not so weak as to tolerate the sway, over the important territory of Kadamba-maṇḍala, of a subordinate of the Pallavas whose hereditary enmity for the Bāḍāmi house is only too well known. Moreover, the provenance of the Māvali inscription, as also its contents, clearly show that the battle of Pergguṇji was fought somewhere in the Pombuchcha region which had all along formed an integral part of the Āḷupa

72 Moraes: The Kadamba Kula, pp.78 and 81. In page 81, the author says - 'Under the Rāṣṭrakūṭas also it (i.e. the Kadamba-maṇḍala) continued to be governed by these chiefs (i.e. the Āḷupas) for well nigh half a century till about the year 800 A.D.'
The reasons for the attack on Chitravāhana II by Gōvinda III will be set forth while discussing the next reign. What concerns us here is the conclusion that the Āḷupas had lost Kadamba-maṇḍala by the date of the Malla inscription.

We have suggested above that Chitravāhana I may have ended his reign in about 730 A.D. This would place the date of Āḷuvarasa II’s accession in about the same year. As shown above, the reign of Āḷuvarasa II witnessed, on the one hand, the estrangement of the Āḷupas and the Chalukyas and the subsequent loss of Kadamba-maṇḍala and, on the other, the transfer of their allegiance by the Āḷupas to the Pallavas. No records are forthcoming to bear witness to the circumstances which led to this surprising political change. In those days of constant wars, when ambitious rulers were fighting for territorial expansion, it would have been difficult for the rulers of Āḷuvakheḷa to have remained outside the protection of an imperial power after their breach with the Chalukyas. There were then only two powers which were effective against that of the Chalukyas. One centred round the ambitious personality of Rāṣṭrakūṭa Dantidurga who, about this time, was too busy in the northern domains of the decaying Chāluukya empire. The other one was the Pallava empire with Nandivarman II on the throne. Though the defences of the Pallava empire had been proved vulnerable by two Chāluukya invasions in the reign of Vikramaṇḍitya II, the position of Nandivarman II himself as emperor had been rendered secure by the efforts of his able general Udāyachandra. The records of Nandivarman II do not say that the Tulu country was invaded by the Pallavas at any
time during his reign. It is thus not possible to know the means by which the Pallava ruler secured the subordination of Aluvarasa II.

The Mallam inscription, while referring to the request made by Aluvarasa II to Nandivarman II, em mentions one Chalukki-arasar as the epatti i.e. the executor of the grant. Salotore, in his attempt to identify Chalukki-arasar, says—...

we know that it was Vijayaditya Satyāsraya's father Vinayāditya Satyāsraya who had twice been requested by the Ālupa king Chitravāhana I to make grants to worthy Brāhmans in the ājyotisāl-viṣhaya in the Banavase country in A.D. 692 and A.D. 694. The two grants had been made when the royal camp was in Chitrasedu in the Toramara-viṣhaya and in Karanjapatra in Hareshapura. From these two records it is certain that the Ālupa king was prone to make requests to his sovereign, the Western Chālukya monarch. We have to suppose that as he had petitioned Vinayāditya Satyāsraya to make grants of land to learned Brāhmans on two different occasions he made a third request to Vinayāditya Satyāsraya's son and successor, Vijayāditya, who seems to have been on friendly terms with his neighbouring rulers including the Pallava kings. If this is allowed, then, the Chalukkiarasar mentioned in the Mallam plates would be Vijayāditya Satyāsraya and the Aluvarasar, Chitravāhana I. In that case, the Mallam inscription must have been inscribed before the defeat of Nandipōtavarman at the hands of Vikramāditya II. But the occasion which made Chitravāhana I go over to Mallam in the Gūḍūr taluka will remain for the present unsolved.'

The expression used in the Mallam inscription, with reference to the names occurring therein is "Nandip-pottarasarkku-
ppadigand-aavadu . . . Aju-arasar vippappattiyar-Chalukki-
arasar-apatiy-aga i.e. 'in the fifteenth (year of the reign)
of Nandippottarasar . . . . at the request of Aju-arasar,
with Chalukkiaarasar as the executor (of the grant)'. It has
already been pointed out that the fifteenth regnal year of Nandi-
varman II fell in 745-46 A.D. and that Vijayaditya, with whom
Saltetore sought to identify Chalukkiaarasar, the apatti, had
been succeeded by his son Vikramaditya II as early as in 737/38
A.D. Chalukki-arasar of the Mallam inscription could not have
meant Vikramaditya II or his son Kirttivarman II either, for,
unlike as suggested by Saltetore, both these rulers displayed their
inherited enmity for the Pallavas by carrying out a successful
raid against the Pallava empire towards the end (744/45 A.D.) of
Vikramaditya II's reign. The answers for the problems posed by
the Mallam inscription, therefore, appear to be outside the pale
of the history of the Western Chalukyas.

It is certain that Ajuvarasa was not present at Mallam
as the ruler of the district Peyiyur-ilangotpam. He was perhaps
carried to that distant place by the political currents of his
days. It is known that Udayachandra, the loyal general of

75 The two grants referred to are the Sorab and Harihar
plates of Chalukya Vinayaditya, which have been discussed in de-
tail above.
Nandivarman II, overran the territories of Eastern Chalukya Vishpuvardhana III soon after lifting the seige at Nandigrāma and that he thereby added the Nellore region to the Pallava empire. It is not improbable that Ájuvarasa accompanied the Pallava general in his expeditions and was consequently at Mallam in 745-46 A.D. The vanquished Eastern Chalukya ruler Vishpuvardhana III probably acted as the Āpattī (Sanskrit āṃṭṭī, executor) of the grant which was made at the request of Ájuvarasa II. The term Āpattī denotes only a subordinate position or office and hence the Chalukki-arasar could not have been the Bādāmi Chalukya contemporary of Nandivarman II.

The other inscription of Ájuvarasa II, from Udīyavara, which, as has been pointed out above, is not dated but palaeographically belongs to the middle of the eighth century, records some grant, particulars about which are lost, to the god Cham-bukalla-deva by a number of donors, including the seventy tenants of Udīyapura (Udīyapurada-nakarad-āpattī-okkalu), during the reign of Ájuvarasa, the possessor of Pattī (Pattī-āṃṭṭī). Pattī is only another name for Pombuchcha, the modern town of Humcha in the Nagar Taluk of Shimoga district. Next to the Vaḍḍarase inscription of Ájuvarasa I, which, as suggested above, appears to have been engraved before that chief came to possess the Kadamba-mpṛḍaḷa, and the Poḷali-Ammunaje inscription discussed above, this Udīya-vara inscription of Ájuvarasa II is the earliest from South
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Kanara and its silence about Kadamba-mandala, with which his predecessors Ájuvarasa I and Chitravāhana I had so much to do, does support our view that during his reign, Ájuvarasa II lost his sway over that important and vast territory. The record ends with the rather puzzling statement that it was written by Kalāditya, the lord of the earth.

Apart from the Udiyāvara and Mallam inscriptions, no other records either belonging to or referring to the reign of Ájuvarasa II have so far come down to us. It has been suggested above that he may have succeeded his father Chitravāhana I in about 730 A.D. He was in Mallam in 745–46 A.D. It will be seen below that his successor Chitravāhana II ended his reign in about 800 A.D. We thus have about seventy years between the commencement of Ájuvarasa II’s reign and the end of Chitravāhana II’s. In the absence of any chronological data, this period may be tentatively split into two equal reigns and thus the reign of Ájuvarasa II may be considered, for the present, to have ended in about 765 A.D. We learn from the Mārupūru and Vōljvikudi grants that Mangalapura (i.e. modern Mangalore) was the capital city of Ájupa kingdom during the reigns of Ájuvarasa I and Chitravāhana I. But the Udiyāvara inscription of Ájuvarasa II suggests that he had his capital at Udayapura, a suggestion confirmed by the records of the subsequent reigns.

Ájuvarasa I alias Gupasāgara had started on a humble note holding only the Tulu country and the Pombuchcha region at the start of his reign. But, after striking a friendship with the
imperial Chālukyas of Bādāmi, he had gained a foothold in Kadamba-maṇḍala. His son Chitravāhana I ushered in a period of glory for the Āḷupas, highlighted by his marriage with the Chālukya princess Kumkumadevī. But the reign of Āḷuvārasa II witnessed the beginning of a decline which started with the loss of Kadamba-maṇḍala and ended, before long, in the confinement of the sway of the Āḷupas to the tiny region of Āḷuvakhēṇa or the district of South Kanara. Under Āḷuvārasa II, the Āḷupas were still in possession of the Pombuchcha region. But the reign of his successor Chitravāhana II set in motion certain events which led to the final confinement of the Āḷupas to Āḷuvakhēṇa.

Chitravāhana II

The stone inscription from Māvalī in the Sorab Taluk of Shimoga district, which has already been referred to, introduces to us the next Āḷupa ruler, Chitravāhana II. Like the other early records on stones having a bearing on Āḷupa history, this inscription also is undated but, on grounds of palaeography as well as known historical facts, it could be assigned to the end of the eighth century. This Chitravāhana II was probably a son of Āḷuvārasa II and grandson of Chitravāhana I.

It is very likely that the political allegiance of the Āḷupas which was transferred, during Āḷuvārasa II's reign, from the Chālukyas of Bādāmi to the Pallavas of Kā颁发, continued
as such up to at least 792 A.D. The Pāṭṭattālmaṅgalā grant of Pallava Nandivarman II, which was issued in that year, claims that, among others, the king of the Tuļu country also waited at the gates of the Pallava emperor praying for audience. From the time they destroyed the empire of the Chālukyas, the Rāṣṭrakūṭa rulers had been on friendly terms with the Pallavas until the reign of Dhrūva Dārāvarsha (780-792 A.D.) who put an end to this Pallava-Rāṣṭrakūṭa alliance by levying a tribute of elephants from Nandivarman II. With hostility marking the relationship between the two imperial powers, the Āḷupas must have found it increasingly difficult to ignore the might of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas whose arms were nearer their kingdom than those of their Pallava suzerain. Dhrūva Dārāvarsha having proved himself more powerful than his Pallava contemporary, the Āḷupas under Chitravāhana II may have deemed it wiser to shift their allegiance once again to the imperial power in the Deccan, this time the Rāṣṭrakūṭas. If this view is accepted, in view of the date of the Pāṭṭattālmaṅgalā grant (792 A.D.), we may have to date this change of allegiance not long before the date of Dhrūva's abdication in favour of his able son Gōvinda III in 792 A.D.

The accession of Gōvinda III precipitated a civil war in the Rāṣṭrakūṭa empire in 792-93 A.D. His eldest brother, Stambha-Raṇapālōka, is known to have opposed Gōvinda III

with a confederacy of twelve rulers, but to no purpose. The identity of the twelve royal supporters is not given in the Rashtrakuta records, but it is not improbable that the Alupa ruler was among them. Chitravāhana II may have desired to benefit by the disorders in the Rashtrakuta empire and may have thrown in his lot with Stambha. Victory did not prompt Govinda III to do away with his opponents. Instead, he treated them with contemptuous generosity.

It is in this light that the Māvāḷi inscription of Govinda III becomes important for Alupa history. This inscription in Kannada language is a hero-stone, commemorating the heroic death of Kulamudda, soldier of the imperial Rashtrakuta army, in the battle of Perggunji. It states that during Govinda III's reign, when Rājadityaras was ruling over Banavasi-maṇḍala, Chitravāhana, who was ruling over Aluvakheda-6000, having proved recalcitrant, Kākarasa, at the bidding of the enraged Kolli Pallava Nolamba, besieged the fortress of Perggunji. In the battle which ensued, in which warriors on both sides displayed great valour, Kākarasa, on seeing Chitravāhana breaking through the right flank of the imperial forces, ordered Kulamudda to oppose him. This Kulamudda fought valiantly, defeated and drove away the soldiers of Chitravāhana and, after bringing victory to the right flank, fell in the field of battle, even as Bhīshma fell, without touching the ground.
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The statement in the record that at the time of this battle Rājādityavārāsa was governing the Banavāsi-māṇḍala goes against the contention of Moraes that the Āḷupas lost their hold on Kadamba-māṇḍala as a result of this war. The find spot of the inscription, Māvali, in the Sorab Taluk of Shimoga district, was situated in the Pombuchcha region and, therefore, the battle of Perggunji must be considered to have been fought somewhere in that territory and not in the Kadambamaṇḍala. It is not, however, possible to definitely identify on a modern map the name of Perggunji. The inscription states that the battle resulted from Chitravāhana's failure to listen to the emperor's advice (bāy-kaḷad-ira). This may be interpreted to mean that even after the defeat of the confederacy of twelve rulers headed by Stambha, Chitravāhana continued to question the supremacy of Gōvinda III and, therefore, came to grief in the battle of Perggunji. If this is accepted, the Māvali inscription may be assigned to about 794-95 A.D., a conclusion which falls in line with the palaeographical features of the record under discussion.

The inscription explicitly states that Chitravāhana and his army were put to headlong flight, implying thereby that the Āḷupa ruler was deprived of his hold over a part of the Pombuchcha region. Under these circumstances, the only course that was open to Chitravāhana was to fall back upon Āḷuvakhēḍa-6000 of which, according to the Māvali inscription, he was the acknowledged sovereign. But with the end of Āḷuvarahasa II's reign, remarkable political developments had taken place in Āḷuvakhēḍa and elsewhere in Karnāṭaka, and, in order to correctly
understand the history of the Alupas during that period, it be-
comes incumbent on our part to evaluate in detail these develop-
ments.

In the early years of the second half of the eighth
century, the political picture of Karpāṭaka underwent momen-
tous changes, the Rāṣṭrakūṭas first destroying and then su-
ceeding to the imperial seat of the Bādami Chālukyas. The
Alupas could not have felt distressed by the extinction of
the Chālukya power, for they were no longer their dependents.
We have earlier seen Āluvarasa II preferring the supremacy of the
Pallavas to that of the decaying Chālukya house and then again
Chitravāhana II entering the Rāṣṭrakūṭa camp. The confusion
which must have prevailed at the time of the death of one and
the birth of another imperial power in the Deccan appears to have
interested Chitravāhana II. He was a daring and ambitious
prince, as is revealed by the Māvalī inscription, and most
likely, moved into the Pombuchoha region with designs of ear-
ning territorial and political gains. However, the confine-
ment of his rule to the Pombuchoha region and his defeat
at Pergumji show that he was unsuccessful in his bid. This was
because the Rāṣṭrakūṭas had stood up to the challenges of their
newly earned status and had soon established the security of their
power. Chitravāhana II and, for that matter, no one else among
the numerous ambitious chiefs of those days, could find any
opportunity for self-aggrandisement.

With Chitravāhana II thus busy in the Pombuchoha region,
the ancient seat of his family in Āluvakhōḍa appears to have
fallen into the hands of another Āḷupa prince, probably his brother, Rapasāgara by name. After his defeat at the hands of Kākarasa, when Chitravāhana II fell back upon his native kingdom of Āļuvakhēga, his return was subjected to severe contest by Rapasāgara and his supporters. A handful of undated archaic stone inscriptions from Udiyāvara, referred to in the records as Udayapura and which had become the capital of the Āḷupa kingdom during the reign of Āļuvarasa II, bear mute and insufficient witness to this civil war which affected two generations. In order to prepare as convincing a chronological sequence as is possible of the reigns and events which filled this period of disquiet, it becomes incumbent on our part to indulge in a comparative study of the palaeographical features of these important records from Udiyāvara and a few other places in South Kanara.

**Early Inscriptions from South Kanara**

Of all the inscriptions, on stone and on copper plates, discussed above, with reference to the reigns of Āļuvarasa I alias Gupasāgara, his son Chitravāhana I, his son Āļuvarasa II and his son Chitravāhana II, only three hail from the district of South Kanara, the native territory of the Āḷupas, namely the Vēḷḷḷḷarāse inscription of Āļuvarasa I, the Poḷali-Ammunaje inscription and the Udiyāvara inscription of Āļuvarasa II. The Vēḷḷḷḷarāse inscription, though undated, has been assigned above to the middle of the seventh century on grounds of palaeography.
In trying to compare the palaeographical features of inscriptions from South Kanara with those of inscriptions hailing from the other regions of Karnataka, it is essential to take into due consideration the comparatively slow pace of scriptal development which took place in South Kanara on account of its long-standing geographical and political isolation. This distinction is noticeable not only in the field of paleography but also in the language-form of the inscriptions from South Kanara.

The Udyavara inscription of Aluvarasa II, which we have assigned, again on grounds of palaeography, to the middle of the eighth century, betrays much palaeographical similarity with inscriptions of the same period coming from other adjacent areas of Karnataka. These two inscriptions from Vagdarse and Udyavara render themselves easy of palaeographical comparison with the other Deccanese records of their period chiefly because they belong to a period when the Tulu country had entered into close contact with the imperial powers of the Deccan. The other inscriptions of South Kanara, up to the time of the Hoyasala occupation in the 14th century, reveal too many of their own peculiar characteristics, linguistic as well as palaeographical, mainly because they belong to a period during which the rulers of the Tulu country were practically left to themselves, barring occasional raids by the forces of the imperial rulers of the Deccan and the Tamilian south.

Reverting to the study of comparative palaeography, the characters of the Vagdarse inscription, compare well with
those of the famous Aihole inscription of Pulakesin II of A.D. 634-35, the Yakkērī rock inscription of the same emperor and of about the same date, the Kurnool plates of Vi-kramēditya I issued in the third year of his reign i.e. about 656-57 A.D., to consider only a few of the records of the period. Attention may also be drawn to the characters in the Kurnool plates of the first year of one of Pulakesin II's sons, Adityavarman, issued probably towards the close of the former's reign, with which the characters in the Vaddarse inscription bear remarkable similarities. These facts do vindi-cate the assignment of this inscription of Ajuvarasa I to the middle of the seventh century.

The Udiyāvara Inscription of Ajuvarasa II is, on the other hand, written in characters which are comparable to those in the records of the middle of the eighth century. To quote only a few examples, we may allude to the Kañchī inscription of Chālukya Vikramēditya II of about 740 A.D., the Jāvalī copper plate grant of Gāṅga Śrīpurusha of 750 A.D., the Paṭṭadakal pillar inscription and the Vakkalērī plates of 754 and
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757 A.D. respectively of the reign of Kirttivarman II as also the same ruler's Kēndūr plates of 749 A.D. We thus find that Sale's contention that the Udiyāvara inscription of Kṣuvarasā II belongs to as early as 600 A.D. is not borne out by data collected from a study of comparative palaeography and that the inscription really belongs to the middle of the eighth century A.D.

We have shown above that Chitravāhana II was expelled from a part of the Pombuchcha region by the forces of Rāshṭrakūṭa Gōvinda III and that he had no choice but to fall back upon the native kingdom of the Kūpas, the Tulu country. The dynastic rivalries which resulted from this act of Chitravāhana II are brought to light by a few inscriptions from the village of Udiyāvara which, as the then capital of the Kūpas, was the main scene of the civil strife.

These inscriptions, which refer to the reigns of five rulers including Chitravāhana II, are all undated and, what is more, palaeographically almost all alike. They allow themselves to be palaeographically compared with the Māvāli inscription of Gōvinda III and Chitravāhana II, which has been assigned above to about 794-95 A.D. on historical grounds and which assignment is well borne out by the palaeographical features of the record. Formations of letters such as ka, ya, ra, la, ṿa etc. are exactly the same in all these inscriptions. But, some of the Udiyāvara inscriptions also contain forms of letters which are comparable

87 Ibid., Vol. IX, plates between pp. 202-05.
to those in the Kumsi stone inscription of Rāṣṭrakūṭa Amoghavarsha I dated as late as in Śaka 799 = 877 A.D. A comparison of the forms of letters such as ṇa, ṭa, ra and ṭa will amply justify the above observation. It is thus obvious that the early inscriptions of South Kanara, which are undated but which palaeographically are later in date to the Udiyāvara inscription of Ājuvarasa II, should best be distributed over a longer period than is warranted by their comparative palaeography.

While judging the propriety or otherwise of this declaration, it must be borne in mind that the political isolation which followed the expulsion of Chitravāhana II from a part of the Pombuchcha region must have resulted in very slow palaeographical changes within Ājukēḍa.

Chitravāhana II and the dynastic feuds

It was only natural for Chitravāhana II to retreat beyond the Ghāṭs to his own native kingdom of Tuḷuva after the wrath of Rāṣṭrakūṭa Gōvinda III had dispossessed him of a part of his extra-Tuḷuva possessions. The Ājupa throne, at that time, was, however, not empty. We have suggested above that Ājuvarasa II may have ended his reign in about 735 A.D. Chitravāhana II, who was probably an elder son of Ājuvarasa II, may have succeeded him but appears to have stationed himself not at Udiyāvara but in the fort of Pergguṇji which was situated in the Pombuchcha region. The sway over Udiyāvara and the

kingdom for which it was then the capital appears to have rested with another prince, Rapasāgara, who may have been the younger brother of Chitravāhana II. It is this Rapasāgara whom we find mentioned in the early inscriptions of Udiyāvara as the contender to Chitravāhana's claims over the Alūpa throne.

Rapasāgara is introduced to us through an undated inscription in Kannāga from Udiyāvara. This inscription, engraved on one of the pillars in the Court-yard of the Chembukallu temple, records the grant of certain incomes to the royal treasury from the city of Udiyāpara to the god in the Chambukallu temple. The presence in Udiyāvara of this purely administrative record of the reign of Rapasāgara and the absence of such records in the Tulu country belonging to the reign of Chitravāhana II lead us to conclude that with the exit of Chitravāhana from the district of South Kanara to the Pombuchcha region, Rapasāgara had become the de facto ruler of Aluvakheḍa-6000 though Chitravāhana II was still considered to be the de jure ruler of the kingdom as is shown by the Māvali inscription.

The period of Rapasāgara's reign from the date of his accession to that of Chitravāhana II's forced return to Udiyāvara was not however entirely peaceful. The troubles which beset his reign are brought to light by two records, one from Udiyāvara and the other from Kariyāngaḍa in the Mangalore Taluk.

Of these, the inscription from Udiyāvara, which consists of a single Kannada verse, describes, in a vivid manner, the death of a hero in the battle which ensued the attempt of Maygesa, 'the villain', to force his entry into the city (i.e. Udiyāvara). The other inscription from Kari-yāṅgaḷa, which consists of one Kannada verse and also a sentence in prose, records, in equally vivid terms, the death of Nāgama alias Śudraka, the chief of Kayravaṇśa, at the end of his victory over the combined forces of Pāybaya, in the battle against Mogīśvara. The sentence in prose declares that Rapasāgara made a gift of compensation in appreciation of the dead warrior.

Neither of these inscriptions is dated. But, on paleographical grounds, they should be referred to the second half of the eighth century and should be considered as contemporaneous with the Udiyāvara inscription of Rapasāgara discussed above. This point is further supported by the reference to Rapasāgara as the adversary of Mogīśvara in the Kariyāṅgaḷa inscription.

The textual as well as contextual similarities noticed in the Udiyāvara and Kariyāṅgaḷa inscriptions lead to the conclusion that both of them record details of the same battle. This will mean that Maygesa and Mogīśvara were two different forms of the name of one person. However, the identity of this foe of Rapasāgara is impossible to fix in the present state of

our knowledge. It can only be suggested that Moglsvara and Maygoga sound like the corrupt forms of Mrigesa, but no chief of this name is known for the period in question. The battles were not confined only to Udayapura, Maygosa's attempted entry into which was foiled by Rapasagara, but was staged even around the city of Mangalore as is evidenced by the other inscription from Kariyanga which is in Mangalore Taluk. Maygosa or Mogisvara was, in all probability, a local feudatory of the Ajupas who, finding Chitravahana II away at Perggunji and only his younger brother on the Ajupa throne, may have made an attempt at personal aggrandisement. He, however, lost his bid and Rapasagara's hold on the capital city of Udayapura as also over the rest of the Ajupa kingdom remained secure.

Towards the end of the eighth century occurred the return of Chitravahana II to Udayapura. Rapasagara obviously had no intentions of surrendering the throne to the prodigal home-comer and instead decided to stage a trial of strength.

We do not know how Chitravahana II's military strength as a conqueror compared with that of Rapasagara as the defender. It is likely that the former's military assets had suffered a heavy loss in his battle against imperial Rashtrakuta forces at Perggunji.

The initial impact of Chitravahana's thrust into Udayapura appears to have gained for him temporary control over the capital, without at the same time exterminating his rival Rapasagara. An inscription from Udiyavara records the heroism
death of an eminent warrior of Chitravāhana, Kālītide by name, son of Vījāna-nāyiga (nāyaka), in the battle against Rapasāgara at the time of the entry of the army of the 'Lord of the Earth' (āraṇa-īṣaṇa) into Udayapura. The 'Lord of the Earth' was, no doubt, the same as Chitravāhana II whose triumph over his adversary is vouchsafed by the presence of this inscription which eulogies the valour of one of his soldiers.

Rapasāgara apparently fled, unable to defeat the designs of his rival. He was not, however, deterred by the outcome and, on his turn, attacked the city in order to wrest it from Chitravāhana II. Two inscriptions, one from Udiyēvara and the other from Kōte, both in the Udipi Taluk, bear witness to this renewed struggle. The former records the death of one Nalimani Nāgadeśita, who had routed the forces of Rapasāgara in the battle which ensued when the latter tried to force an entry into Udayapura.

The Kōte inscription records that in the battle fought on behalf of the 'Lord of the earth' (āraṇa-īṣaṇa) at the time of Rapakīsara's attempted entry into Udayapura, Anupesāra Polega, the warrior of Juddhamalla, displayed great valour and fell fight-

---
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ing. The 'Lord of the earth' is again no doubt Chitravâhana II. Rapakāsara is obviously a mistake for Rapasāgara. Juddhamalla may have been one of the commanders or some minor prince leading the forces of Chitravâhana II. It is possible that Chitravâhana's long stay outside Tuluva had earned him the alliance and assistance of some minor rulers of principalities adjoining South Kanara. Juddhamalla appears to have been one such.

Another short inscription from Udiyavara records the death of the hero Medumāpan who was a servant (ālu) of the illustrious Sāntara. It is known that, towards the close of the ninth century, the Sāntaras established themselves as the rulers of the Sāntalige kingdom with Pombuchcha for their capital. It is likely that, at the time of Chitravâhana's rule from Pergguṇji, Sāntara was ruling over some adjacent principality. The palaeography of the inscription strongly supports the likelihood of Chitravâhana II and Sāntara having been contemporaries. It is likely that the latter rushed to the aid of Chitravâhana II in the wake of Rapasāgara's stiff resistance. The presence of Sāntara and his army in Ālupakēḍa is otherwise very difficult to explain. The discovery in Udiyavara and in its vicinity of inscriptions eulogising the heroism of Chitravâhana II's soldiers suggests, by implication, the failure of Rapasāgara's bid to recapture the Ālupa capital.

95 Vide Mysore and Coorg From the Inscriptions, pp.138-39.

The earliest known inscription of Vikrama Sāntara, who is credited with the founding of the Sāntalige kingdom, is A.D. 998 (Ep.Carn. Vol.VII, Nr. 60).
At a later stage of the civil war, however, Chitravāhāna II disappears from the political arena and we find Rapasāgara once again in occupation of Udayapura with one Śvētavāhāna pitted against him as his rival for the Ālupa throne. On the strength of the vāhana ending in his name, this Śvētavāhāna may be considered as the son of Chitravāhāna II. It is probable that Rapasāgara persisted in his efforts to regain Udayapura and at last succeeded, though epigraphs bearing witness to his final triumph over Chitravāhāna II have not come down to us. Chitravāhāna II was driven out of Udayapura and was, in all probability, killed in one of the encounters.

We have suggested above that Chitravāhāna II and Rapasāgara, who was probably his younger brother, succeeded to the territorial possessions of their father Ājumarasa II almost at the same time, the former at Perghumji outside Tuḷuva and the latter at Udayapura, the native capital of the Ālupas. They were thus close contemporaries.

Since it has been suggested above that Ājumarasa II may have ended his reign in about 765 A.D., and since Chitravāhāna II's expulsion from Perghumji could not have taken place earlier than 792 A.D., the year of Rāṣṭṛakūṭa Gōvinda III's accession, the reign period of Chitravāhāna II may be tentatively assigned to about 765–800 A.D.

During Ājumarasa II's reign, the Ālupas lost their hold over Kadamba-māṇḍala. During the troubled reign of Chitravāhāna II,
Xjupa possessions suffered a further loss. Yet, not all the Pombuchcha region was lost to them as a result of their expulsion from Pergguṇji. They were still masters of a part of that region, including the city of Pombuchcha.

Rapasāgara and Śvētavāhana

The exit of Chitravāhana II did not leave Rapasāgara in peace and without a rival. An inscription from Udiyāvara records the death of the hero Kāmakōga, son of Viñja Prabhār-bhūshāna and a servant of Rapasāgara, in a battle at the time of Śvētavāhana’s attempted entry into Udayapura. We find in this inscription Rapasāgara bearing the epithet Paṭṭi-cādevyaṇ (i.e. the chief of Paṭṭi which is the same as Pombuchcha) indicating thereby that, at the death of Chitravāhana II, he came to consider himself the sole ruler of all his father’s possessions minus, of course, the Pergguṇji region.

Another inscription from Udiyāvara itself, however, reveals that subsequently Śvētavāhana did get the better of Rapasāgara and secure entry into Udayapura. This inscription, without mentioning who the defeated adversary was, records the death of one Dēvu in the battle which was fought at the time of Śvētavāhana’s entry into Udayapura. The mention only of
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Śvētavāhana and the presence of this hero-stone in Udiyāvāra itself clearly indicate that Śvētavāhana was successful in his efforts. Rapasāgara was, in all probability, killed in one of these battles for supremacy, for, we not only do not hear any more of him in inscriptions, but find, on the other hand, one Prithvīśāgara engaged in the next phase of the civil war for the Rūpa throne.

It has been suggested above that, like Chitravāhana II, Rapasāgara too may have succeeded his father Rūeparasā II in about 765 A.D. Since we find Rapasāgara engaged in battles with Śvētavāhana, who was probably the son of Chitravāhana II, who, according to us, may have ended his reign in about 800 A.D., Rapasāgara himself may be tentatively considered to have ruled until about 805 A.D.

With the exit of Rapasāgara from the scene of this dynastic civil war, a new generation of rival princes, Śvētavāhana and Prithvīśāgara, are found contending for the Rūpa throne. An undated inscription, also from Udiyāvāra, and, palaeographically belonging to the same period as the other Udiyāvāra inscriptions discussed immediately above, records that one Palipare, son of Kandavilmudi, fell fighting in the battle which ensued at the time of the entry into Udayapura of Prithvīśāgara who had had himself crowned. It becomes obvious from the text of this inscription that Prithvīśāgara's coronation had to be

---
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celebrated somewhere outside the capital city of Udayapura and that Udayapura itself was at that time under the control of a rival claimant, not named in the inscription. But, on palaeographical grounds and in keeping with the narrative cogency which has been sought to be put into the Ājupā history of this period in the pages above, it may be safely conjectured that Prithvīsāgara's political and military manoeuvres, recorded in the above inscription from Udiyāvara, were directed against none other than Śvētavāhana himself.

Śvētavāhana and Prithvīsāgara

The sāgara ending in Prithvīsāgara's name suggests that he was the son of Rapasāgara. We learn from the Udiyāvara inscription referred to above that his reign started outside the capital city of Udayapura as a challenger to the authority of Śvētavāhana whom he had every reason to consider as an usurper. Śvētavāhana had, in all probability, ousted and killed Rapasāgara who may have been the father of Prithvīsāgara. Prithvīsāgara's first rebuff to the status of Śvētavāhana as ruler of Ājuvakhēda was his coronation as the rightful sovereign of the Tuḷu country, which was performed outside Udayapura. His next task was to oust Śvētavāhana from Udayapura and to ensure his own position as the unrivalled occupant of the Ājupā throne. The Udiyāvara inscription which refers to his coronation also records the earliest battle he fought against his rival after the date of his coronation.
Another inscription from Udiyāvara, which refers to Prithviśāgara also as Ajumändra, records the death of the king's servant Polokku Priyachelva at the time of the entry into Udayapura of the 'Lord of the earth' (dharag-Isān). The 'Lord of the earth' mentioned in the record is none other than Prithviśāgara, who had apparently appropriated to himself even that lofty epithet which had adorned Chitravāhana II. These two inscriptions clearly show that Prithviśāgara was successful in his attempts to regain the throne on which his father had sat earlier. Svētavāhana, of whom we hear no more, was probably killed in battle by Prithviśāgara.

Śvētavāhana is the third and last of the Jūpa princes whose names ended in vāhana and, if the suggestion made above that he was the son of Chitravāhana II is accepted, he becomes the last representative of the elder branch of the Jūpa ruling house. In between his victory over Rapasāgara and his defeat by Prithviśāgara, Śvētavāhana may not have ruled for long and we may tentatively assign to him a reign period of 10 years from c. 805 to c. 815 A.D.

That Prithviśāgara came out victorious from this conflict is not a matter for mere conjecture but is clearly borne out by a third Udiyāvara inscription which introduces him as ruling from the capital city of Udayapura. This inscription
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is of importance from more than one point of study. It reveals that with the triumph of Prithvisagara, the civil war, which had involved two generations of princes, had reached its end. It states, for the first time, that the Alupas belonged to the lunar race (Soma-vamśa-odbhava). Again, after the Shiggaon plates of Vijayaditya and the Pojali-Ammunaje inscription discussed above, this is the earliest record to associate the Alupas with the dynastic name Pandyya by referring to Prithvisagara as Udayaditya Uttama-Pandyya. It also refers to him as Aluvarasa, thus making him the third of that name.

This inscription records that during Boygavarma's headmanship of the district (nathy-mudime), Prithvisagara alias Udayaditya Uttama-Pandyya alias Aluvarasa (III), confirmed the gift of one half of the tolls both on water and on land levied in the cities of Patti and Udayapura to four persons, namely, Singadatta, son of Udayapura-nayaga, Kumara Erega, Rapavikrama-nayaga and Kappachi, son of Sandavarada. Boygavarma was apparently administering the region around the city of Udayapura. Udayapura-nayaga, given as the name of Singadatta's father, may also stand for the nayaka of Udayapura i.e., an officer in charge of the administration of the capital. The gift of a part of the tolls collected at Patti, which is the same as Pombuchcha, suggests that inspite of Chitravahana II's expulsion from Perggunji, the Alupas were able to retain effective control over a part of their possessions beyond the Ghats including Pombuchcha.
No dated references to Prithviśāgara alias Ājuvarasa III have come down to us. With the end of the civil war, a long period of peace set in throughout the Ājupa kingdom. Prithviśāgara may have ruled from about 810 to about 840 A.D.

It must be remembered in this connection that his coronation resulted in the Ājupa kingdom having two rulers for a brief period until Prithviśāgara triumphed over his rival. He was succeeded on the throne by Mārama alias Ājuvarasa IV.

Mārama was in all probability the son of Prithviśāgara. He inherited from his father not only the territorial possessions but also a reign of peace. He was left alone without a rival and also without a master. There were no invasions from outside to threaten his safety and status.

Four inscriptions of his have come down to us, all of them from Udīyāvara. Their contents pertain to matters of administration and grants, thus bearing witness to the peace and prosperity of his reign.

One of these inscriptions mentions the king merely as Mārama Ājuvarasar and appears to refer to one Karasī-nāyga as the administrator of Koḷala-nakara which has been identified with Koḷala-giri, a village in the South Kanara district.

103 Ancient Karnataka, Vol. I, History of Tuluva, p.79.
The record also mentions Odevura-nakara which is the same as the capital city of Udayapura. We have pointed out earlier in this chapter, while discussing Chalukya Kirtivarman's conquest of Ajuka = Ajupa, that Salestore's contention that this Maramma-Ajuvarasar was Kirtivarman's Ajupa contemporary is absolutely untenable. The palaeographical features of this inscription clearly betray the fact that it belongs only to the middle of the ninth century.

The second inscription, besides naming the ruler as Maramma Ajuvarasar, also calls him Vijayaditya-Ajupendra and Uttama-Pandya. While the last name was borne by Maramma's father Prithvisagara also, the name Vijayaditya is applied to him for the first time even as was the case with the name of Udayaditya borne by Prithvisagara. The imperial powers of the Deccan were, at this time, engaged in their own affairs and wars and the resultant sense of security and independence appears to have prompted Maramma to assume high-sounding imperial titles. For, this record glorifies him as Paramasagara and Adhirajaraja. Like the Udyavara inscription of his predecessor, this record describes the king as belonging to the lunar race.

It records the confirmation of the gift of tolls collected in the cities of Pombulcha and Udayapura on grains, cotton, areca-nuts and pepper to four persons. The inscription

---
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Haramma is the fourth of the known Anuja kings to have had the name of Anuvarasa. The third inscription belonging to his reign omits the name Haramma but gives all the others, namely, Vijayaditya Anupendra, Uttama-Pandya and Anuvarasa. The lunar race to which the king belonged as also the sovereign titles of Paramesvara and Adhirajara are repeated in this inscription. It records that, during Arakella’s headmanship of the district, the king confirmed the gift of one half of the tolls levied in the cities of Ponbaliacha and Udayapura to six persons who were agricultural tenants (akkalu). Arakella was apparently governing an administrative division around Udayapura.

The fourth Udivavara inscription is much worn out. But the name of the king can be made out as Marann-Anuvarasar. The record is also incomplete but it seems to record the grant of lands by the padineppu-pattapa. The land was situated to the east of the village which is not named (undrasvada-kayi). The record once again mentions the padineppu-pattapa and a certain Ujvalanayaga probably as the bounden protectors of the grant. Though this inscription does not endow sovereign titles to the ruler and gives him only the honorific sri, it refers to his rule over the earth (prithvirajya) thus suggesting that Haramma
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was an independent ruler.

That the tolls levied and granted included those from Pombuchcha shows that Maramma had inherited from his father the Pombuchcha region beyond the Ghats in addition to the native Ajupa kingdom. Even as Chitravāhana I’s reign was one of glory and achievements, Maramma’s was one of peace and prosperity, as is clearly borne out by his inscriptions. Since we have suggested above that Prithvisāgara may have ended his reign in about 840 A.D., his successor Maramma alias Ajuvarasa IV may have reigned from about 840 to 870 A.D.

This will be the proper place to discuss an undated inscription from Baptra, a village in the Mangalore Taluk, South Kanara district. The characters and language of the inscription belong to the archaic Kannada variety and are in conformity with contemporaneous records from the adjacent areas. Though it is not in any way dated, it could be assigned, on grounds of palaeography, to about the middle of the ninth century A.D. As is usual with such early records from South Kanara, the letters
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do not all of them fall into one particular palaeographical period, some like ya and la showing earlier characteristics and others like la and ka and, in some instances, ya betraying later developments. Nevertheless, the record does bear comparison, in general, with Kannada records of the said period discovered in South Kanara itself as also in the adjacent regions and, in particular, with the three inscriptions of Nārāma aliṣa Aṭuvarasa IV discussed above.

The inscription records a political agreement entered into by four persons, namely, king Nyppamallarāja, an unnamed Katambha ruler, Rāchamallan-Dugarāja, the beloved brother of Viḷarittālyarasana and Narasingan-Dugarāja, the son of Balle-(or Valle-)Oḍeya. The treaty was to the effect that the parties concerned would, in the times to come, discontinue mutual enmity (peṇa), vengeance (pali) and fights (eṣaṇa).

The record commences with the auspicious word svasti and immediately refers to the reign of Nyppamallarāja who is eulogised therein as rāja-kul-śambhar-āditya and satya-saucha-vinay-śāhara-sampanna. The passage which follows immediately refers to the universal reign (prithvi-rāja) of a ruler whose name it fails to give but who is eulogised as sakala-supa-gan-

-ālanākṛita and Katambha-kul-śābhava. The inscription then records that these two rulers and Rāchamallan-Dugarāja and Narasingan-Dugarāja met in the temple at Sādanura and, in the presence of witnesses, who are named and who included the physician of Sādanura and those who arrange for service like playing instrumental music by turns in the temple, concluded
the treaty which has been referred to above.

South Kanara was, during the period to which this record belongs, in all probability, under the sway of Māramma alias Aḻuvarasa IV. Sovereign titles such as Paramāsvara and Aṁbirājarāja which he had assumed show that Māramma was the most powerful ruler of South Kanara in his times. It is not improbable, therefore, that Nripamallarāja and the unnamed Katambha ruler were his subordinates. It is difficult to say, in the present state of our knowledge, if the Katambha-kula was in any way related to the name of the famous Kadamba dynasty. As for Rachamallan-Dugarāja and Narasingan-Dugarāja, they appear to have been princes of two minor houses of which Vīlarittāliyarasa and Balle-çgeya were the ruling members at the time of the conclusion of the treaty.

In all probability, these four rulers were administering adjacent bits of tracts within the Aḻupa kingdom as feudatories of Māramma. The absence of any reference to the Aḻupa ruler does not preclude the possibilities suggested above for, during the Vijayanagara period, when such treaties become more numerous in South Kanara, the inscriptions do not generally mention the Vijayanagara emperors though the Tulu country formed a permanent and important part of the empire.

Strangely enough, the Ajupas of this period appear to have been involved with the Gaṅgas of Taḷakāṇḍ. We do not, however, know if this relationship was friendly or inimical. We have seen that the Bapṭra inscription of the period of Māramma alias Ajuvarasa IV mentions Rāchamallan-Dugarāja. Rāchamalla is a name common among the Western Gaṅgas of Taḷakāṇḍ and is the same as Rājamalla. Even the name Nripamalla occurring in the above record is only a variant of this Rājamalla.

It is in this context that an undated inscription from Poḷali in Mangalore Taluk gains in importance. While reporting this inscription it was observed—"States that Arakoll entered fire becoming a victim of calumny at Taḷakāṇḍ. The memorial stone in his honour was set up by Palyavāṇa and Malalop-gaiya." It will be shown presently that the above remarks are entirely wrong.

The inscription is to be assigned, on palaeographical grounds, to the second half of the ninth century. Its writing very closely resembles the inscription of Māramma and the Bapṭra inscription discussed above. It states that Palyavāṇa-Āḷi-gāṇapapa, on hearing of the death of Ēbya Arakellan at Taḷa-kaṇḍu, entered the fire (and died) and that the memorial stone was set up by . . . dhuru (an inhabitant) of Malalokaiyūru.
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We have seen above that one of the Udiyāvara inscriptions of Narāmassa alias Ajūvarasa IV refers to one Arakella as the headman of the district, probably the region around the capital city of Udayapura. The Poḷali record refers to one Śēbya-Ārākella. It is very likely that Arakella and Śēbya-Ārākella were the names of one and the same person. It is interesting to note that two inscriptions, one from Veṇūr in Karkala Taluk and the other from Uḷipāḷi in Mangalore Taluk, refer to the reign of Mahāmaṇḍalāśvara Śēvyagella in the first quarter of the 12th century. Kella appears to have been the name of a minor ruling family in South Kanara and has survived as a surname to this day in that region.

From the Poḷali inscription, it may be concluded that Arakella or Śēbya-Ārākella had gone to the Western Gāṅga capital of Tālakāḷu and there, under circumstances which we have no means of knowing, had met with his death. Palyavapa Aḷi-gāṇapa was probably one of his trusted servants and unable to bear the news of his master’s death, sacrificed his own life by entering fire.

The Western Gāṅgas of this period were up in rebellion against the Rāṣṭrakūṭas. It may be that they had gained

---

1963-64, App. A, No. 10. In this copper plate inscription from Honavar, North Kanara District, Chitrasēṇa, a Kaikēya ruler of the 6th century A.D., calls himself a kalla and maha-kella.
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the assistance of the Ajupas in holding their own against imperial retaliations. The Rāṣṭrakūṭa invasion of the Ajupa kingdom, to which reference will be made by and by, seems to lend significant support to this suggestion of a Ajupa-Western Ganga alliance. It may also be noted here that the Ajupas and the Western Gāṇgas of Tālakāṇḍ both contracted marital alliances with the Sāntaras of Sāntalīge-1000 in the centuries which followed.

It is surprising that the peaceful reign of Māramma is followed by almost a century of uncertainty, Ajupa history. The next time we meet with an inscription expressly belonging to the reign of an Ajupa king is only in 968 A.D. to which year the Kadiri inscription of Kundavarma belongs. Contrary to expectations, the names of the immediate successors of Māramma as also the immediate predecessors of Kundavarma have to be dug out of inscriptions of an uncertain nature or from inscriptions discovered in areas adjacent to South Kanara.

However, a fragmentary inscription from Nīḍugundi in Bankapur Taluk, Dharwar District, Mysore state, throws some light on an event which may have brought about this political eclipse in South Kanara. This inscription, which seems to record the grant of compensation (parivāra), probably to some warrior killed in battle, is broken off at the beginning,

---
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the name of the king as also the date being entirely lost. The available parts of lines 5-7 read -

5 . . . . . . arīmad-Indapayyaṁ Bana-
6 . . . . . . mu Ājvaṅkēśam-aru-sāyī-
7 . . . . . . ttu Nāṅgundage panneragara

It will be shown below that Indapayya served as the governor of Banavasi-12000 under Rāṣṭrakūṭa Amoghavarsa I and Śrīnivasa II. Therefore, in the above text, Bana . . . . . . obviously is to be taken as Banavasi-12000 and . . . . . ttu as Ājnavuṭ (i.e. while ruling over). Indapayya would thus become the ruler of Banavasi-12000 as also Ājvakhēga-6000.

On palaeographical grounds, the Nīḷugundi inscription is to be assigned to the second half of the ninth century. We find Indapayya mentioned in two more inscriptions of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas. Of these, one is from Hojjūr, Shiggaon Taluk, Dharwar District. It is undated but belongs to the reign of Nripatunga. On palaeographical grounds, this Nripatunga is to be identified with Amoghavarsa I (814-880 A.D.). The record states that Samadhigata-pañchnamahāśāba, Śaṅkṣentarśāhipati Indapayya was governing Banavasi-12000. The other inscription, which is
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from Sorajur, Gadag Taluk, Dharwar District and which belongs to the reign of Akalavarsha Krishpa II (880-915 A.D.), the son and successor of Amoghavarsha I, is dated Šaka 805, Šobhakrit = 833 A.D. and refers to Indapayya as administering the nādu by which may have been meant Purigere-nādu within which the find-spot of the record, Sorajur, was situated or, more likely, Banavasi-nādu itself. In view of the unusually long reign of Amoghavarsha I and in view of Indapayya's mention in 833 A.D. in a record belonging to the subsequent reign, it may be safely concluded that Indapayya served under the Rashtrakūtas during the last years of Amoghavarsha I's rule and during the reign of Krishpa II. The damaged inscription from Nijugundi would thus belong either to the last years of Amoghavarsha I's reign or to the early years of the reign of his successor.

The reference in the Nijugundi record to Indapayya as the ruler of Banavasi-12000 and Álvakhēda-6000 is of the utmost importance to the history of South Kanara. We have seen above that high-sounding titles such as Paramāvāra and Adhirājarāja were borne by Mārama alias Áluvarasa IV. It is very likely that Mārama ended his reign as an independent ruler.

On the basis of the Nijugundi record, it may be concluded that sometime after Mārama's death, either towards the end of Amoghavarsha's reign or during the early years of Krishpa II's reign, Áluvakhēda was invaded and subjected to Rashtrakūta supremacy. It is otherwise impossible to explain the role of Indapayya as the ruler of Banavasi-12000 and Álvakhēda-6000.
It is likely that the Ajupas had incurred the wrath of the Rashtrakutas by their alliance with the Ganges. While under the Badami Chalukyas, the Ajupas were ruling not only over Anuvakheda but also over Banavasi-12000, the Governor of Banavasi-12000 is found ruling over Anuvakheda also under the Rashtrakutas. Thus the supremacy of the Rashtrakutas which had ceased at the time of Chitravahana II’s expulsion from the Pرغgunji fort is found reestablished towards the end of the ninth century, though, as will be seen below, only for a brief period.

The identity of the Ajupa ruler who had to face this Rashtrakuta invasion can not be fixed beyond doubt. Nevertheless, an undated and mostly illegible stone inscription in the Anantesvara temple at Udipi, headquarters of the Taluk of the same name, provides us with a plausible answer to this question. This record is so indifferently engraved that it has not been possible to make out its exact readings and purport. The figure, in relief, of a crowned male figure with a sword in the right hand and a shield in the left and, perhaps, a sheath hanging from his hip, suggests that the inscription is a hero-stone commemorating the death of a hero.

The characters, though indifferently engraved, may be confidently assigned to the second half of the ninth century on grounds of palaeography. The formation of letters has
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much in common with the inscriptions of the Ajupa king Māramma alias Aluvarasa IV. It seems to record the death of a hero, whose name was Vimalāditya, wrongly engraved as Vimalāditya, or in a battle during the reign of this Vimalāditya. The record seems to eulogise the deceased warrior as rāpa-muppya, probably meaning 'eminent in war' and seems to record some grant made in his honour.

There is no direct evidence in the text of this inscription to show that it belongs to the reign of an Ajupa king. Nevertheless, in view of the fact that the last two Ajupa rulers discussed above, viz., Prithviśāgara and Māramma, bore the secondary names of Udayāditya and Vijayāditya respectively, it may be suggested here that Vimalāditya may have belonged to the Ajupa family and was, perhaps, the successor of Māramma alias Aluvarasa IV. If this is accepted, Vimalāditya would be the Ajupa ruler during whose reign Alvakheḍa was conquered by the Rāṣṭrakūṭas. As will be seen in the pages to come, the Ajupas were not extinguished as a ruling house by the invaders but appear to have ruled as feudatories for some generations. The title Sāṃśīdhipati given to Indapayya is interesting in this light.

Nothing definite can be said about the period of Vimalāditya's reign. If, as has been suggested above, he succeeded Māramma in about 870 A.D., he may be deemed to have reigned till the end of the ninth century.
Amoghavarsha I was of spiritual temperament and, what is more, his long reign was beset with internal revolts. His son and successor Krishpa II, on the other hand, frequently indulged in military exploits, though mostly without success. The Rashtrakuta invasion should, therefore, be better placed in the reign of Krishpa II and also towards the very end of the ninth century.

It was during this period that the Alupas suffered the loss of their only extra-Tuluva possession, that part of the Pombuchecha region which they had retained even in the wake of Chitravahanas defeat at Peragunji. Sometime towards the close of the ninth century, this region became a part of the newly carved out kingdom of Santalige-1000 which thenceforward came under the sway of the Santaras. The earliest Santara inscription from Humcha (i.e. ancient Pombuchcha) is dated Saka 820 = A.D. 898 and belongs to the reign of Vikrama-Santara, the founder of the Santalige-1000 kingdom. Thus, the final confinement of the Alupas to the limits of South Kanara, which, as we had pointed out above, was set in motion at the battle of Peragunji towards the close of the 8th century, came about towards the end of the 9th century.

Yet another Alpa ruler is brought to light by an inscription from Humcha, Nagar Taluq, Shimoga District, dated in Saka 999, Pingala = A.D. 1077 and belonging to the reign of the Kalyapi Chalukya emperor Vikramaditya VI. This inscrip-
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tion contains a detailed genealogical account of the Śāntara rulers from its progenitor Rāha up to Nanni Śāntara, the feudatory of Vikramāditya VI. It states that Chāgi Śāntara, son of Vikrama Śāntara and Lakshmīdēvi, daughter of Kāmadēva, the king of Banavāsi, married Eṅjaladēvi, the daughter of Raṇañjaya, the Kēva ruler. To this Chāgi Śāntara and Eṅjaladēvi was born Vīra Śāntara.

Vikrama Śāntara, the father of Chāgi Śāntara, is stated in the above inscription to have consolidated the kingdom of Sāntalīge-1000. He is represented by two dated records. The 121 earlier of them, from the same village of Humcha, is dated Śaka 820 = A.D. 898 and records the construction of a āsādi and certain gifts made for its maintenance. The second inscription, from Sālūr, Shikarpur Taluq, Shimoga District, is dated Śaka 825, Dundhubhi = A.D. 903 during the reign of Kannara-Vallabha i.e. Rāṣṭrakūta Kṛishṇa II (880-915 A.D.). Both these inscriptions refer to the Śāntara ruler as Vikramāditya-Śāntara and the second record further reveals that he was a feudatory of the Rāṣṭrakūta. Since, according to the Humcha inscription of 1077 A.D., Chāgi Śāntara married Eṅjaladēvi, her father Raṇañjaya, the Kēva king, may be deemed to have ruled contemporaneously with Chāgi-Śāntara’s father Vikrama or Vikramāditya-Śāntara and with Chāgi-Śāntara himself. This would place Kēva Raṇañjaya in the first half of the tenth century. He may have ruled from about 900 A.D. to about 930 A.D., perhaps as the direct successor to Vimalāditya.
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We have seen above that Vikramaditya-Santara was a feudatory of Rashtrakūṭa Krishna II. It has also been shown above that towards the end of the ninth century, the Āḷupas were subjugated by the Rashtrakūṭas when, in all probability, Vimalāditya was the ruling Āḷupa king. The marital alliance between the Śāntaras of Sāntaligė-1000 and the Āḷupas of this period would suggest that the latter continued to be subject to Rashtrakūṭa supremacy even during Ranañjaya's reign.

Ranañjaya was, in all probability, succeeded by Dattā Āḷupa. Saletori places one Dattāḷendra-Srīmāra as the successor and predecessor of Ranañjaya and Kundavarma respectively and assigns his undated inscription from Mūḍakēri in Bārakūru, Udipi Taluq, to about 959 A.D. As will be shown below, this inscription should be assigned, on palaeographical grounds, to a much later period, and, therefore, this Dattāḷendra is only a later Āḷupa ruler of the thirteenth century bearing the same first name of Datta.

The reign of Dattā Āḷupa, who actually succeeded Ranañjaya, is, on the other hand, brought to light by an interesting stanza in the Kadiri inscription of Kundavarma already referred to. This stanza reads:


"By whom, setting aside the traitor Datt-Ajupa by force, the kingdom was obtained by the strength of his own arms." It will be seen below that this achievement is credited to Kundavarma to whose reign the Kadiri inscription belongs.

It is obvious, from a study of the above stanza, that Datt-Ajupa had actually reigned. We may safely conclude that he ignored the claims of Kundavarma for the Ajupa throne at the time of selecting a successor. This situation, as also the stanza quoted above, inevitably remind one of the Badami Chalukya emperor Mangalesa's attempts at ignoring Pulakesin II's claims for the throne and the bitter civil war which ensued as a result. It may be that Datt-Ajupa, like Mangalesa, was only a brother of his predecessor - on the throne, Alva Rapañjaya, and that he wanted to appropriate the throne.

125 Ibid., No. 191. In the published text, the reading given is datṭa bhūpam nir̄ākṛitya etc., which makes no sense. The inked estampage lying with the Office of the Government Epigraphist for India, Ootacamund, clearly shows Datt-Ajupa etc.
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for his own direct issue at the expense of Kundavarma. The vilification of Datt-Ālupa as visvāsa-chātin, and the claim of Kundavarma that he took the kingdom from him by force (bālat), lend overwhelming support to the above suggestion. The dynastic name Ālupa borne by Datta further proves that the war of succession was confined only to the members of that ruling house.

No records belonging to Dattālupa’s reign have come down to us. Since his reign appears to have been cut short by Kundavarma he may be taken to have reigned from about 930 A.D. to about 950 A.D. Datt-Ālupa was succeeded on the throne by Kundavarma.

The reign of Kundavarma marks a new beginning in Ālupa history. We have seen above that of the eleven reigns discussed so far, dated references are available only for the first four reigns, those of Āluvarasa I, Chitravāhana I, Āluvarasa II and Chitravāhana II. All these dated references are, however, found in records discovered outside the bounds of South Kanara. On the other hand, the Kadiri and Vepūr inscriptions of Kundavarma are both dated and are followed by dated inscriptions in large numbers. It is in order to lay stress on this important distinction in epigraphical source-material available in South Kanara that the next chapter of this thesis, on the medieval history of the Ālupas, is commenced with the reign of Kundavarma though his known date of A.D. 967-68 is not late enough to be called medieval.
The genealogical tree of the Śūpus whose reigns have been discussed above is given below:

Śuka-mahārāja alias Śjuvarasa I alias Gupasāgara-Śjuverdra = Mahādevī (c. 650-680 A.D.)

Mahārāja Citurvāhana I = Kumkuma-mahādevī (c. 680-730 A.D.)

Śjuvarasa II (c. 730-765 A.D.)

Śjuvarasa II
(c. 765-800 A.D.)

Śvetavāhana
(c. 805-815 A.D.)

Rajasagara (c. 765-805 A.D.)

Prithvīśāgara alias Śjuvarasa III (c. 810-840 A.D.)

Śvetavāhana
(c. 805-815 A.D.)

Mārama alias Śjuvarasa IV
(Paravāś, Adhirājarāja)
(c. 840-870 A.D.)

Vimalāditya (c. 870-900 A.D.)

Śiva Ranaśāya (c. 900-930 A.D.) Datt-Śuju (c. 930-950 A.D.)