CHAPTER IV

THE RULING ELITE - GROWTH OF INTERMEDIARIES

We have seen earlier that the political structure of the Ganga principality in the first phase was not very complex. In the eighth century and thereafter, however, we have evidence of the growth of a vast and varied class of intermediaries. This chapter will take up the composition of this class of intermediaries in detail.

A) FEUDATORIES BELONGING TO THE GANGA LINEAGE

There was a persistent tendency, particularly in the eighth century to distribute the Ganga domain amongst members of the royal family in particular, and collateral Ganga lineages, in general. Thus, in the period of Śṛipuruśa (AD 725 - 788) his son Duggamāra Ereyappa held the nādus of Kuvalāla - 300 and Ganga - 6000, *1 Belvathūr-nāḍu, Pulvaki nāḍu - 1000 Bēpōḍu - 1000 and a nāḍu of sixty *2. However, another eighth century record mentions Muthurā... as ruling Kuvalāla nāḍu - 300 and Ganga - 6000 under Śṛipuruśa. *3 Since these lithic inscriptions are not dated, their relative chronology is difficult to fix. Possibly, Muthurā...held these territories before they were assigned to Duggamāra. At any rate it is clear that such assignments were not permanent. It would also indicate that the Gangas in this period exercised close control over the eastern division, changing the rulers of the nādus at will.

Duggamāra Ereyappa's queen (Mahādevī) Kāńći-abbe ruled Agali under him. *4 Likewise, Śivamāra Ereyappa, another son of Śṛipuruśa was ruling Kuṇungil nāḍu *5, while Vijayāditya, another prince of royal blood ruled Āsandī nāḍ. *6 The Honnuḍike inscription of Śṛipuruśa mentions his father's younger brother Śivamāra Ereyappa by name. Although he is not mentioned as the ruler of a nāḍu, he made a grant to the goddess of Ponnuḍike of the
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income in gold (pon) out of the receipts at the time of harvest (suggivul)*7. That he could thus dispose of the revenues apparently without reference to the king would indicate that he was a territorial or administrative potentate of some importance.

Yet another local ruler belonging to the royal family was Sripurusa’s valorous queen (Vara Virantarpuram) Vinnimmađi the ruler of Malavellūr. In that capacity she granted exemption from forced labour (vitta), impressment of bullocks (ettukol), and tolls on headloads to the Forty of Amasu and the Twenty.*8

An inscription of the close of the eighth century AD from Hemmige (T. Narsipur taluk, Mysore district) refers to the reign of Konguṇi Mārājar and mentions Permānađi and his queen (arasi).*9 Permānađi became a common title of Ganga rulers from the reign of Rācamalla I (acc. AD 819).*10 But possibly here it is either Sripuruṣa or Śivamāra II who is mentioned under this title. Konguṇi is in any case the title hereditarily attached to all Ganga rulers after the founder Konguṇivarman.

The record registers the remission of the Pattondi tax at the request (besati) of the queen by Permānađi for two generations of inhabitants of Pemoge (possibly identical with Hemmige). It would appear that Hemmige fell within the jurisdiction of Permānađi himself or of his queen. The T. Narsipur area apparently fell within the personal domain of the Gangas at this time, including as it did their capital city of Talkād. Most eighth century inscriptions from T. Narsipur record grants by Ganga Kings themselves, albeit sometimes at the request of their subordinates *11.
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After the reign of Śrīpuruṣa systematic distribution of territory among members of the royal family does not appear to have been much in evidence. The Husakuru inscription of AD 870-71 (Nanjanagud taluk, Mysore district) is one of the earliest records to refer to the reign of Satyavākyya Permnādi Rācamalla II and to the rule of Būtarasa I his younger brother over Kongalnādu and Punnādu. Būtarasa is also stated to have held the Yuvarāja patṭa *12. This is interesting particularly in the light of the Jaina literary works of the tenth century which consistently portray kings crowning their elder son as adhirāja and the younger son as Yuvarāja before retiring to the monastery. Thus in Pampa's Ādirūpana Vṛṣabhanātha bestows the Rājapadavi on Bharata along with the territory of Ayōdhya while Bāhubali is given the Yuvarāja padavi and the territory of Pauḍanapura *13. Likewise in Ponna's Sāntipurāṇa ministers crown Aparājita as king while his younger brother Anantavīrya is given the position of Yuvarāja after their father Stimitāsāgara adopts the Digambaravrata *14.

In Neminātha Purāṇa, Śrīvaṇā crowns his elder son Andhakavṛṣṇi as king and Vṛṣṇi narapati, his younger son as the crown prince before retiring to the monastery *15. The Husakuru inscription indicates that the literary texts reflected a current practice. This would also explain why there was such a strong tendency for collateral succession among the Gangas. In fact, Rācamalla II was succeeded by Būtarasa's son Nītimārga Ereyanga II - one of the many collateral shifts in succession in Ganga history.

It is the Kūrgal inscription however, that represents a true continuation of the practice of dividing the territory among members of the royal family.

*12 EC III (new ed) Nj 385
This inscription of the close of the ninth century refers to the reign of Permanādi (Rācamalla II), while Ereyappa II was ruling Kongal nādu-8000 and Būtuga I's queen (arasi) Paramabbe was ruling Kūrgallu (Periyappāṭana taluk, Mysore district). Like the Kōlār inscriptions of Duggamāra Ereyappa, the Kūrgal record *16 not only depicts the distribution of territory among the various members of the royal family but also a feudatory hierarchy therein.

Several records from the Mysore district datable to the closing years of the ninth century or the early years of the tenth refer to the joint rule of Rācamalla II and Ereyappa II but they do not specify Ereyappa's territorial holdings. Thus the Iggali inscription (Nanjanagūd taluk, Mysore district) of the twenty second regnal year of Rācamalla II (AD 892) registers a grant of Kalna? to the family Rāceya Ganga who died fighting at Uttarillaga against Nōlamba. The grant was made jointly by Rācamalla II and Ereyappa *17. This inscription is significant in that it records a grant to a minor chieftain of Ganga lineage. The Gaṭṭavāḍi plates of AD 904 also refer to the joint rule of Racamalla II and Ereyappa II but again omit mention of Ereyappa's territorial holdings.*18 An ambiguous reference to their joint rule comes from the tenth century Mudahalli inscription (Nanjanagūd taluk) which records the grant of Adirāru-12 to four individuals who died fighting Chō...li Muttarasa. The grant was made by Permacli, his Mahādevi, and Ereyappa together with the Aysāmantas *19. The editors of Epigraphia Carnatica identify them with Rācamalla II his chief queen and Ereyappa II *20.
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In contrast, the Kaṭṭemanuganahalli inscription (Heggadēvanakōṭe taluk, Mysore district) of the same period mentions only Nītimārga Permānāḍi (the regnal title of Eyappa II) as the reigning king, but then specifically mentions Eyapparasa as ruling Nugu nāḍ and Navale nāḍ. In discussing the empire of Charles V in sixteenth century Europe, G.R. Elton has pointed out that Charles changed his character and title from domain to domain within his disparate realm. He was Duke in the former Burgundian holdings in the Low Country, king in Spain and Emperor in Germany, and he dealt with each domain through its separate and distinct institutions. Perhaps the same insight can be applied here as well. The nāḍus, or at least some of them, fostered such a strong corporate regional identity that Eyappa though the overlord of Gangavāḍi as a whole had to approach such units as Nugu nāḍ and Navale nāḍu separately as their local ruler. This surmise is further strengthened by the Hiraṇandi inscription (Heggadēvanakōṭe taluk) of the tenth century. This interesting epigraph records the accession of Rācamalla III and the challenge to his rule posed by one Bhuvanāditya who demanded half the kingdom and the treasure. Thereupon the Five Sāmantas (Aysāmanta) and the Pergades declared that none other than Rācamalla would rule over Bayalnāḍ and gave battle to Bhuvanāyta (the tadbhava form of Bhuvanāditya) at Māguṇḍi. Although Bhuvanāditya had demanded half the kingdom, the subordinates of Bayal nāḍ were clearly concerned more with the issue of the local ruler. Bayal nāḍ too thus appeared to have had a strong regional identity as did Nugu nāḍ and Navale nāḍ. It is interesting moreover to note that all these units belong to the same geographical area of the upper valley of the river Kabbāṇi and its tributary, the Nugu river.
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After Ereyappa II we do not appear to have any evidence for the distribution of territory among the members of the Ganga royal family. The Elkuru inscription (Chamrajnagar taluk, Mysore district) of AD 999-1000 records a joint grant by Nūtimārga Gōbindarasa and his queen Prthuvabbarasi to the Twelve of Elavakkalūru.*24 But there is no evidence that Prthuvabbarasi held a separate fief of her own.

We have several epigraphic references to Ganga chiefs of collateral lineages. The Tāyuru inscription of the ninth century (Nanjanagud taluk) refers to the reign of Pīlduvi Ganga, the son of Asaga Ganga.*25 The editor of Mysore Archaeological Report, 1930 has suggested that he was identical with Prthivipati I, the son of Śivamāra II *26 although no other epigraph gives Śivamāra II the title of Asaga Ganga. The territory ruled by him is also not specified. Similarly the Bevinakuppe virgal (Pāṇḍavapura taluk, Mandya district) of the ninth century mentions one Prthivi Ganga whose concubine (sūle) Bīrakka's son ērekalinga got his head cut off for an unknown reason in his presence.*27 Prthivi Ganga has not been identified nor his domain defined. The Māṇne plates of Rācamalla I of AD 817 also refer to a Ganga prince named Mahēndra at whose instance the Doddavāḍī village was granted as a dēvadāna. *28

An inscription palaeographically datable to the close of the ninth century from Biligere (Nanjanagud taluk) registers a grant of dehusked paddy (nellakki sollage) to the Mahājanas of Kūḍālūr by Śrī Vinayāditya, who is given the titles, inter alia, of Atiśaya Ganga and Gangara Bhīma (Bhīma among the Gangas).*29 From these titles he would appear to belong to the Ganga lineage. No overlord is mentioned, nor is the area ruled by Vinayāditya specified.
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A similar grant is registered in the Nelamane inscription of the close of the ninth century (Srīrangapatna taluk, Māndya district) wherein a chief of Ganga Kula whose name is lost, granted a sollage of dehusked rice (beliyakki) for feeding persons. Again the territorial domain of this chief is not specified. The Hiriyūr inscription of the same period records the death of Kali Ganga, the son of Anungarasa of Kiḷvuli in the battle against Ayyapa at Kalikaṭṭi. But it is not clear whether Kali Ganga actually belonged to Ganga lineage. The name and title of his father in particular throws some doubt on the assumption. The Uppahāḷḷī virgal of AD 959-60 (Chikmagalūr taluk, district) also mentions one Kali Ganga who was ruling over Devalige nāḍu. While it is possible that he was of Ganga extraction, we cannot be certain.

In contrast two eighth century inscriptions from the Bowringpet taluk of Kōḷār district clearly refer to the rule of Śrivibhava Muttarasar of Gangānvaya over Eḷenagar nāḍ-70, Āvanya nāḍ-30, and Pomkundu-12. Both records mention battles with a Bāṇa chief in which certain tenants (okkal) died and received posthumous grants of land as Kalnāḍ. Similarly, the Jinnahāḷḷī inscription (Heggadēvanakōṭe taluk, Mysore district) records the death in a battle against Nōḷambāḍhīrāja, of Mācīga the son of Ereyangappa. The hero is described as Gangānvayamūlastabhā and Gangavamśādhipati. He died fighting at the orders of Guttiya Ganga, a title of Mārasimha II. B.R.Gopal et al. identify Guttiya Ganga with Ereyappapa II and assign this inscription to the close of the ninth century. This is a doubtful
identification. In any case, both Śrīvibhava Muttarāsara and Mācīga are undeniably of Ganga descent. While the territory ruled by Mācīga is not specified, Śrīvibhava Muttarāsara's estates are clearly alluded to. The relationship of both chiefs to the main branch of the Gangas cannot be discerned. But if B.R. Gopal's contention is right, Mācīga might be a son of Ereyappa II.

A tenth century record from Hiri-Bidnūr (Goribidānūr taluk, Kōlār istrict) mentions Nanniya Ganga, the son of Ganga-kula-tilaka Kōḻālapuraparamēśvara, Śrīmat Piḷduvipati.37 He is probably identical with Ganga Prthivipati II the ally of Cōla Parāntaka I. Nanniya Ganga however appears to be subordinate to Anīga Bīra Nōḷamba, the son of Nōḷambādhirāja Ayyapadēva whose name comes first in the record - the place assigned to the reigning king. The inscription goes on to state that Nanniya Ganga's champion (gaṇḍa) joined Bīra Nōḷamba in a battle against Sāntara at Isavūr, slew the enemy and brought his head and shield to the king (āldana) before dying himself. In appreciation of his valour, Bīra Nōḷamba granted Piriya Bidanūr in Kījka nāḍ as Kalnāḍ. The grant was apparently to be maintained by the Gangas and their descendants. Although the fact that Bīra Nōḷamba's name appears before Nanniya Ganga's in this record and that the Nōḷamba is referred to as the commemorated hero's ruler (āldana) would incline us to the belief that the Nōḷamba was the overlord, the fact that Nanniya Ganga's subordination is not unambiguously mentioned as is usually the case, might indicate that the two chiefs were merely allies, possibly making common cause against the Sāntara. This surmise is strengthened by the Tātanakallu inscription of the tenth century (Goribidanūr taluk) which once again mentions Nanniya Ganga. This time the Ganga's servant (?) Anīya Gaṇḍa fought against Bīra Nōḷamba's invading army and died. In this record the grant for the deceased hero is made by the okkal of an unspecified village (ūr) and the Mahājanaṁatas.38

37 EC X (old ed) Gd 4. 38 ASMAR 1925, No.86, p 74-75
An inscription from Bēlūr (Maṇḍya taluk, district) dated AD 997 mentions Ganga Maṇḍalēśvara and Ganga Permāṇāḍi the latter being the ruler of Kundūr nāḍī. It is possible that, both refer to Gōbindara Rakkasa Ganga the reigning Ganga monarch. In the second case he is possibly mentioned specifically as the ruler of the nāḍu to which the grant pertains. Alternatively Ganga Permāṇāḍi might have belonged to a collateral branch although the title of Permāṇāḍi was usually applied only to scions of the main branch. It is interesting that this record gives the Ganga only the title of Maṇḍalēśvara instead of the sovereign titles of Mahārājādhīrāja and Paramēśvara. Would this indicate subordination to a greater power? The fragmentary reference to Tribhuvanamalla a common biruda of the Cālukyas, at the beginning of this inscription might in fact suggest such subordination. On the other hand the Hale Būdanūr inscription of AD 1024 (Maṇḍya taluk, district) which is dated in the regnal years of Rājendra Cōla signifying his suzerainty, gives Gōbindara Rakkasa Ganga all the sovereign titles. It is therefore difficult to come to a conclusion on the status of a ruler on the basis of titles only.

In the Pampa Bhārata Arjuna after his coronation bestows on his brothers and Yuyutsu the nāḍus of their choice. Such distribution of territory among the members of the lineage appears then, to have been established practice even in the tenth century. In the case of the Gangas it is best attested to in the eighth century when they held close control over most of Gangavādi by this means, as also by transferring feudatories from one territorial unit to another. Thereafter this hold weakened even as the practice of distribution among members of the ruling family is attested to only from a few records. The majority of references to Gangas of collateral branches come from
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the post eighth century period. But the Gangas lost effective control over the Eastern division which represented their earliest power base. Other lineages, particularly the Bāṇas and Nolambas supplanted them there.

**B) OTHER RULING LINEAGES OF SOUTHERN KARNATAKA.**

(I) **BĀNAS:** Mention has been made earlier of Mahalingam’s view that the Bāṇas had a base in the Kōlār area in the mid-fourth century AD from which they were ousted by the Gangas.*43 However, the earliest authentic Bāṇa records date only from the eighth century. The Tātikallu inscription assigned by Rice to c-715 AD (Mūlbāgāl taluk, Kōlār district) refers to the reign of Mahāvali Bāṇarasa. No overlord is mentioned. The inscription records the death of a hero who died defending cattle.*44 Likewise, the Sīsandra inscription (Kōlārtaluk, district) of the mid-eighth century mentions Mahābali Bāṇarasa as the ruler of Ganga-6000.*45 The Hulikunda inscription (Bowringpet taluk, Kōlār district) of the same period also refers to Mahāvali Bāṇarasa as the ruler of Ganga-6000 without mentioning an overlord. The Bāṇa appears as the superior of a minor chieftain named Nāgadeva who was probably ruling Pōmkundu-12.*46 The Bāṇa’s claim to rule over Ganga-6000 independently is interesting in the light of other Kōlār epigraphs which mention Mūthūra...*47 and Duggamāra Ereyappa*48 as rulers of that unit under the suzerainty of Śrīpuruṣa Ganga in the same period. Similar conflicting claims to rule over the Banavāsi-12000 unit have been noted earlier.*49 It would appear that the Ganga hold over this region in Śrīpuruṣa’s reign was not as secure as it appears merely from a perusal of the Ganga records. The Bāṇas held at least some portion of Ganga-6000 independently of the Gangas. The Tallapalḷi and Pīḷāvara records*50 cited earlier would also support this emerging picture of a Ganga - Bāṇa conflict over the territories in the Eastern division.

*43 Supra, Chapter III, Section A. *44 EC X (old ed) Mb 261.
*47 Supra, fn 3. *48 Supra, fn 1.
*49 Supra chapter II, section B. *50 Supra, fn 33.
Ganga-Bāna relations were not always hostile in this period. The Hullēnahalli copper plates of Śripuruṣa refer to Dindigarar of Bāna lineage as the subordinate ruler of Oṃlūlu in Kaṅbappu-nādu. At his request, the Kōvalavēṭṭu village was granted to three brāhmaṇas as brahmaṇḍa by Śripuruṣa. Likewise the Dēvarahalli plates of AD 776 record the grant of Ponnalli village in Nirggunda viṣaya and of other lands to a Jaina temple at Śripura constructed at the instance of Kundāccī, the queen of Paramagūla, the Prithivi Nirggundarāja of Bāna lineage. The grant itself was made at the instance of Paramagūla. Both Dindigarar and Paramagūla were thus subordinates of Śripuruṣa and were ruling territories in the Western division.

The Eastern division was the Bāna’s main base. Towards the close of the eighth century several records from the Śrīnivāspur and Mulpāgal taluks of Kolār district refer to the reign of Vikramāditya Jayamēru Bāna Vidyādhara also known as Prabhumēru over the earth - an expression of independence. One of these records, a virgal from Aralukōṭe records a battle with Kāḍuvattī’s entire force (samasta bala) in which his subordinate Vīramahāmēru died fighting. Kāḍuvattī is the Tamil dynastic name of the Pallavas. It would seem that the Pallavas were attempting to expand their circle of influence by fishing in the troubled waters of Southern Karnāṭaka where at this time the Raṣṭrakūṭas had supplanted the Gangas, perhaps with some aid from the Pallavas. The Maṇṭe plates of yuvarāja Mārasimha state that Śivamāra II had been jointly crowned by Gōvinda III Raṣṭrakūṭa and Nandivarman Pallavamalla. Another virgal from Aralukōṭe itself records the death of Viyāla Vīyādhara in a battle against the Dāmarīgas at the order (besase) of his lord (ālva) Prabhumēru. It is not clear who the Dāmarīgas were. The word dāmara means a riot or an affray. Dāmarīga by extension might mean rioters. The Rājatarangini of Kalhaṇa refers to a class of landlords or wealthy cultivators in ancient Kashmir known as Dāmaras.
This is unlikely to apply to southern Karnataka where an analogous class of wealthy cultivator landlords was better known as gāvunda. At all events, the Dāmarigas of the Araḷukōṭe inscription appear to have been a formidable force. The deceased hero received the village Kulanellūr with all exemptions.\(^*57\). From the ninth century the Bāṇas appear to have been overshadowed by the Nōlambas whose inscriptions outnumber those of all other lineages in the Eastern division. But the Bāṇas retained a foothold in the Mūḷbāgāl taluk area whence a series of Bāṇa records of the ninth and tenth centuries have been recovered.\(^*58\)

The Bāṇas' relations with the Gangas and the Nōlambas appear to have fluctuated. After the restoration of the Gangas a period of Ganga-Nōlamba alliance followed. It is probably to this phase in the ninth century that the Maṇḍivāla inscription (Kōlār taluk, district) belongs. This epigraph states that Nītimārga Permāṇāḍi was ruling Gangavāḍi-96,000 while Nōlambāḍhirāja was ruling Ganga-6000. At the Nōlamba's orders Pompallavoḍeyar, the lord of Bēngaḍa (Bēngada-nātha) marched with his forces upon Murggepāḍi and fought against Bāṇarasa. Both monarchs made a posthumous grant in appreciation of his valour.\(^*59\)

While the Maṇḍivāla inscription indicates that Ganga-Bāṇa relations were hostile in this period the Bangavāḍi epigraph (Mūḷbāgāl taluk, Kōlār district)\(^*60\) seems to suggest that an alliance even if a short-lived one existed between the three powers. They appear to have joined together to fight against Māyināḍiya Dāḍiga in the battle of Mandāvu. Likewise, the Vartūr inscription (Bangalore taluk, district) also of the ninth century mentions a Bāṇa chief Aṇniga, the son of Nijapa of Mahābali varṇa.

\(^*57\) EC X (old ed) Sp 5.
\(^*58\) EC X (old ed) Mb 265, 26, 230, 124, kl 200 of c 850 AD, Mb 243, 244 of c 890 AD, Mb 227 of c 900 AD, Mb 126 of AD 961, etc.,
\(^*59\) EC X (old ed) Kl 79.
\(^*60\) Ibid, Mb 228
as the subordinate of the Ganga and of Nōlamba Śivamāra, the ruler of Morasu
nadu.*61

We also have references to chiefs belonging to Balivamśa from the Western
division. While the epigraphs themselves do not describe them as Bānas, the fact that
the Bānas too claimed descent from Bali might justify mentioning them with the Bānas.
One of these chiefs was Śrī Muttara, the Śāmanta of Rācamalla II and Ereyappa II who
fought off an invasion by Nōlambarasa at Kalikaṭi. He is highly eulogized as the
Dīlīpa of this world (bhuvana - Dīlīpa), Śudraka among heroes (Kali-Kali-Śudraka),
the beloved of victory (Jayakke nalla) and the forehead ornament of Balivamśa.*62
Similarly the Gaṇiganurū inscription (Yelandūr taluk, Mysore district), mentions
Gaṇarudra Arakuṭṭi of Balivamśa evidently a subject of Satyavākya Permānaḍi who is
referred to as the reigning king. Arakuṭṭi made several land grants for the
Arakuṭṭīśvara temple which was evidently constructed on his behalf by Śivaśakti
bhaṭāra, the trustee.*63 We do not know the rank enjoyed by Gaṇarudra Arakuṭṭi
nor the territory ruled by him.

The Bānas then, appear as chiefs claiming independent control over the
Ganga-6000 province in the eighth century. In the following two centuries, however,
their realm appears to have shrunk under the impact of the expanding Nōlamba
lineages to mere pockets in the modern Mūlībāgāl taluk. Their relations with the
dominant powers of the region fluctuated. While the Gangas and Nōlambas
occasionally waged war against the Bānas they also appear to have co-operated
sometimes in the conduct of local wars. Individual Bāna chiefs are also mentioned in
the records of the western division, mostly as the subordinates of the Gangas.

*63 EC IV (new ed) Yl 174.
(II) NOLAMBAS: The earliest certain references to the Nōjambas in our records come from the close of the eighth century. The Gānjam copper plates of yuvarāja Mārasimha refer to Kollijyarasa Kali Nōjambādhirāja of Pallavarāya, who granted Tipperūr to Ponnaḍi, the ođevā of Ārppola, with Mārasimha's permission.*64

Another eighth century record from Hebbāḷu (Maddūr taluk, Māṇḍya district) mentions Nōlvabba raįya*65 which may be a reference to a Nōjamba principality, but we cannot be certain. Likewise, two Kōḷār district epigraphs refer to the reign of Pallava mārāja*66 and of a chief entitled to play the five great instruments (pañcamahāśabda), named Prthvivallabha Pallavarāma of Pallavāṅvaya*67 respectively. Since the distinctive name of Nōjamba is absent in both records, it is hard to determine whether the Pallava chiefs referred to were of Pallava stock from Tamil Nadu or their local offshoots in south-eastern Kārṇāṭaka.

Like the Bāṇas, the Nōjambas too were based in the eastern division and became the dominant power there. Until the end of the ninth century the names of individual Nōjamba rulers are not mentioned in inscriptions and we have only generic references to Nōjambādhirāja of Pallavāṅvaya entitled to the Pañcamahāśabdas, who presumably was the main representative of this lineage.*68

*64 EC VI (new ed) Sr 66.
*65 EC VII (new ed) Mu 36.
*66 EC X (old ed) Bg 77 of the eighth century from Venkatapura.
*67 EC X (old ed) Mb 59 of c.800 AD from Avani.
*68 For instance, EC X (old ed) Bp 45 of c AD 820 Mb 248 of C 860 AD, Sp 27, Sd 32 of c 870 AD: Sd 33,Mb 102, Sp50, CB 26,Gd 5, Ct 36 of c 880 AD, etc.
The Ghaṭamāranahāḷi inscription (Sidlaghāṭa taluk, Kōḷār district) of the ninth century which mentions Pallava Nōḷambarasa entitled to the Paṇcamahāśabdas,*69 the Malliśēṭtipura epigraph of the beginning of the ninth century which refers to Śrī Nōḷamba ruling the kingdom,*70 and the Hulikunda inscription of c.880 AD which mentions Maṇja Nōḷamba as the reigning king,*71 perhaps represent collateral Nōḷamba chiefs. The Vartūr inscription (Bangalore taluk, district) of the ninth century which mentions Nōḷamba Śivamāra as the ruler of Morasu nāḍu and the subordinate of (Ganga) Permānaḍī*72 has been referred to earlier.*73 Likewise, the Duntūru record (Kankanahāḷi taluk, Bangalore district) mentions a minor Nōḷamba chieftain named Sēnemāra whose son, Mendaṇḍa’s death in a cattle raid is commemorated.*74

From the last quarter of the ninth century Nōḷamba inscriptions begin alluding to the names of the monarchs. Mahēndrādhirāja is one of the earliest Nōḷambas to be mentioned by name. He was the son of Nōḷambādhirāja Pōḻalcōra by Jāyabbe the daughter of Rācamalla II Ganga.*75 Pōḻalcōra and his immediate predecessors are named only in an inscription from Hēmāvati dated AD 942-43.*76 It is probably Pōḻalcōra who was ruling over Ganga-6000 under Nītimārga Ereyappa.*77 Mahēndrādhirāja is said to have ascended the throne after destroying rival claimants (dāyiga), Cōramma and others.*78 He established the temple of Mahēndresvara at Bāragūr and granted Nāṇḍūr in Sīre nāḍ for its maintenance and conduct of worship therein.*79 Another record from Bāragūr mentions several queens of Mahēndra such as Bija(y)a Mahādevī, Parama Mahādevī, Akkabbe and Ḍombokbe who were ruling over Oreyūru, Dharmapōḷaḷa, Siyavūr and Tailōka pōḷaḷa respectively.*80

*69 ASMAR 1929,No.36,P 103
*70 EC X (old ed) Sd 59.
*71 EC X (old ed) Bp 41
*72 EC IX (old ed) Bn 40
*73 supra, p/75-6, fn.61.
*74 EC IX (old ed) Kk 152 of c.900 AD.
*75 EC XII (old ed) Si 38. of AD 878
*76 EC X (old ed) Kl 79.
*77 Ibid Si 28 of AD 942-43.
*78 EC XII (old ed) Si 38
*79 Ibid Si 24 of c.880.
This epigraph thus attests to distribution of territory among members of the royal family. Interestingly the queens appear to have granted lands to a basadi. It is significant that women patronized Jainism to a greater extent than men. This issue will be taken up later.*81

Apart from the Bāragūr records Mahēndrādhirāja is referred to in an inscription from Nidugal (Pāvagaḍa taluk, Tumkur district). This also mentions Bīḍi Cōrārasa of Pallavānvaya who is said to have constructed a temple of Candrasekara.*82 Similarly, an inscription from Karubelē (Bowringpet taluk, Kōḷār district) states that Mahēndrādhirāja was ruling Ganga-6000.*83

Although Mahēndrādhirāja was the son of a Ganga princess, Ganga-Nōḷamba relations were far from cordial in this period. The Muttukaḍahāḷḷi vīrgaḷ*84 (Chintāmaṇi taluk, Kōḷār district) and the Doḍḍabelavangala vīrgaḷ*85 (Doḍḍaballāpura taluk, Bangalore district) both refer to the reign(arasugeyyye) of Mahēndra, and to battles with the Gangas in which the latter appear to have been worsted. The Bēgūr inscription of Ereyappa II also mentions a battle with Bīra Mahēndra in which Nāgattara a subordinate of the Ganga died fighting.*86 The Śeṭṭīhalḷi*87 and Venkaṭapura*vīrgaḷs ofc 880 AD which mention Māyindamarasa as the reigning king might also belong to the same Nōḷamba monarch whose domain covered most of Kōḷār district and parts of the Bangalore and Tumkur districts. In addition, Dharmapuri (TamīḷNāḍu) and its adjoining areas were also held by the Nōḷambas at this time.*89

*81 Infra, Chapter VI.
*82 EC XII (old ed) Pg 45.
*84 Ibid, Ct 116.
*86 Ibid, Bn 83.
*83 EC X (old ed) Bp 64.
*85 EC IX (old ed) DB 3.
*87 EC X (old ed) Sd 39.
*89 EI X, No. 14, pp. 54-70.
Two inscriptions from Āvani record the death of Mahēndrādhirāja. His mother, Dīvalabbarasi, a Kadamba princess, built a temple Nōjamba Nārāyaṇes'vara in his memory.*90 He was apparently succeeded by Ayyapa dēva Nōjambādhirāja, his son. The Kōyira vīrgal (Dēvanahalli taluk, Bangalore district) which mentions śrimad Ayyapa as the reigning king is dated AD 909.*91 Another inscription from Bāragūr (Sira taluk, Tumkur district) which mentions Ayyapadeva as the ruler is dated AD 919. His queens (Mano-nayana-Vallabheyar) Nāgiyabbe and Neleyabbe granted lands for two temples, situated at Bāragūr.*92 Most other records are undated but palaeographically assigned to the beginning of the tenth century. This is the case with the Hulikunda inscription*93 (Bowringpēṭ taluk, Kōlār district) the Hebbāta inscription*94 (Śrīnivāspur taluk, Kōlār district)*95 and the Cāmanahalli inscription (Mālūr taluk, Kōlār district). All these inscriptions are hero-stones, the first two commemorating deaths in cattle raids and the last a conflict between a local ruler Sitipendranarasa of Navilūr and Ayyapa. Ayyapa's son Bīra Nōlamba appears to be the next ruler of the line. Two of his records from Kurubūr (Chintāmaṇi taluk, Kōlār district) are dated AD 931.*96 Both record cash grants to the 108 Mahājanas of Kurumbūr by the sons of Nāgamayya, the oḍeya of Kōmaramangala.*97 Bīra Nōlamba's realm seems to have included the Śrīnivāspur,*98 Kōlār,*99 Gauribidanūr,*100 and Chintāmaṇi taluks*101 of Kōlār district, and the Sira,*102 Maddagiri*103 and Pāvagada*104 taluks of Tumkur district. His relations with Nanniya Ganga of the collateral Ganga line has been discussed earlier.*105 It was also Aṇṇiga Bīra Nōlamba who is said to have been defeated by Ganga Rācamalla III and reduced to vassal status according to the Kūḍūr plates of Mārasimha II.*106 But Aṇṇiga Bīra Nōlamba's records do not betray any signs of such subordination.
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*92 EC XII (old ed) Si 39
*94 EC X (old ed) Sp 29
*96 EC X (old ed) Ct 43,44.
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*93 EC X (old ed) Bp 42.
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Brra Nōlamba was succeeded by his younger brother Dilipayya Nōlamba. This chief bore the titles and birudas of Prthivīvallabha, Pallava-kula-tilaka, Iriva Nōlambādhirāja and Palarode ganda and is said to be entitled to the Paṇcamahāśabdās according to the Hemāvati inscription of AD 942-43*107

His domain included Āvani in Mūlāgāl taluk,*108 Tekal (Mālūr taluk),*109Hebbāṭa (Śrīnīvāspur taluk)*110 and Hulikunda (in Bowringpet taluk)*111 in the Kōḷār district and the Sira taluk*112 in Tumkur district. Apart from this, several inscriptions from the Kōḷār, Tumkūr and Bangalore districts refer to Iriva Nōlambādhirāja; one of the titles of Dilipayya Nōlamba.*113

However the descendants of Pōḷalcōra are not the only Nōlamba chieftains attested to for the end of the ninth and the beginning of the tenth century. An inscription from Koḍlāpura (Maddagiri taluk, Tumkur district) dated AD 897-98 refers itself to the reign of Prthivīvallabha Nōlambādhirāja Nōlipayya, entitled to the Paṇcamahāśabdās.*114 He appears to have reigned until the middle of the tenth century since his Tūmbāḍi inscription (Maddagiri taluk) is palaeographically assigned to that period.*115 This inscription refers to a battle at Bidirūr with Būtuga (the Ganga?) in which Poṇīga of Tumbevāḍi participated at the order (besadal) of Ankayya, the son of Nōlambādhirāja Nōlipayya.

---
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While the Tumkur records consistently attribute only the title of Nōlambādhirāja to Nōlipayya two records from Kōlār palaeographically assignable to the mid-tenth century also give him the title of Īrīva-Nōlambādhirāja. Of these, the Gundlahalli epigraph (Kōlār taluk) gives Nōlipayya the titles of Ēkavākya, Nōlambādhirāja and Īrīva-Nōlamba and he is said to be entitled to the Paṇcamahāsātādas. The inscription also mentions Vikramāditya Tiruvayya as the ruler of the Ganga-6000 unit as a subordinate of Nōlipayya.*116 Tiruvayya, who is described as Vaidumba sikhāmanī is also mentioned in the Bētamangala inscription (Bowringpet taluk) of Nōlipayya. In this record, Nōlipayya is described as Īrīva-Nōlambādhirāja.*117

Since the title of Īrīva Nōlambādhirāja is ascribed to both Dīlīpayya and to Nōlipayya it becomes difficult to determine whether the inscriptions mentioning only the title should be ascribed to Nōlipayya or to Dīlīpayya. The extent of their domains also cannot be precisely ascertained on this account. The relationship between Nōlipayya and Mahendrādhirāja and his scions also cannot be discerned. While Dīlīpayya's inscriptions by and large portray him as an independent ruler, the Muddalahalli inscription of AD 956 (?) suggests that he was subordinate to Nōlipayya.*118 The last reference to Īrīva Nōlamba comes from the Haralakunte virgal (Kolar taluk) which is dated AD 966.*119 Since Nōlipayya was ruling from 897-98 AD this record is more likely to belong to Dīlīpayya. Nōlipayya's last certain date is AD 951 to which year the Ārūru inscription (Chintāmani taluk, Kōlār district) belongs. This records a grant by Nōlamba and Tiruvayya (the Vaiḍumbā) of ten kölas of waste land at Āne-ūr as dēvabhūga to the Bhūmesvara temple.*120 The lacuna in the Muddalahalli inscription throws some doubt on its date. If it is indeed assignable to AD 956. (Saka 8.8), then this would be the last-known reference to Nōlipayya.

*116 EC X (old ed) Kl.198. of c 950 AD
*118 EC X (old ed) Ct.143
*119 EC X (old ed) Kl 245
*120 Ibid, Ct 49.
The Uttanūr epigraph of AD 968 (Mūlbāgāl taluk) records the coronation (pattamgatti) of Nanni Nōlamba.*121 It was possibly Nanni Nōlamba together with collateral Nōlamba chiefs, who was defeated and perhaps killed by Mārasimha II Ganga who then adopted the title of Nōlambakulāntaka.*122 Subsequent to this we find the Ganga asserting his authority in the Eastern division for the first time in the tenth century. The Hālahalli*123 and Hulikunda*124 virgals both refer to the reign of Mārasinghadeva (II), in recording the death of local heroes in defence of buffaloes and cattle. However, in spite of the grandiose title of Nōlambakulāntaka adopted by Mārasimha he does not seem to have been successful in wiping out the Nōlambas at least in the Eastern division. An inscription from Melāgani (Mūlbāgāl taluk) dated AD 974 states that Nōlambādhirāja Cōrayya and his father (tande) received the news of Mārasimha's death.*125 It is possibly Cōrayya who is referred to under the title of Nōlambādhirāja in the Kandagrāma inscription (Chikka-Baḷḷapura taluk, Kōlār district) of AD 977*126

Two virgals from Haḍakanahaḷḷi (Hosakōṭe taluk, Bangalore district) point to the existence of collateral branches of the Nōlambas and of conflict among them. One of these refers itself to the reign of Nōlambādhirāja and records the death of a Nōlambara in a battle apparently against the Nōlamba chief of Cōla Bijāyitamangala.*127 The other virgal records the valour of Nōlambaras's retainer Mallapapaṇṇa and his elder brother Kāvaliya Raṇugayya possibly in the same battle.*128 Two other references to Nōlamba chiefs from the Eastern division in the post 975 AD period come from hero-commemoration stones at Hēmāvati. The first records the death of Uttiga, a soldier of Nōlamba Permādi and Sāgabbarasi in a battle against the Gangas.*129 The second virgal refers itself to the reign of Āhavamalla Nōlambādhirāja and records the death of Pōcayya in a local skirmish.*130

*121 EC X (old ed) Mb 122.
*122 EC II (new ed) SB 64; Cavundaraya Purana, op.cit. p.4.
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Although the Nōlambas were essentially based in the Eastern division, which came to be known as Nōlambaṇaḍi by the close of the tenth century*131 we do have references to Nōlamba chiefs from the western division as well. As mentioned earlier, the earliest reference to a Nōlamba comes from a Maṇḍya inscription.*132 One Nōlamba chief appears to have been based in Āsandi nāḍ as the Hir-Bāsūr inscription indicates. (Kaḍūr taluk, Chikmagalūr district) This epigraph records the death of Mārasimha gāmupṭa in a battle against Nōlamba of Āsandi nāḍ. The deceased hero was given the village of Bāsanūr with all exemptions.*133 It is possibly the same Nōlamba ruler who was fought off by Śrī Muttara, the sāmanta of Āreyyappa II who was ruling Āsandi nāḍ.*134

Two other inscriptions from Hāssan district, the Dīḍaga virgal of AD 970 (Channarāyapaṭna taluk) and the Nērīlage virgal (Arsīkere taluk) of AD 971-72 mention battles undertaken by Nōlambakulāntaka Mārasingha Permānaḍi (II) against the Nōlambas. The Dīḍaga virgal mentions a battle at Ulanūr in which Asagayya of Panaravāḍi was killed fighting with Mahāśāmanta Lēsāyya. His son, Sankaragopuṇḍa received a grant as Kālnāḍ.*135 Since the location of Ulanūr is not specified it is not clear where the Nōlamba adversary of this record was based. The Nērīlage inscription also records the death of a hero Annavāsaya in a battle against the Nōlambas and the grant of Nērīlage village as Kālnāḍ to his son Būtuga in perpetuity.*136 Once again in the absence of data we cannot hazard a guess as to the territorial holding of the Nōlamba chief in question.
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An equally unsatisfactory reference to a Nōlamba chief comes from the Kerehaḷḷi inscription (Chāmprajnagar taluk, Mysore district) of the close of the ninth century which mentions Permāḍi (a Ganga?) receiving homage from Nōlamba’s Pergade, Tribhuvanayya. The record goes on to state that Tribhuvanayya was administering Śivayyanakēre and granted bittuvattā for the tank.*137 Since the inscription is on a stone in the tank bund of Kerehaḷḷi, it is tempting to conclude that Tribhuvanayya was the local officer and Nōlamba, his lord, had jurisdiction over this area. While it is possible we cannot be certain. If we accept this view, it would imply that the Ganga control over the Kaveri valley too was incomplete and the process of sub-infeudation had set in here also.

In sum, the Nōlambas emerged as a major power in the eastern division in the ninth century and remained entrenched there in spite of Ganga attempts to subject them to their own authority. Initially they had allied themselves to the Gaṅgas, matrimonial alliances had been entered into and the Nōlambas acknowledged the suzerainty of Rācamalla I and Nītimārga Ereyappa I as the Maḍivāla inscription bears witness.*138 But in the majority of the Kōlār, Bangalore and Tumkur records, the Nōlambas do not refer to the Gangas as their overlord. They appear to have pushed the Bāṇas to a corner and subordinated the Vaiḍumbas to their authority. Although several inscriptions from Hässan in the west and Kōlār in the east mention Mārasimha II’s conflict with the Nōlambas, his biruda of Nōlambakulāntaka seems far from the truth. The Nōlamba kula survived his onslaught but were submerged soon after by the Cōla blitzkrieg.*139

(III) VAIḌUMBAS: In comparison to the Nōlambas or even the Bāṇas, the Vaiḍumbas had a limited presence in south-eastern Karnātaka. Only from the tenth century do we have epigraphic references to this lineage.

*137 EC IV (new ed) Ch 352  
*138 EC X (old ed) Kl 79.  
*139 Only two records, EC X (old ed) Ct 118 of AD 1011-12 and Sp 14 of c 1015 AD refer to Nōlamba Cōrayya under Cōla rule.
As in the case of the Nōlambas we only have generic references to the Vaidumba mahārāja initially. One of the earliest inscriptions to refer to Vaidumba mahārāja is the Bairaganapalli epigraph (Srinivāspur taluk, Kōlar district) of c.900 AD. The Vaidumba mahārāja is stated to be entitled to play the Pañcamahāsabdas and was apparently an independent ruler. The arasa of Halayūr and Pallava Mahārāja, the donor of a Kalṇāṭu are also mentioned, but the relation of these three kings to each other is not clear.*140

The other early reference to the Vaidumba comes from Bechirākh Yarragudi inscription of the same period (Bāgepalli taluk, Kōlar district). This states that the Vaidumba mahārāja was ruling with the small river (Kirudore) as his boundary. He seems to have come into conflict with the Nōlamba Mahārāja and a hero fell in the battle of Muṟu Malikī.*141 It is not clear which small river is referred to here. The Kirudore as boundary (maryāde) is also mentioned in the Bayyapalli inscription of c.880 AD (Srinivāspur taluk). The Kirudore was the boundary between the domains of Nōlabbādyarasa (Nōlambādhirāja?), Cōḷa Permāṇaḍīgaḷ and Māyindama.*142 The Bayyapalli inscription brings out the political fragmentation in the Kōlar region at this time. So great was this fragmentation that the nādu units are scarcely ever mentioned. They do not appear to have been valid political units at this time. When the Cōḷas brought this entire region under their control, however, the old nādu are once more mentioned. Apparently, they continued as units with an ethnic or regional identity but for the purposes of the record-keepers, the most significant point at issue was the local ruler whose domain did not necessarily coincide with the nādu boundaries, at least in the Kolar area.*142(a)

*140 EC X (old ed) Sp 85.
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The third early record mentioning Vaidumbha mahārāja as ruling the kingdom of earth comes from Kottapalli (Srīnivāspur taluk) and refers to a certain Corayya who was ruling the Nelavanki abhyantara-siddhi evidently as a subordinate of Vaidumbha mahārāja.*143 Abhyantara-siddhi has been explained by Sircar as internal income or revenue payable to the village authorities as against those payable to the king.*144 It has been explained by others as "the power of adjudication".*145 In this inscription and in other records from Shimoga district it seems to indicate rulership of a village.*146

At the beginning of the tenth century, then, the Vaidumbas appear to have been independent rulers based mainly in the Srīnivāspur taluk but with a small pocket in the Bāgepalli taluk as well. Inscriptions of the mid-tenth century, however, portray them as subordinates of the Nolambas. The Bētamangala inscription of c.950 AD (Bowringpet taluk, Kōlār district) mentions Irīva-Nolambādhirāja Nōlipayya as the reigning king and Vaidumba sikhāmani Vikramāditya Tiruvayya repairing the breach in the tank of Vijayādityamangala (evidently the modern Bētamangala) at the orders (besado!) of Nōlipayya. The bittukāṭṭa for the tanks maintenance was granted in favour of the 500 mahājanas of Kayvāra.*147 The fact that Tiruvayya acted at the command of Nōlipayya would clearly indicate his subordinate status. This is further confirmed by the Gunḍlahāḷi inscription of the same period (Kōlār taluk) which describes Nōlipayya as the reigning king and Vikramāditya Tiruvayya as the ruler of Ganga-6000.*148 This once more records the grant of bittukāṭṭa for the tank of Bangavāḍi. Likewise the Āṟūr inscription (Chintāmani taluk) of AD 951 mentions Irīva Nolambādhirāja as the reigning king and records the grant of a devabhoga for the Bhimesvara temple by Nolamba and Tiruvayya.*149

*143 ASMAR 1928, No 33, p 45-46.
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While Tiruvayya's domain is not specified in this record nor his subordination clearly mentioned, the order in which the names appear seem to imply vassalage.

Lastly we have the Gundlahalli epigraph of c.950 AD (Mulbagal taluk), which mentions Dilipayya as the reigning king and records the grant of bittukatta for the tank of Mandigallu by Tiruvayya's son Candrasekara.*150

It is interesting to note that the distribution of the mid-tenth century epigraphs mentioning the Vaidumbas differs from the geographical spread of the earlier records of Vaidumba mahārāja. The relation between Vaidumba mahārāja of the early tenth century and Vikramāditya Tiruvayya and his son Candrasekara cannot be discerned. It is possible that they belonged to collateral branches. On the other hand it is also possible that the acceptance of Nolamba suzerainty enabled the Vaidumbas to extend their sphere of influence just as Rajput chiefs accepting Mughal sovereignty could enjoy mansabs and jagirs under imperial service in addition to their patrimonial estates.

(IV) COLAS: We have a few epigraphic references indicating Cōla presence in southeastern Karnāṭaka prior to its conquest by Imperial Cōlas under Rājarāja Cōla I. A group of vīrgals from Sravanagudi (Maddagiri taluk, Tumkur district) of c.750 AD mention Cōla Dhananjaya as the ruler of Erigālavādi-600. Two of these commemorate death of heroes in the war waged by the Twelve (Pannīrvarum) against Rattapādi (the Rastrakūta territory).*151 Another vīrgal mentions a rebellion by Kangapādi, Kottavallipādi and Vallabhavādi against Valavarma who apparently ruled over them.*152 The relation between Cōla Dhananjaya and Valavarma is not clear. Yet another hero-stone commemorates the death of Āditya Kumaran a retainer (ālu) of Cōla Dhananjaya in some battle.*153

*150 Ibid, Mb 198.
*151 EC XII (old ed) Mi 97,92. *152 EC XII (old ed) Mi 93.
*153 Ibid, Mi 101.
Another early reference to a Cōla comes from the eighth century Hebbālu virgal (Maddur taluk, Maṇḍya district) which has been cited earlier in connection with the Nōlambas.*154 This hero-stone records the prowess in battle of Karmāga Rāca, Irmādi Bīra and Maṇalēra, okkal from Kunungīl under the command of Irmādiyar at Tungāl against Vadi Cōla. The territory of Vadi Cōla cannot be determined from this record. Likewise, the Bayyaṇalli inscription (Śrinivāspur taluk, Kōlār district) which mentions Cōla Permapādīgāl sharing the Kirudore as a boundary with Nōlabbādyarasa and Māyindama*155 also does not help much in fixing the domain of the Cōla chief beyond indicating that it lay in the Śrinivāspur area.

Two inscriptions from Nagaragere (Gauribidanūr taluk, Kōlār district) assigned to the beginning of the tenth century, mention Cōla Mahārāja as the local ruler. While the purport of one is unclear,*156 the other records the grant of wet lands (galde) for three temples (Mūru dēgulakkam) by a subordinate of Māyindama Cōla Mahārāja.*157

While the above records are of local chiefs of Cōla extraction the Bairakūru inscription (Mulbāgal taluk, Kōlār district) indicates that the Imperial Cōlas had conquered parts of south-eastern Karnātaka even prior to Rājarāja I. This inscription mentions Madiregonda Kō Parakēsarivarman (Parāntaka I) as the reigning king and is dated in his twenty-ninth regnal year (AD 934).*158 It records the rescue of cattle by Māremma of Bayadakūru and the grant of one kanduga of riceland (kalani) below the tank to the hero by a feudatory (sāmanta) of Permapādi. Permapādi might possibly refer to Prthivipati II Ganga or to his son Nanniyā Ganga who is mentioned in the Gauribidanūr inscriptions cited earlier.*159 But Parāntaka’s control of this region did not last long. The invasion of Kṛṣṇa III Rāṣṭrakūṭa and of Būtuga II Ganga wrested even Tōṇḍaimanḍalam from the Cōlas.*160
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But under Rājarāja I the Cōlas reconquered most of Gangavadi and retained it until expelled from there by Viśṇuvardhana Hoysalā, a century later. The extent and nature of Cōla administrative control over Gangavadi will be discussed later. *161

(V) NĀGATTARAS: A few inscriptions from Bangalore district refer to the Nāgattaras who appear to have been vassals of the Gangas. It is not quite clear whether "Nāgattara" refers to a descent group or to an office. But the Agara inscription of the ninth century (Bangalore taluk) mentions Nāgattara Irugamayya as the Irvuliyūr-odeya.*162 From this Nāgattara would seem to be a family name. This is further suggested by the Bēgur inscription which mentions the tying of the Nāgattara vatta.*163 This immediately recalls the Šerugunda inscription which mentions Nirvinitā's younger son being crowned with the Kongani patta (the Ganga crown).*164 Just as Kongani was the generic name for the Gangas after the founder Kongoṇivarman, so it is possible that Nāgattara was the generic name for this descent group although the word vamsa is nowhere used.

The position of Irvuliyur odea held by Nāgattara Irugamayya implies that he held land in that settlement. The Agara inscription thus brings out the rural landholding base of the Nāgattaras though we have no hint as to their caste affiliation.*165 The Bēgur inscription on the other hand stresses the Nāgattaras' position as military vassals of the Gangas. It refers to the battle against Bīrā Mahēndra in which Nāgattara led the forces of Ayyapa and his sāmantas and died fighting in the battle of Tumbepādi. His son Iruga was then given the Nāgattara vaṭṭa (crown) and the division of Bēmpūr-12 as kalnāḍ. *166 The Bēgur inscription substantiates Nandi's contention of contractual relationship between overlords and vassals.*167

In addition the Bēgūr record also signifies the confirmation of the heir in his succession to the dignity or estate of Nagattara.

The Bammonḍapallī inscription (Ānekal taluk, Bangalore district) of the close of the ninth century is the last record to refer to Nāgattara. It records the death of Mangala Bīvanṇa, the servant (āl) of Nāgattara in a cattle raid (turugōl).*168 The hero was probably a raider since inscriptions generally mention death in defence of cattle specifically.*169 If so this would indicate, how widespread the practice of cattle raiding was.*170

In sum, the Nāgattaras appear to be low-ranking feudatories who were initially associated with landholdings at the village level. By the close of the ninth century as a result of meritorious military service Iruga who succeeded to the Nāgattara vatta held a division of twelve villages. The history of the Nāgattaras brings out the dynamism of the political system of the period wherein the endemic warfare provided the feudatories scope for increasing their rank and possessions.*171 We are proceeding here on the assumption that the Nāgattaras formed a feudatory lineage. Whether the three references to the Nāgattaras belong to members of a single lineage or collateral branches thereof cannot be discerned from the meagre data at our disposal.

(VI) KUṢA-TARYALLA. We have a single reference to this lineage in our inscriptions. This comes from the Köṭeṛōr inscription (Chikmagalūr taluk, district) of the close of the eighth century. The Kuṣa-Taryallas claim descent from Manu, Ikṣvāku, Hariscandra, Dilīpa and Rāghava, who are described as the progenitors (vamsyādirājah).

*167 R.N. Nandi, "Growth of Rural Economy in Early Feudal India" in PIHC, Presidential Address, Ancient India section, (1984), p 27; infra, Chapter V, Section B.
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In that family (kula) was Hari-Viśnu-Trivikrama by whom the solar race was purified. Rāma’s son was Kusā whose son was Kukuśa. Kukuśa had two sons, Mallikāri and Mūrikāri. The latter is said to have slain.....śena, a hunter difficult to conquer. He is also credited with the migration to the south, where he performed jātakarma ceremonies for Taryalla I apparently with the help of a Kāśyapa brāhmaṇa. Taryalla II, the donor of this record traces his descent from Taryalla I through Śāntakērti, Nāgakērti and Sangama all of whom appear to be devotees of Brahma. Their munificence to vedic learning is also lauded. The Kōṭēvūr epigraph registers a grant to twenty-five brāhmaṇas but the object granted is not clear. The sāsana is said to have been composed by Pandasvāmi, a Kāśyapa, who was Taryalla’s purōhita and is described being well-versed in Purāṇas (purāṇajñā).*172 This inscription provides an interesting example of a local, perhaps, tribal chief claiming superior status through descent from the ancient race of Ikṣvāku and from Viśnu in his incarnation as Rāma. The reference to the performance of jāta karma, one of the brahmanical samskaras, for Taryalla by Mūrikāri is also interesting. Is this a reference to the hiranyagarbha which was the archetypal method for autochthonous chiefs to claim respectibility?*173

The association of Kāśyapa brāhmaṇas both with the performance of the jāta karma and with the composition of this record is significant. It appears to represent the legitimation of an emerging tribal chief by obliging brāhmaṇas. In return Taryalla II and his immediate predecessors extended their patronage to brahmanical institutions.

The Kōṭēvūr record remains the only trace of this lineage. Apparently it failed to flourish thereafter.

*172 EC VI (old ed) Cm.63.
*173 supra, Chapter III,Section B,fn. 262.
(VII) **NIRGGUNDAS:** We have a few references to Nirgunda *visaya* and to Nirgunda-arasa in inscriptions. We have seen earlier that the Dévarahalli copper plates of Sripruṣa mention Paramagūla who bore the title of Pṛthvī Nirggundarāja but who belonged to the Bāna vaṁśa.*174* It is consequently difficult to ascertain whether the Nirggunda prefix in the names of some monarchs refers to a lineage or merely to the territory ruled by them. On the other hand, it is possible that, Nirggunda *visaya* derived its name from an ancient lineage by that name but later passed under the sway of rulers of other lineages.

Apart from the Dévarahalli plates, the Bhairapura inscription (Channarāyapāṭṇa taluk, Hassan district) of Sripruṣa mentions Nirggunda-arasa ruling Nirggunda nādu-300. It is not clear whether this Nirggunda-arasa was identical with Paramagūla. At all events the inscription commemorates the death of Mālvapotteya of Vīravūr, the servant (āḷ) of Nirggunda-arasa in a skirmish at the boundary (mēre) with Kuḍi Muddan.*175* The epigraph does not specify whether the boundary mentioned is that of the village or of the nādu, nor does it give much information on the aggressor.

The Siradanahalli *virgāl* of AD 921-22 (Arkalgūḍ taluk, Hassan district) of the reign of Satyavākya Bīra Permāṇaḍī (Rācamalla III), the son of Nītimārga Eṛeyappa II Permāṇaḍī records the grant of a kalṇāṭu in to Nirggunda Jaggiyarasa of Belgali in appreciation of the valour of his son Tippayya who died in battle leading seventeen men.*176* The territory ruled by Jaggiyarasa is not specified so it is an open question whether Nirgunda here refers to a lineage or territory.

Lastly, we have the Bāgali inscription (Chāmrānjagār taluk, Mysore district) which has been assigned on palaeographic grounds to the tenth century. This epigraph mentions Mahāśāmanta Kaccāga Nirggundadeva of the Vānaradhvaja and Vṛṣabha lānchana entitled to play the Pāṇcamahāśabdās as the reigning king ruling


*176* EC VIII (new ed) Ag 81.
from Śoṇitapura. The inscription records several grants of land for the Bhujangēśvara temple of Bālgaliyūr, which were entrusted to Kūci bhaṭārār, its lord. Incidentally, Kūci bhaṭārār bore the title of Nirggunda-gōrava.*177 Evidently he was closely associated with the ruler who bestowed the title on him. However, the adoption of the overlord's name or title is more common among the lay feudatories of a king than among religious potentiaries. As in the case of Jaggiyarasa, the territorial units ruled by Kaccāga Nirggunda dēva are not clearly specified. Since the gāvundas of Ede nād are mentioned as witnesses, it is possible that this was one of the units ruled by this Mahāsāmanta. At all events reference to Nirggunda viṣayā/nāḍu is conspicuously absent. The reference to Vānara dhvaja makes it likely that Kaccāga Nirggunda dēva belonged to the Kadamba lineage. Consequently derivation of the Nirggunda component in the name of this chief becomes a mystery.

(VIII) KADAMBAS: The Kadambas had risen to power in Northern Karnāṭaka around the same time as the Gangas in South-eastern Karnāṭaka. In the late sixth century they were uprooted and supplanted by the western Cāḷukyas.*177 Some minor Kadamba chiefs continued to exist, however, in Northern Karnāṭaka and in the Hāssan and Shimoga districts as well.

During the second phase the earliest references to the Kadambas come from the Narasimharājapura plates of Śīpuruṣa and Śivamāra II Ganga. The first of these records refers to Nāgavarma of the Pāśiṇḍi Ganga family and his brother-in-law, Tuļuga-āḍī of Kadamba lineage as the donors along with Manali Mane-odeyon of Kośika lineage. The village Maḷavalli in Tagare janapada was granted by the two chiefs to the caityālaya (Jaina shrine) at Tolḷa.*178

*176 EC IV (new ed) Ch 114.
*177 supra, Chapter III, Section A, p. 108
The Narasimharaja plates of Sivamara II also mention Viṭṭarasa, the son of Mādhavendra who is described as being entitled to the Kadamba kingdom ('Kadamba rājyakkarhan'). Viṭṭarasa granted to the cediya (caitya) at Tolla some black soil land as mānya.*179

After these chiefs who apparently held lands in the Tagare nāḍu (the Hāssan-Chikmagalur tract) we have scarcely any references to the Kadambas until the close of the ninth century. The Gaujāgrahara inscription of c.890 AD (Shikaripur taluk, Shimoga district) mentions Śāntarasa, the son of Ajavamarasa of the Kadamba lineage among the donors. But we have no hint as to the territory ruled by this Kadamba.*180 In contrast the Kumsi virgal records that Kaliviṭṭarasa, a mahāsāmanta subordinate to Rāṣṭrakūṭa Kṛṣṇa II had supplanted Banavasi Gaṇambar (Kadamba?) Āryavarma. If Āryavarma was a Kadamba then it is clear that for some time at least he had held the town and fort of Banavasi.*181 This inscription clearly brings out the clienteles that each territorial lord built up to bolster his rule. It is curious, however, that the overlord Kṛṣṇa II seems to have played no part whatsoever in these political changes in Banavasi-12,000.

The Maḷali inscription (Heggadeedēvanakōte taluk, Mysore district) of the tenth century refers to Cāgi of Kadamba lineage as the ruler of Bayal nāḍ. No overlord is mentioned.*182 As we have seen earlier the Hiranandi inscription clearly attests to the fact that Bayal nāḍ was under the overlordship of Raṇamalla III Ganga.*183 It would appear that the Gangas subsequently lost this unit to independent chiefs.
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The Honnavara inscription of Nūtimarga Permānaḍi of the tenth century (Hāssan taluk, district) refers to a chief who was probably his feudatory who bore the titles and attributes of Bhuvanādhāra vānaradhvaja and vṛsabha lāñcana. The vānaradhvaja and vṛsabha lāñcana were associated with the Kadambas. Consequently this chief was probably of Kadamba lineage. He granted a bālgacu for a hero, the details of which are lost.*184 The territory ruled by this chief cannot be determined. Similarly, the Ankanāthapura inscription (Hoelope-narsipur taluk, Hāssan district) of the tenth century records the death of Rāceya of Kadamba lineage by observing the vow (nontu) for three days.*185 Once more the status of this Kadamba cannot be discerned.

In contrast the Mangalūru inscription (Sorab taluk, Shimoga district) of AD 968.*186 refers to a Kadamba prince who was ruling Banavāsi-12000 under his sole umbrella (‘ekachatra chaïyeyol’) although Cāṭigadēva is mentioned in the earlier part of the record as the reigning king. The Kadamba’s name is lost but he is given the attribute of vānaradhvaja and the biruda of Kadamba-mārttanda. The inscription records the construction of a temple probably by a Pergade and grants for the deity.

Another Kadamba prince who ruled over Banavāsi-12,000 around AD 1018 was Gōravadeva, a feudatory (pāda-padmāpajjīvi) of Jagadekamalla. Gōravadeva had the rank of Mahāmaṇḍalēsvara*187 and was styled Kadamba cakri.*188 Likewise, virgals from Gūḍuve (Sorab taluk, Shimoga district) mentions two Kadamba chiefs - Kadambayya dēva of Banavāsi and Kadamba Sāntayya dēva who were attacked by Pergade Māḍinayya the ruler of Banavāsi-12,000. They retaliated by a cattle raid on Gūḍuve. These records indicate conflicting claims over Banavāsi between Pergade Māḍinayya and his immediate superior Māṭuravamśi Dēvūra Sāntayya dēva on the one
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hand and the two Kadamba princes on the other. Once again the Emperor, Cālukya Jayasingha dēvar who is mentioned as the reigning king appears to stand aloof from the developments at the local level where two factions were competing for control over Banavāsi-12,000.*189

A series of inscriptions from the Manjarābād taluk (Hassan district) reveal the existence of a Kadamba principality there ruled by a chief named Nītimahārāja. The earliest records of this series come from Ballu village. The two inscriptions register grants for heroes and their dependents by Nītimahārāja of the Kadamba rājya with Pergade Biyya as the executor of the grant.*190 The Chikkanāyakanahali inscription of c.1030 AD states that Nītimahārāja sought to conquer another rājya.*191 The Kōgōḍu inscription (Bēḷūr taluk, Hāssan district) of c.1034 AD records an invasion by Nītimahārāja and his general Dumma Kāṭayya*192 on Kōgōḍu. Another inscription from Chikkanāyakanahalli records the death of Chikka Kāṭayya.*193 It is not clear whether Dumma Kāṭayya and Chikka Kāṭayya were identical. Finally a third inscription from Ballu records the death of Nītimahārāja himself by the adoption of and perseverance in, sanyasana. His velevāli probably followed him in death.*194 Thus the Manjarābād inscriptions document the attempts made by a local Kadamba chief to extend his dominions by conquest. The Kōgōḍu epigraph clearly brings out the destructive character of such invasions.

In sum, the Kadambas maintained a significant presence in the western division, particularly in the Banavāsi-12,000 unit, which after all, was the original nucleus of Kadamba power in the fourth and fifth centuries AD. Minor chiefs of this lineage also established principalities for themselves or received domains by accepting the suzerainty of regional powers like the Gangas.

*189 Ibid, Sb 60,61,62,63 of AD 1032.
*190 EC V (old ed) Mj 53,54 of AD 1026.
*192 ASMAR 1939, No36, p 143-144.
*194 EC V (old ed) Mj 55.
(IX) CĀLUKYAS: The Cālukyas supplanted the Kadambas from Northern Karnāṭaka and established their suzerainty there in the sixth century. In the mid-eighth century they were supplanted in their turn by the Rāṣṭrakūṭas. Minor Cālukyas chiefs continued to hold small domains under Rāṣṭrakūṭa suzerainty until one such chief, Tailapa II mobilized support from fellow feudatories to overthrow the Rāṣṭrakūṭas and re-establish Cālukyan overlordship over Northern Karnāṭaka and the Banavāsi-12,000 province in c.973 AD.

Apart from Banavāsi-12,000 we find references to Cālukya chiefs from Gangavādi-96,000 also. They were minor rulers of collateral Cālukyan branches. Mention has already been made of Vimalāditya of Cālukya vamsa who was ruling Kunungil desa under Cākīraja the adhirāja of Ganga mandala.195 during the Rāṣṭrakūṭa interregnum of the early ninth century. The Kaḍaba plates thus indicate Cālukyan presence in southern Karnāṭaka as early as the ninth century.

Several tenth century records from Mysore taluk mention Cālukyan chiefs Goggi, Durga and Narasingayya. The Kukkarahalli inscription refers to the Mahāsāmanta entitled to the pāṇcamahāśabdās, Narasingayya of Cālukya vamsa. He was probably the ruler of Pūrva Bayal nāḍ. Although he is given the title of Mahāsāmanta which is indicative of subordination, we are not told who his overlord was. He constructed a temple Narasingesvara, evidently named after himself, which was given the abhyantara-siddhi grant of Manaḷeṭāḍi. The grant was to be safeguarded by the three Nārgāvundas.196 Another inscription from Varuṇa mentions Mahāsāmanta Narasinga of Cālukya vamsa and his queen Gāvilabbarasi.197 Narasinga was probably identical with Narasingayya of the Kukkarahalli epigraph.

*195 supra, Chapter III, Section C, fn 328.  
*196 EC V (new ed) My 223.  
*197 Ibid, My 167.
Another inscription from Varuna also palaeographically assigned to the tenth century mentions Paścamahāśabda Mahāśāmanta Goggi of Cālukya vamśa, the bearer of Ādivarāha lāṁchana. He appears to have granted Aragōḍupalli to the Būṭesvara temple as a devabhōga with all exemptions (sarvabādhā-parihāra).*198 This Goggi is perhaps identical with the chief of the same name who is mentioned in several other virgals from Varuna as having participated in the fratricidal war (‘dāyāga sammannadin’) between Ėdavari and Uttavaga in which several retainers (mane-magatin) of Goggi died.*199 The identity and status of Ėdavari and Uttavaga cannot be discerned nor can the territory ruled by Goggi be determined precisely. Once more we have no information as to Goggi’s overlord though the title Mahāśāmanta would indicate subordinate status.

Yet another Cālukyan chief mentioned in the Varuna inscriptions is Mahāśāmanta Durga, born in the Cālukya vamśa. He appears to have granted Torevalli to the west of the Būṭesvara temple and some land below the tank at Bāsamballiyūr to the Būṭesvara temple as devabhōga. The sarva-bādhā-parihāra grant was entrusted to Nannikarttāra bhāṭāra.*200 Another epigraph from Vārakōḍu records the death of Piṭṭabbe, the queen (arasi) of Durga, apparently by a Jaina vow since the stone is said to be her nisidhige.*201 Their relative chronology cannot be determined either since the records are only dated palaeographically. However, some of the virgals recording Goggi’s participation in the war between Ėdavari and Uttavaga mention Dugga*202 who might possibly be identical with Mahāśāmanta Durga. If so, Goggi and Durga might have been contemporaries. At all events these Mysore inscriptions indicate the presence, in the heart of Gaṅgavādi, of a line of apparently independent Cālukyan chiefs of the rank of Mahāśāmanta. None of them acknowledges his overlord.

*202 Ibid, My 176,178.
After the decline of the Gangas, while the Cōlas were establishing themselves in the south-eastern parts of Gangavādi, the Imperial Cālukyas held portions of Mysore district. The Kudakūr vīrgal of AD 997-98 mentions Pampādevī, the daughter of Cālukya Permāṇaḍī dēva, as the local ruler.*203

Apart from these ruling lineages new ones such as the Kongāḷvas*204 and the Hoysaḷas*205 were emerging from the fringes of Gangavādi and were to play a leading role in the political history of Karnāṭaka in the following centuries.

The Gangas then exercised varying degrees of control over the numerous royal lineages who controlled tracts of land across Gaṅgavādi. In the tenth century many of these chiefs from other lineages assumed independence. Few acknowledged the Ganga sovereignty over them. The overlords had recourse to numerous strategies to mobilise support in such a situation. For putting together an army they had to depend on common enmity (page), ties of blood or of loyalty (svāmi-bhṛtya sambandha), the desire to attain fame (mahime) or old diplomatic relations (attu).*206

---
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X) PETTY RULERS OF UNCERTAIN ORIGINS

There was a general tendency particularly by the tenth century AD to claim descent from a recognized royal lineage. The importance of Kula is stressed in the Pampa Bharata where Karna is repeatedly ridiculed as Munguliga (fisherman) *207 in contrast to Bhishma, Arjuna and others who belonged to a Satkula. *208 Likewise, in the story of Cilataputra in the Vaddaradhane, Upasrøpika the king of Magadha weds Gunasaundari only after ascertaining that her father belonged to a royal lineage (arasukula) though he was then ruling over a Beça hamlet (Beçapalli) *209. In the Jaina Puranas too there is considerable stress on lineage. Here the preferred claim is to descent from the Tirthankaras as in the Santi Purana of Ponna where for instance, Srivijaya, the Emperor ruling from Paudanapura is lauded for his descent from Nåbhiñatubhava (Adinatha) *210. Alternatively, Jainas could claim to belong to one of the four lineages established by Adinatha namely, the Kuruvamśa, Harivamśa, Nåthavamśa and Ugravamśa *211. Thus in Neminathapurana, when the people of Campanagara seek a successor to the heirless king Candrakirti, the choice falls on Simhaketu who belonged to the Harivamśa and was renamed Mårkaŋđeya *212. It was in this lineage that Kṛṣṇa, Balarāma and Neminātha were to be born. It was this general stress on pure birth that led many rulers feudatory and sovereign alike to claim descent from Puranic lineages or a Brahmaksatriya status as seen above. *213 But not all feudatory rulers did so. We find numerous local rulers who did not sanctify their
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origins by claiming to belong to a Purānic lineage or to a locally dominant one. In many cases the tribal affiliations of these little kings is all too apparent. Such is the case with Cottamman, king of the Arattis, who is referred to as ruling Edettorendu-1000 as a subordinate of Kongapi Mahāraja Śripuruṣa in an eighth century record from Varuna (Mysore Taluk, district) *214 The Arattis appear to be a tribe well absorbed into the early medieval polity, though they seem to have retained their ethnic identity. It is perhaps a member of the same group who is mentioned in the Dēvalapura inscription of the same period and area.*215 This record mentions Arattitirar a swordsman (?balal) of Singadikṣar, probably the ruler of Kūḍalūr. A certain Arattiga taḷāra is also referred to as the donee in this epigraph and received a senior retainers field (pērālvina kēy) and Nokki-ūr, a vṛtti of Kūḍalūr from the odeva of Gottemādi. It is not clear whether Arattitirar and Arattiga taḷāra were identical, but it is possible that both belonged to the group of Arattis which was now possibly undergoing differentiation and assimilation into the class divided state society of the period at various levels * 215.

The Āsandī inscription of AD 972 (Kaḍūr Taluk, Chikmagalūr district) gives us another instance of a tribal chieftain. But in this case unlike Cottamman of the Arattis the tribe and its chief are perceived as adversaries of the established order. The inscription records that the Mahājanas of Tagure naḍ complain to Mārasimha II about the depredations of Naraga in the countryside. The King thereupon declared that henceforth he would personally deal with cows, brāhmaṇas, the army and the treasury as well as Naraga. Royal soldiers (?talevarum) were sent to deal with Naraga who was killed together with his son-in-law, children, tenants and subjects *216. The reference to his tenants and subjects [tann-okkalum prajeyum] is interesting. Would this indicate an incipient class differentiation in the tribe or was it a case of viewing tribals as a forest variant of a plains kingdom as is done in the literary works of the period? In the story of Cilātapatra cited earlier, the Bēda king (Bēdarasa) is said to have built a city (polala)
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in the forest and his retinue and court are no different from that of any ruler of settled tracts save in its location. Cilātaputra when driven away from his father’s kingdom for his misdemeanour goes to the forest and establishes a city complete with a fort (Kōnte) and big gateways (Gopuradvāram) in an inaccessible part of the forest (ādaviyol durgamappedeyol) but near the hermitage of a forest dwelling sage (tāpasa) named Mahēndra. In Pampa Bhārata, Hidimba though portrayed as a cannibalistic savage to start with, takes the Pāṇḍavas to her city Hidimbapura which had multistoried buildings which were whitewashed and stood out amidst the dark trees on the hill in the midst of the forest.

The description of Hidimbapura, brief though it is, is no different from that of Vāraṇāvata, Ėkacakrapura or other towns described in the Pampa Bhārata. Thus, while the forest-dwelling tribals were viewed as enemies of the settled order of the nādu, the Beśas in particular being generally associated with cattle raids on villages and cities, there was simultaneously a tendency to view them as forest based counterparts of the nādu kingdoms in literary sources. Naraga is clearly viewed as a menace to the settled order of the nādu burning and ravaging villages of the Tegure nāḍ, the Sravanabēgōla epitaph of Mārasimha even compares him to the asuras Madhu and Kaitabha but he is also looked upon as a minor king. It is difficult to guage whether the tribe which he led was already differentiated along class lines or not from the available evidence.

Apart from this inscriptions abound in references to local rulers whose antecedents cannot be determined. The Sivanapura inscriptions (Hosakōte taluk, Bangalore district) of the eighth century records that Siyavallavarasar was ordered (besade) by his overlord Kongaṇi Muttarasar, to fight the Kāduvaṭṭi army.
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His death in that battle was commemorated by the setting up of a pillar by Śrīkāna *223. The antecedents of Śiyavallavarasa cannot be discerned from the available evidence. Similarly the Dāsarāhalli inscription of the same period (Bangalore taluk district) record the death of Pollettālva Kukkara, the ruler of Bidirkkal in Kārikamid, who fell in the battle against the army of Pālikkāri nāḍ. *224 Once again the social background of this local chief cannot be determined. Another eighth century inscription from Dimbāla (Śrīnivāspur Taluk, Kōlār district) records the death of Pollettālva Kukkara, the ruler of Bidirkkal in Kārikamid, who fell in the battle against the army of Pālikkāri nāḍ. *224 Once again the social background of this local chief cannot be determined. Another eighth century inscription from Dimbāla (Śrīnivāspur Taluk, Kōlār district) refers to Vejjape-arasa who was ruling Rōṇār under Duggamāra Ereyappa, the son of Śrīpurūṣa who was himself ruling Kuvalāla nāḍu *225. The epigraph records the anointing of Sāgara Mikkāne as the Mane-odeyar (superintendent of the royal household?) *226 and the grant of lands with all exemptions to him. While Vejjape-arasa does not seem to belong to a recognized lineage, the Mane-odeya appears to lay claim to descent from Sāgara.

While the above instances are of the subordinates of the Gaṅgas, apparently independent local rulers who did not belong to any recognized lineage are also frequently mentioned in inscriptions of the second phase. Thus, the Sosale inscription of the close of the eighth century [T Narsipur taluk, Mysore district] mentions Vikramādityarasa who was ruling Vada(kare) nāḍu - 300. The lineage of this local ruler is not given nor is there any indication of his subordination to the Gaṅgas. This is plausible as the record belongs to the period of Rāstrakūṭa interregnum in Southern Karnāṭaka. The territory ruled by Vikramādityarasa is in fact the core of the Ganga kingdom being situated to the immediate north of their capital of Talakād. There is no sign of Vikramāditya's subordination to the Rāstrakūṭas either. The inscription records the appropriation by the King of one pon during the harvest (suggi) out of the
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Mane-vergade
bhatamānya of the palace soldiers.\footnote{EC V (new ed) TN120}{227} A ninth century inscription from Muttatti (TNarsipur taluk) refers to a chief whose name is lost but who is described as Valabhipuravarēśvara \footnote{EC V (new ed) TN 39}{228}. Once again there is no hint of his lineage or of his subordination to the Gaṅgas. But the title of Valabhipuravarēśvara was also held by Maṇalēra, the vassal of Būtuga II mentioned in the celebrated Āṭakur inscription of the tenth century (Maddūr taluk, Maṇḍya district).\footnote{EC VII (new ed) Mu 42}{229} If the Valabhipuravarēśvara mentioned in the Muttatti record belonged to the same family, then it is possible that he too claimed descent from Sagara as did Maṇalēra in the tenth century. An inscription from Beramvādi (Gundlupē taluk, Mysore district) of the tenth century refers itself to the seventh year of the tying of the pāṭṭa on Cāvunḍa Perfanaḍi, who was probably ruling Bayalnāḍu or parts of it.\footnote{EC III (new ed) Gu 219}{230} The antecedents of this local ruler are unknown nor is it specified by whom the pāṭṭa was tied on him. He appears to be totally independent. Similarly inscriptions on the pedestal of an image of Cauvīsa Tīrthankara and other items of worship found buried at Mangala (Gundlupē taluk) and palaeographically assignable to the tenth century refer to Sarvalōkāśraya whose wife Cikka Jōgabbe probably had the image cast.\footnote{EC III (new ed) Gu 203-205}{231} The plural suffix employed in referring to Cikka Jōgabbe indicates a respectable social status. The name Sarvalōkāśraya is reminiscent of the standard Cāḷukyan titles of Satyāśraya. But with the limited information at our disposal, we cannot say that he was a king.

The Mallesvara inscription \footnote{EC VI (old ed) Kd 8}{232} of the close of the 10th century [Kadūr taluk, Chikmagalūr district] records a grant of five gāndugas of land to a basadi by Cāvunḍa Nāyaka, the vēle of Lōka Vidyādharayya. The antecedents of both Cāvunḍa and Lōka Vidyādharayya are not specified. They appear to have held feudal rank, and Lōka Vidyādharayya probably was a local chief but the territory ruled by him is not mentioned in the inscription. Cāvunḍa Nāyaka too appears to have been a landholder. At all events he makes a land grant without reference to his superior. Raṣṭrakuṭa
records also often mention local chieftains who do not appear to claim exalted descent and whose antecedents are untraceable. This is the case in the Māvali inscription of Govinda III Rāṣṭrakūṭa of the eighth century [Sōrab taluk, Shimoga district] *233. This inscription refers to Madanāgarasar as the ruler of Eḍenāḍ. Another local ruler mentioned is Madangēla whose village (gāma) was seized by Kallimmēran. The social background of all these notables is unknown. None of them, not even Madanāgarasar seems to claim any illustrious descent. Likewise the Induvalī inscription [Sōrab taluk] of the end of the eighth century mentions one Deḍa Nāgānda as the ruler of a nāḍ which is unfortunately not specified. *234 Once again the social background of this local ruler is not discernible. Another instance is provided by the Aradeśahalli inscription of the close of the ninth century [Dēvanakōte taluk, Bangalore district] which refers itself to the reign of Akālavarṣa Prithvivallabhā (Krṣṇa II?). His subordinate, Govinda was ruling Sālne-300 and Kuṇungil-500 by his favour. *235 As in the case of Madanāgarasar and Deḍa Nāgānda his antecedents cannot be determined.

Under Krṣṇa III Rāṣṭrakūṭa, Banavāsi 12,000 appears to have changed hands frequently and in many cases these feudatories were of indeterminate origins. Thus the Beṭṭadakūrali inscription of AD 954-55 (Sorab taluk, Shimoga district) mentions Javanaisāmi as the ruler of Bana(vā)si nāḍ *236 while the Bhārangi epigraph of AD957 refers to Gabbendra as the ruler of Banavāsi-12,000 * 237 as does the Hunavalli inscription of AD 968 * 238. But the Beḷagi record of AD 964 states that Bappava held the paṭṭa of Banavāsi-12,000 * 239. As we have discussed earlier * 240, it is very likely that none of these lords controlled the entire territory of Banavāsi 12,000 and hence the conflicting claims. In any case it is noteworthy that none of the individuals mentioned here cared to claim an exalted descent unlike Sāntivarmarasa.
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who claimed to belong to the **Brahmaksatrya Maṭūra vaṁśa** and also held the exalted titles of **Maḥāsāmantādhipati** and was entitled to the **Paṇcamahāsabdas**. 

Likewise Kadamba Cakravarti Kāmadeva, the son of a *senaḥdhipati* of Tailapadeva of Candavūr claimed to be a Surya-vaṁśi and held the title of **Maḥāmandaḷeśvara**. He too was entitled to the **Paṇcamahāsabdas**. In contrast to these chiefs Javanaiṃsi, Gabbendara and Bappava appear to have been of humble extraction though it is hard to conclude merely from the silence of the records.

In AD 972-73, in the period of transition from Raṣṭrakūṭa to Caḷukya overlordship, we have references to a certain Kakkaladeva as ruling the kingdom of earth, an expression generally indicating overlordship and independent control. The Bennūru inscription [Sorab taluk] mentions Caṭṭaya deva, evidently Kakkaladeva's subordinate as ruling Banavāsī - 12,000.*243 However, the Jambeḥalli inscription *244 of the same year, AD 972-73 merely refers to Śaṅtivarmarasar (the Maṭūravaṁśi ?) as the king of Banavāsī-12,000 without mentioning any overlord. But the Hece inscription of c.990 AD refers to the reign of Kakkaladeva and to the **Maḥāsāmanta** entitled to **Paṇcamahāsabda** Śaṅtivarma ruling an unspecified unit from Heṛdese *245. Evidently the Caḷukyas had not strengthened their hold over Banavāsī until this time and the political situation continued to be fluid permitting obscure adventurers like Kakkaladeva to rise to the forefront for a brief space of time. Another inscription from Hecehe dated AD 991 mentions Bhuvanāśraya Satyāśraya Kulatikala Caḷukyābharaṇa Āhavamalladeva as the reigning king. Śaṅtivarmarasar appears to have transferred his fealty to the Caḷukyas *246
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Thus while recognized lineages such as the Gangas, Nōlambas, Bāṇas, Caṅkayas etc. dominated this region and controlled most of the territory therein, many of the rulers of villages and nāḍus mentioned in the inscriptions of this period were of obscure and sometimes of discernible tribal origins. These individuals were usually subordinate to a regional or sub-regional power such as the Gangas or Rāṣṭrakūtas. But the political situation at times favoured assumption of independence and even claim to sovereign overlordship as in the case of Kakkaladeva.
C) OFFICIALS

Officials such as Pergades and Nadbovas constituted another section of vassals. Originally members of the state bureaucracy or part of the rural landholding elite these groups came to hold hereditary rights over villages and nādus.

(I) Pergades: As we have seen earlier the designation Pergade was a Kannada derivative of the Sanskrit designation Adhyaksa and denoted a Chamberlain, a superintendent or a director.*247 Specialized functions were discharged by Mane vergades as superintendent of the royal household*248 and by sunka vergade as toll collector.*249 Our inscriptions provide us with one reference to the former.*250 In literary works Pergades are frequently mentioned along with royal officials. Thus in the story of Sukumārasvāmi, Nāgasrī, the daughter of a minister visits the Nāgathāna in the company of the daughters of ministers, Pergades, Kājasrēṣṭhi, Pradhānas, and Nyōgis.*251 Pergades are usually deputed as the king's envoys in both the Vaddarādhane and the Pampa Bhārata. Thus in the story of Sukaujaśvāmi, king Gandhabhajana of Campānagara sends his senior Pergades (Pradhāna Pergadegalam) Madhusēna and Madhusūdana to Nāgadatta ṣeṭtī to ask for the hand of his daughter Sukēsini in marriage.*252 Similarly, in the story of Vṛṣabhasēna also, king Pradyōta of Ujjēna asks gavanda Jinadatta for the hand of his daughter through his pergades.*253 In the Pampa Bhārata Kṛṣṇa in his role as Yudhiṣṭhira's envoy is described as Pergade by Duryōdhana ('Atidda nimma Pergade...').*254

In inscriptions we have but two references to Pergades in this role. The Kerehalli inscription of the close of the ninth century records that while Permādi was reigning he received homage (olagisi) from Tribhuvanayya, the Pergade of Nōlamba. It is apparent that Tribhuvanayya was sent to the court of Permādi which possibly denotes the Ganga king, as the envoy of Nōlamba. In addition, the inscription records the grant of bittuvatta of the tank...
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(at?) Sivayyanakešē by Tribhuvanayya its administrator. Since the inscription was found on the tank bund of Kerehalli the inscription probably refers to the same tank. The relation between the two facts mentioned in the record is not clear. We cannot determine whether the grant of the bituvatta was made after the mission or was part of it. The other reference comes from the Magge vīrgal of AD 998-999 which records that while Uraviyammarasa Rājādhīraja was ruling Bira Bayal nādu, Konguni's heggade (same as Pergade) came asking for the distinction of an umbrella (Koḍeya bhōga.) He was apparently refused, whereupon Konguni gāvuṇḍa attacked Magge from Maṇale. Here again, the heggade was an envoy.

For the most part, Pergades were associated with the rulership of a village and were endowed with abhyantara-siddhi rights over them. Thus the Kamaravalli inscription of the eighth century (Gunḍlupēṭ taluk) mentions Mādapana, the son of Akkaikilur as the Pergade of Ariyūr. From the tenth century we have numerous references to pergades holding abhyantara-siddhi rights over villages. The Bandalike inscription mentions Sandīvara Kuḍīvulda as the Pergade of Koḍangeyūr. Pergade Sandīvara Kāliga is also mentioned; but his area of jurisdiction is not specified. Both were subordinate to Gāvuṇḍa Jākiyabbe who held the nālgāvuṇḍu of Nāgarakhaṇḍa - 70. Similarly the Kaladēvapura inscription (Maddagiri taluk, Tumkur district) of c. AD 920 records the grant of Kalliyūr as abhyantara-siddhi to Pergade Bēnayya as Kalliyūr. In addition some Pergades appear to have enjoyed the rank of Mahāmātya. Thus the Īṭūr inscription of c AD 938 mentions Pergade Poleyamma who is described as Mahāmātya-guṇa-sampanna. He constructed a tank and made a dēvadāna grant. Interestingly, his brother Pergade Nākiyayya is not given the title of Mahāmātya but he is said to have held abhyantara-siddhi rights over Cittaraṭe Īṭūr.

Poleyamma does not seem to be associated with abhyantara siddhi rule over villages. Were these two attributes mutually exclusive? Likewise the Talagunda inscription (Shikārpur taluk, Shimoga district) of AD 997 mentions Pergade Kālimayya who also held the
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title of Mahāmātya.*261 Kālimayya granted the manṇeya (same as mānya- a rent free holding)*262 of Nariyālige-70 to Kāyimma. This would indicate that Kālimayya enjoyed a high rank in the feudatory hierarchy. He too is not apparently associated with the rulership of a village. Can we then take the title of Mahāmātya conferred on some Pergades as an indication of high rank not enjoyed by others who were merely associated with abhyantara-siddhi rights over a village?

Unlike gāvundas who were, for most part drawn from the peasantry, Pergades came from varied social backgrounds. Thus the Melāgani inscription (Mūlbaṇḍa taluk, Kōlār district) of the early ninth century mentions Pergade gauḍa Śrī Puli as the ruler of Agalī-12.*263 He was apparently a gāvunda originally. Likewise, the Kakkarasi inscription of AD 954 (Sorab taluk, Shimoga district) mentions Bāradavāja who held the post of Pergade over the land of Kakkarasi.*264 The oja suffix would indicate that this individual was by origin an artisan - a blacksmith, a carpenter or a goldsmith-probably the first.*265 In other cases the social background is indeterminable. This is so with Pergade Nandivara Kālīga and Pergade Sandivara Kudīvulda of Koḍangeyūr.*266

Pergades too were part of the feudatory hierarchy. Thus Nandivara Kālīga and Sandivara Kudīvulda evidently filled the position in the hierarchy normally held by ur-gāvundas.*267 Similarly the Kaisoṭi virgāl (Sorab taluk) of AD 951-52 mentions Cikka Śambuvanayenira as the ruler of Eḍenāḍ-70 while Aycenna held the office of Pergade under him.*268 But this point is most strikingly borne out by the Hirapandi inscription (Heggaṇedēvanakōṭe taluk, Mysore district) of the tenth century.*269 Here the Pergades are classed together with the sāmantas and apparently played an identical role in the politics of the day.
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Pergades thus bring out vividly the process of the feudalization of the bureaucracy. Originally royal officials, they gradually came to be associated with rulership of villages. Others, enjoying a higher rank in the feudal hierarchy could dispose of an entire unit without reference to a superior.

(II) NĀDABŌVAS: Unlike the Pergades, Nadabōvas appear to have retained their original character as members of the bureaucracy. The designation seems to have been derived from that of sēnabōva which denoted a village accountant.*270 Nadabōvas were probably their counterparts at the nādu level. We have a few epigraphic references to sēnabōvas in our records. In two inscriptions from Shimoga sēnabōvas appear as scribes.*271 In the Kāṇatūr inscription (Ālūr taluk, Hassan district) also a sēnabōva Dhūrapayya acted as a scribe and apparently received a grant (‘ida bareda sēnabōva Dhūrapayyage Koṭṭa sāsana’). The details of the supplementary grant are not given. *272 In the Bāgālī inscription (Chāmrājanagar taluk, Mysore district) a sēnabōva was one of the donors together with the Pergade Jōgapayya and the Three Hundred.*273 Thus our inscriptions do not bring out the sēnabōva's functions as a village accountant. They appear rather mostly as scribes and received land for the discharge of their functions.

In the case of the Nādabōva the two available references depict them as part of the tax collecting machinery of the state. The Īṣvarahāḷi inscription (Chikmagalur taluk, district) of the ninth century is the earliest available epigraphic reference to a Nādabōva. The Nādabōva together with the Nālgāvunda of Erenād are exhorted to respect the remission of the tax on ghee made in favour of a group of merchants.*274 The Beḷāgūḷi inscription (Arkalagūḍ taluk, Hassan district) of the tenth century which records the grant of the village Beḷgaḷi as Kalnāṭu to Ankada Kēṭayya, the vēlevāḷi of Queen Rēvakanimmaṇḍi warns the Nādabōva and the Nālgāvunda from entering the village to collect attadere and kurudere (taxes). *275
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Thus Nādābōvas together with Nālgāvundas were apparently saddled with the responsibility for the collection of taxes for the king in the villages which were not granted either to brāhmaṇas or to secular assignees as abhyantara siddhi. We have no information on how they were remunerated for their services. It is possible that they too enjoyed rights over the produce of designated villages but we have no certain evidence in support.
PRABHUS

The earliest reference to a Prabhu comes from the Belavañe inscription (Mysore taluk) of the eighth century which records the death of Mahāprabhu Gō vapayya and the grant of a kalnāḍ probably by the king.*276 There is no evidence here to connect him with the chieftaincy of a nādu. The ninth century Doḍḍa Kuṇé inscription (Hoḷe Narsipur taluk, Hāssan district) of the ninth century seems to indicate that Prabhus were associated with administration since it records the remission of taxes on ghee in perpetuity granted to the Mahājanas of Kuṇé by Permaḍi and Prabhu Kāmayya.*277

The Marūru and Karagaḍa inscriptions on the other hand seem to suggest that the Prabhus constituted a local corporate group like the nāttar of Tamil Nadu who were responsible, inter alia for the demarcation of the boundaries of the gift lands.*278 The Marūru inscription of the ninth century (Arkalgūḍ taluk, Hāssan district) records the grant of lands to Akhaṇḍa bhāṭāra as vidyādāna by Taddayya. The lands were demarcated (manna balasida) by prabhus who included Būva gāvunda, Kannamma, Padi Ayyapa, Duddayya, Aycaṇṭḍa and Dēvāṇḍa. Their place of origin is not specified and with the exception of the gāvunda, the occupations of the other individuals are unknown. Perhaps they were local landholders but in the absence of specific information we can never be certain.*279 Likewise the Karagaḍa inscription (Belur taluk, Hāssan district) of AD 971 which records the grant of five khandugas of land to Bāsa gāvunda for his distinguished role in the battle of Uccangi mentions once again the Prabhus who demarcated the lands. They were (i) Permaḍi gāvunda, (ii) Nāgayya of Muguḷi, (iii) Basavayya of Basavanahalli, (iv) Pōci gāvunda of Uppavalī, (v) Vaḷiyeṭe Mudda and (vi) Erɛga of Māgunta. The inscription also mentions the seventy-six (Elpattāra) prabhugal of Benneyūr.*280 Unlike the Marūru inscription the Karagaḍa record specifies the place of origin of the Prabhus, who once again included gāvundas in their number.
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B.D. Chattopadhyaya draws our attention to the practice of drawing select representatives from different settlements in the context of landsale transactions in Gupta and post Gupta Bengal. Similarly in Kalikatti (Arsikere taluk, Hassan district) during the Hoysala period social conflict in the village was settled in the presence not merely of the subjects (praje) of the village, but also of the three prabhu gavundas of the nādu and people from other settlements.*281 Perhaps this practice is foreshadowed in the Marūru and Karagaḍa epigraphs. Similarly, the Chikmagalūr inscription which has been cited earlier records the demarcation (balasidor) of the boundaries by individuals from neighbouring settlements, led by the Nālgamunda.*282 The term prabhu is however, not used in this record. Interestingly all these inscriptions, occur in the same geographical tract of the Vēḍavati valley. Kalikatti too falls in the same region. Thus prabhus appear to be an informally constituted body of notables drawn together to witness a land grant and demarcate boundaries. Their association with nādu chieftaincy is not borne out in our records.

(IV) NĀLGĀMIGAS:

Inscriptions from Shimoga mention Gāmigas whose precise socio-political status cannot be determined from available evidence. The earliest reference to Gāmigas comes from the Māvali inscription (Sorab taluk, Shimoga district) of the end of the eighth century. This records the conquest of Madangēla's village by Kallimāraṇ. Seeing this, the Nālgāmigas fought back and fell fighting at the fort of Vasavīr.*283 A similar reference comes from the Induvaḷḷi inscription of the same period (Sorab taluk).*284 This records the invasion of Vasavīr by Biṭiga and Erega the Nālgāduḍigas (same as Nālgamunda?) of Golliga nāḍ. It was liberated by the Nālgāmigas. The inscription specifically commemorates the valour of Gāḍigana Kājira, one of the Nālgāmigas. From these references it would appear that Nālgāmigas were Nādu level officials responsible for the defence of the Nādu.
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Gamiga is probably the tadbhava form of Grāmika which signified a village headman.*285

Other inscriptions from Shimoga district mention Gamigas. Thus another inscription from Māvali of the close of the eighth century records the valour and death in battle of Kulamudda gāmigar. He received four oxen (?) and wet fields as compensation.*286

Here once more Gamigas appear to be associated with defence. But the body of Nālgāmigas is not mentioned in this inscription. Another reference to Gāmiga comes from the ninth century Šālūr inscription (Shikārpur taluk, Shimoga district). Unlike the earlier records this epigraph is not concerned with defence of a village or Nāḍu. It merely registers the grant of land by the son of Pubbāmiga and Mālengi gāmigitti.*287 Gāmigitti signifies the wife of a gāmiga. Surprisingly Pubbāmiga is not given the epithet of gāmiga unless it be assumed that Pubbāmiga is an orthographic error for Pubba gāmiga, for which we have no certain evidence. Did Mālengi then acquire the title by virtue of heredity or was she invested with it after the death of her husband? At all events her son too, is not invested with the title of gāmiga. It is noteworthy that this individual granted land without reference to his superiors.

When all the references are taken together it would seem that Gamigas were either village headman or had substantial land holdings. The plural suffix to Gāmiga in the reference to Kulamudda gāmigar implies a respectable social status. It is possible that the Gāmigas of a nāḍu constituted a corporate group which undertook the defence of the nāḍu in the frequent inter-nāḍu conflicts of the period.*288 It is also striking that all references to Gāmigas come only from Shimoga inscriptions of the end of the eighth and the ninth century. Were they replaced by some other officers or group later on? We can only speculate.
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D) THE RURAL LAND HOLDING ELITE - THE GAVUNDAS

Gavundas were drawn from the peasantry. We have referred earlier to Vikramaditya gavunda the Kōlalavishayādhīpāti who was granted Bēdirū grāma by Bhūvikrama Ganga in AD 634-35. Vikramaditya gavunda is described as sātvādra which implies his peasant extraction.

The term gavunda has the following connotations (i) the (śūdra) Chief Officer of a village, (ii) a title of honour among peasants and (iii) a good caste of peasants. The peasant extraction of gavundas is further borne out by the Tallapalli and Pilāvara inscriptions (Bowringpēt taluk, Kōlār district) of the eighth century. These record the death in battles between Ganga Śrīvibhava Muttarasa and a Bāṇa of Bolva Ganga gāmunda and Aṇṇa gāmunda. Both of them are described as tenants (okkal) of Kogali and Maṇṭayatūr respectively.

By the tenth century, however, the gavundas were distinguished from the class of tenants (okkal) as the Tāyālūr inscription (Maddūr taluk, Maṇḍya district) of AD 907 indicates. This epigraph records the construction of a tank at Tāyālūr by Kaccāvāra Polālaṣṣēṭṭi. The gāmūndas and the okkal of Kadaṇḍūr then got together to grant 35 gāndūgas of which five gāndūgas were for personal enjoyment after the payment of the pattōndi (tax) on the remaining thirty gāndūgas. A further payment of fifteen pānas in lōha drammas is stipulated although the grant is said to be made with all exemptions (sarva pariḥāra). Apart from recording the cleavage which had developed between the gavundas and okkal this record also implies that the local assembly of the gāmūndas and the okkal could levy taxes and dispose of lands independently of any superior authority. This is further attested by the Doṭṭahomma inscription (Nanjanagūḍ taluk, Mysore district) of AD 977. This records the grant by the Twelve (Pannirvarū) of Piriyaḥolma and Ayyapa gavunda, of lands and a
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contribution of one load from the land of each okkal, ten kolas of paddy (bhatta) and a pair of bullocks (balivatta?) for a Sākta temple probably at Piriyaholma itself which is described as a sthāna of Śakti Pariṣe. In this case the composition of the local assembly is not known. But the assembly together with the gāvunda who was in this case probably the headman could grant lands and levy contributions from the okkal without a reference to a superior power.

The Piriyaholma inscription gives us no hint as to the composition of the local corporate body, the Twelve. We have numerous such references to local groups addressed merely in numerical terms. The membership of these bodies cannot be determined precisely. In Tamil Nadu the local corporate bodies of the ur were composed of the local landholding elite, the vellālar. Similarly, we might posit that the majority of these local corporations mentioned in our inscriptions were composed of the gāvundas, the Karnataka counterpart of the vellālar. In at least two cases, we have evidence for the membership of the gāvundas in these local bodies. A tenth century record from Nagarle which registers the grant of an enclosed black soil field (mutte) by Vidyādharaayya for the temple of Nannayya at Nagarala for the purpose of imparting education (vidyādāna) and feeding ascetics (bratigaluban) mentions the Twelve of Nagarala together with the (inhabitants of) Sakkile, Belgundur, Kīruvēlgundur, Sattiyur, and Singur, the Mahāpariṣe, and the three Nālgāmundaś of Edenaś as witnesses. A fragmentary inscription from the same place and of the same period also mentions Vidyādhara and the Twelve gāvundas of Nagarala. It is more than probable that the Twelve of Nagarala referred to in the earlier record relates to the Twelve gāvundas, in other words the Twelve of Nagarala were gāvundas. Another reference to gāvundas constituting the local body comes from the Mangaja inscription.

---
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of the tenth century. This records the grant of four Khandugas of wetland (nirman) as Keregudage (gift for maintenance of the tank) by the Twelve gavūndas of Mangala.*299

Another inscription dated AD 964 records the grant of twelve pallis to the Pergade Mācayya the gāvunda of Mangala.*300 There is no reference to the Twelve gavūndas in this record, nor does it specify whether Mācayya was the headman of Mangala or merely one of the numerous landholders of the village.

Inscriptions from Shimoga clearly mention gāvūndas as headmen. The expression used is "ūrgūṃdu gēyyutītere" (held or exercised the gāmūndu of the īr) Thus the Beḍdakūrali inscription of AD 954-55 refers to Bitjiga as holding the nālgūṃdu while Sesigal held the gāmūndu of Bīvanūr.*301 The Beḷagī inscription (Sorab taluk, Shimoga district) which has been cited earlier indicates that nālgiṃundas were drawn from among the āurgūṃundas of a nādu.*302 It is not clear whether nālgiṃundas always held the headship of the nādu and the īr concurrently as in this case. That this might have been the usual practice is indicated also by the Mūḍlpālya inscription (Māgadi taluk, Bangalore district) of AD 968 which records the death of Daḍiğa, the son of Ganga gacca, the nālgūṃda of Manne nāḍ-300 in defence of his village.*303 Though neither Daḍiğa nor Ganga gacca is specifically stated to have been the āurgūṃda, the death in defence of the village might possibly indicate that it was their original base.

Two inscriptions from Mālūrparaṇa (Channapatna taluk, Bangalore district) also support the inference drawn from the Beḷagī inscription that nālgiṃundas were derived from the village headmen's ranks. Thus Kottayyan Uttaman, alias Sōḷa Viccādira Kkāmūṇḍan who is mentioned as the gāvunda of Manalūr in a Mālūrparaṇa record of AD 1013*304 is referred to as the nāṭtu gāvunda in a record of the following year.*305 It is not clear whether Kottayyan Uttaman concurrently held the two offices. In AD 1007 the nāṭtu gāmūnda was one Sōḷa Vjjādiva gāmūnda.*306
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That the उर्गावुंदु or नाल्गावुंदु implied headship of the उर or नादु is further indicated by the Bhārangi inscription of AD 957 which after stating that Erega held the उर्गामुंदु of Bhārangi, records a cattle raid by Pebb (गावुंदा) of Bhārangi.*307 Pebb गावुंदा was evidently a landholder in the village but was not the headman. It is possible that here we have the beginnings of the division between Prabhu गावुंदास and Praje गावुंदास which was to crystallize in the twelfth and the thirteenth centuries.*308

This is not to say that we do not have references to more than one individual holding the उर or नाद headship. Thus the Bechirākh Kōdipura inscription (Nanjanagūḍ taluk, Mysore district) of the tenth century records the conferment of गावुंदु of Gattavādi on the Selabhyeyaru and the Āneyaru. Did this denote two groups or two families? The inscription is not very clear. It further appears to register the construction of a tank by the Selabhyeyaru and the Āneyaru and gifts of land for its maintenance.*309 Similarly, the Nagarle inscription cited earlier mentions the three Nālgāvūndas of Edenād as witnesses to the grant.*310 The Gattavādi plates of Ereyappa II record that the boundaries of Śivayyamangala were demarcated by the Nālgāmūndas together with the (assemblies of) उर of Karggēre, Perggeyvādi, Kavilande, Muṭṭi, Bellamvādi and Gattavādi after exchanging betel leaves and areca nuts ('tāmbhula śrāvaṇa geydu') as a token of agreement.*311

The Gattavādi plates imply that demarcating boundaries in consultation with local notables was a function of the Nālgāvūndas. This is also brought out by the tenth century Chikmagalūr inscription which records a grant of land to Permādi goṇḍa. The lands were
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demarcated by the Nālgāmunda Biyala together with Komarayya of Piriyamuguḷi, Mendamma of Pāmādi, Dēvagāna of Benṇeyūr, Permāḍi gāmūṇḍa of Maḷlavūr, Cāmaya of Urppavaḷḷi and Viṭṭiyya of Indavūr.*312

Collection of taxes was another responsibility of the nālgāmūṇḍas. This is brought out by the Ṣivarahāḷḷi inscription (Chikamagalur taluk) of the ninth century.*313 Likewise the Sulidēnahāḷḷi inscriptions of AD 1017-18 (Kōlār taluk,district) which record the levy of a contribution of a goat per inhabitant (?) of Kaivāra nādu by the nāṭṭōm for the guardian deity of the nādu, goddess Cāmūṇḍēsvāri of Jayangondacaturvēdimangalām hold the nāṭtu gāmūṇḍas and the ur gāmūṇḍas responsible for the execution of the gift. If they failed to supply the goat they were to be fined a hundred Kalanjus of gold.*314

As local notables gāvūṇḍas were generally enlisted as witnesses to grants. Thus the Balīgāmī inscription (Shikārpur taluk, Shimoga district) of AD 685 which records the remission of alavāna (tax) on festival days (osageyum) and the escheat of heirless persons by Kandarbor, the officer (adhikāri) of Sēndraka mahārāja includes Sokka gāmūṇḍa of Ālamvalḷi, Eṣeyā gāmūṇḍa, Māpiya gāmūṇḍa of Moḷe-ūr, Anḍugīya gāmūṇḍa and Sinḍhēra gāmūṇḍa of Nirillī.*315 Similarly, the Gaḻigekere copper plates of Yuvarāja Mārasimha includes Mārasimha gāvūṇḍa and Ereganga gāvūṇḍa of Muduguppe, Urkāṇe gāvūṇḍa and Bhīma gāvūṇḍa of Maravūr, Śriya gāvūṇḍa of Bellimāṇī, Uttaṇa gāvūṇḍa and Kūndā gāvūṇḍa of Perbbala and Ripurāṇa gāvūṇḍa and Prithuvi gāvūṇḍa of Samgama*316 in its list of witnesses. A similar list is given in the Gaḻigekere copper plates of Raṇavikramayya(Nīṭimārga Ereyanga I) of the ninth century, which records the grant of Kolanellūru as brahmadeśya. The witnesses were Permāṇāḍi gāvūṇḍa of Samgama, Raṇavikrama gāvūṇḍa, Cōḷa gāvūṇḍa, Ummāḍa gāvūṇḍa of Mīride, Ereyanga gāvūṇḍa, Indara gāvūṇḍa of Muduguppe, Dāmā gāvūṇḍa, Ummāḍa gāvūṇḍa of Pērvoḷalu and Piḷḍuvi
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gāvūnda. Other witnesses were Tenandakara of Pērvāyalu and Śālattār and Varadar of Kolanellūru.*317

It was common for subordinates to bear the titles or names of the reigning king in the early medieval period. In Karnātaka this practice was particularly common among the gāvūndas. Both the Gaṅjam and Gaṅgekere plates provide us with instances. When the Cōlas conquered this region, the practice became commonplace. Thus the Śōladevaṇanahalli inscription (Nelamangala taluk, Bangalore district) of AD 1029*318 which records the construction of the Siddhēsvara temple by Vāmanayya and the grant of twelve khandugas of wet land as devabhoga mentions the following individuals:

(i) Raṭṭakulakāla Cōla gāvūnda, the Nālgāvūnda of Kukkanūr nāḍu; and
(ii) Nityavinōda Mānikka setṭi of Bānapura both of whom received gold from the donor Vāmanayya.

(iii) Vikrama Cōla gāvūnda
(iv) Rājarājasetti of Piriya Māṭuvūr
(v) Cōla gāvūnda of Ālūr
(vi) Nālgāvūnda Kumāraṇ Kuṣa gāvūnda of Saṇṇe nāḍ
(vii) Uttama Cōla gāvūnda of Pattandūr.
(viii) Nālgāvūnda Cōla gāvūnda of Kirukundacci nāḍ
(ix) Mūmmaḍ Cōla gāvūnda of Baḷevāḍi in Maṇṇe nāḍ
(x) Cālukyābharana gāvūnda of Kīrugaṇḍalu,
all of whom were witnesses. All these are names or birudas of various Cōla monarchs.

The process by which a gāvūnda took on the name or title of the reigning king is described in the Karshanapalle inscription (Punganūr zamindari, Chittoor district, Andhra Pradesh) of the late tenth or early eleventh century. This records that Nōlamba Vīra Mahēndra II on his way from Cōḷṇāḍu to Nōlambavāḍi, stopped at Kōḷāla in Ganga-6000 and anointed Kirtti gāmunda's son (pattavam katti). The anointed individual was apparently given the title of Nōlamba gāmunda and the gift of Beḷagūṭ in Puḷināṭtakere.*319 The Karshanapalle inscription thus brings out both the ties of personal allegiance that bound the

*319 S.I.L. Vol IX, Part (i) No.39
gāmundā to the king and the process by which the gāmundas were vested with rights over villages.

While the grant of BeJagatur to Nōlamba gāvunda was apparently made in expectation of future service, the Dhanugūr inscription (Malavalli taluk, Māndya district) of AD 960 records the grant of Dhanugūr in Badagare nāḍ as kalnāḍu to gāvunda Bīyalamma. Some confusion is introduced by the inscription by also recording the grant of the same village to Ācama of Dharamukhyānvaya as kalnāḍu in perpetuity. It is possible that the grant initially made to Ācama was entrusted to Bīyalamma, a kinsman. But this is not clear from the record. The service performed by either Ācama or Bīyalamma is also not specified. But the term kalnāḍ would imply recognition of the military service performed by either individual. Similarly, an undated ninth century record from Iggalī*322 (Nanjanagud taluk, Mysore district) registers the grant of Mādigere as valita (estate)*323 by Pīlduvi Ganga to Adhikārī gāvunda, Carama gāvunda and Śivāya gāvunda for protecting the cattle of Iggalī. Other instances of gāvundas' participation in local and inter-dynastic conflicts and grants to them of land and villages have been cited in another context.*324

Thus whether as the rural landholding elite or as fief-holders, gāvundas emerged as an important section of intermediaries between the king and the tiller. We do not have much information on the rights held by the gāvundas in village lands. Grants of villages as kalnāḍ occasionally carried with it the rights of abhyantara siddhi*325 which denoted control over the entire resources of a village and perhaps the rights of adjudication as well. Sarva parihāra or exemption from all dues is also a frequently employed term used to qualify such
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grants. But the Tāyalūr inscription indicates that even such lands carried the burden of some dues, at least, whether payable to the king or the village assembly. This is similar to the āraivili (tax-free) grants mentioned in Cōla inscriptions which definitely brought some taxes to the king.*326

In twelfth and thirteenth century Tamil Nādu we have evidence for kāṇi rights being held by influential individuals who also bore titles or āraivan, veḷān and ālvān. The right of kāṇi in the opinion of Karashima denoted a hereditary right of possession of land.*327 It was later replaced by the Persian term mīrās which included not merely the right to a plot of land alone but a complex of rights to lands, houses, water, etc., and the enjoyment of taxes and privileges.*328 Similar rights and privileges were apparently held by service assignees in southern Kamātaka in the period under study. Whether the ordinary gāvunda landholders held similar rights is not clear from our sources. But the headship of a nādu (nālgāvunda) at least carried such perquisites. This is indicated by the Belagi inscription which states that the nālgāvunda of Jiddūrālge-70 included the living (bālige) of Balligāmī.*329

In some cases we have references to more than one individual holding the gāvunda whether of an īr or of a nādu. A similar situation is described by Perlin in seventeenth and eighteenth century Maharashtra where many different individuals could hold shares in the headship of a village (mokadami) or of a district (deshmukhi). Here even with many people holding rights to the produce of a given village or territory, each individual held a well-defined legally protected channel through which his writ ran fiat. Such rights could be sold and purchased freely in seventeenth century Maharashtra and were held as property.*330 For the same period in Tamil Nādu also we have evidence for sale and transfer of mīrāsī
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rights and of ownership of shares (pangu) in a miras.*331 For southern Karnataka in the period under study, although we have references to more than one individual holding a gavundu which here also probably implied a well-defined legal channel for exploitation of resources, we do not have evidence for the free sale and transfer of such rights and privileges. Either the gavundu was hereditary or was conferred by the king or overlord.*332

Gavundas as local notables and state functionaries discharged important functions such as collection of taxes, demarcation of grant lands and execution of land grants by kings. They also were enlisted as witnesses. In cases where they were bestowed fiefs in expectation of service they were probably military commanders as well as is borne out by the Bandaliike inscription.*333

That gavundas were part of the feudatory hierarchy is indicated not merely by inscriptions but also by literary works such as the Vaddaradhane. Here, in the story of Vrsabhasena bhatara, king Pradyota of Ujjeni marries the daughter of an ur-gavunda and bestows the Mahadevivatta on her.*334 We have seen in another context that kings stressed the importance of kula when entering into matrimonial alliances.*335 The marriage of a gavunda's daughter to a king and her rise to Mahadevi status would indicate the basic unity in the ranks of the landholding elite.

While the majority of the gavundas emerged from the class of cultivating tenants, we have some references to gavundas belonging to tribes and occupational groups. Evidently gavunda came to denote chiefship of a community or group. Thus the eighth century
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Basavatī inscription (Chāmarājanagar taluk, Mysore district) mentions Kalipatṛodēya Kurimba gāvunda (chief of shepherds) who together with Kaṭakaya was granted two gandugas of land and taxes of land (manna dere) and the remission of taxes on shepherds (Kurimba dere) for all times (‘ella kālakkam’). We cannot determine from available evidence the extent of stratification in the ranks of the shepherds. But the grant recorded in this inscription would have had the effect of raising the gāvunda above the community. The reason for the grant is not stated. It is possible that it represented the process of assimilation of the shepherds into the Ganga political structure. The Beḷachavāḍī inscription (Gundlupēṭ taluk, Mysore district) of AD 1013 records the grant of Naranāgala village to Mēlāroḍeeya Mārayya by Jēduvara Ereyanga gāvunda and Kuruvatti Bēḍa gāvunda of Perāya. Both were apparently subordinates of Permāḍi gāvunda who held the nālgavundu. Jēduvara gāvunda probably denotes headship of the weaver community, while Bēḍa gāvunda was probably the chief of the Bēḍas, a hunters’ tribe. It is interesting to note that both chiefs made these grants apparently without reference to their superior. It is not quite clear how they came to possess rights over Naranāgala. Both appear to belong to Perāya. At all events both Jēduvara Ereyanga gāvunda and Kuruvatti Bēḍa gāvunda were part of the early medieval state polity, making grants of a village probably to a brāhmaṇa though this is not clearly specified.
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E) SERVICE ASSIGNMENTS

Apart from feudatories whether of recognised ruling lineages or obscure origins, service assignees formed a major section of the variegated ranks of secular feudatories. The majority of these service assignments were made to heroes who perished in local or interlineage conflicts. Grants were made by local corporate bodies, by local chieftains or headmen as well as rulers, and ranged from small plots of land for the dependents of the hero, to whole villages or even larger politico-geographical units depending on the hero's status and service. Generally but not invariably these grants were made posthumously and were designated Kalnadu or bālgalu. Inscriptions by and large state that the deceased hero received the grant whereas it meant that the recipients were his heirs and dependents. In the discussion below, the epigraphic idiom is retained. While the majority of heroes received grants, a significant number of hero stones merely commemorate the deeds of valour of the local hero and do not record any grants to them or their dependents.

While grants made to heroes account for the major portion of the secular service grants we also have records registering some kind of contract between an overlord and vassal which was symbolized by the tying of a patta (fillet). Grants of land usually accompanied the act of tying of the patta and sometimes the anointed individual went on to make a brahmadēya or dēvadāna grant after receiving lands from his superior. Contemporary literature links such anointing ceremonies with battles with the Commander-in-chief being bestowed the virapatta by the king. *340 Such a linkage is not brought out in epigraphic sources.

Literary sources also highlight the close, mutual bonds between the king and his warriors. The king supported the warrior materially in return for which the warrior was obliged to fight even to death in his master's interest. This obligation termed jolapāli in the literary works is not much attested to in inscriptions. However, a special class of warriors who were obliged to die with their master is frequently mentioned in inscriptions. These warriors were termed velevālis and were recipients of Kalnadu grants.

GRANTS TO HEROES: As stated above grants to heroes covered a vast range from a small plot of land donated by local rulers—village headmen or a corporate group or local chief, for heroes who perished in defence of the village in cattle raid encounters, to grants of a whole village to a velevali or local notable in recognition of service by the overlord, or even the grant of nalgavunda's position for the family members of a hero or sometimes lordship of a whole politico-geographical unit.

(I) GRANTS TO LOCAL HEROES:
An early instance of the small-scale grants of land made to heroes who perished in local skirmishes is provided by the Hulikunda inscription of the mid-eighth century which records the grant of four gulas of land by Miligeyarasu and Attani for Nāgadēva who rescued cattle * 341. Likewise the Balla virgal of C 780 AD [Mūḷāgala taluk, Kōlar district] records the death of Tuṣuvalla Ūvalan in a cattle raid on Balla by Karapūran the son of Raṇamukha Duṭṭa. Ūvalan received five gulas of land yielding one paddy crop from Māsakuṭiyaru and Attani in appreciation of his valour * 342. These two individuals seem to have been local notables. Similarly the Hebaṭa inscription of C 870 AD [Śrīnivāspur taluk, Kōlar district] records an invasion on Perbaṭa by Aggaḷa of Bidirūr. Bidiyēta who fought in this battle probably as a defender of Perbaṭa received a grant of 1 gula of land from Brahmaśiva baṭārār, with all exemptions * 343. Perbaṭa was the seat of a Śaiva monastic establishment and Brahmaśiva baṭārār was probably the pontiff at the time * 344. A similar grant of land is recorded in the fragmentary Tōremāvu inscription [Nanjangūḍ taluk, Mysore district] which is palaeographically assigned to the ninth century.

This registers the grant of five gulas of cultivable (bede) land to Koppa, the younger brother of Kaliyaṇṇa who appears to have perished in a cattle raid (tūrūgōl). Unfortunately it is unclear who the donor was in this case. A gavunda is mentioned earlier in the inscription but the lacunae make it difficult to come to any conclusion * 345.
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An interesting case of a small scale grant made to a local hero is recorded in the tenth century Honnûru inscription [Yelandûru taluk, Mysore district]. This record, dated in the third regnal year of Permânadi registers the grant of 5 gulas of cultivable land under the tank for Ponnavayya who died in a cattle raid. The grant was made by Ponnavayya’s elder (piriya) who also planted the stone. It is not clear who this elder was. Was he a member of Ponnavayya’s family or was he a respected senior member of the village? We can only speculate.  

Occasionally such Kalnâd grants were made by corporate groups. This is brought out by the Bhaktarahalli virgal [Sidlaghatta taluk, Kôlår district] of c AD 870 which records the death of Tingaṇimâra Melîtingâni in a rescue of the cattle of Madalur which were carried off by Kakkara. The Seventy four [Epattanâllaru], possibly of Madalûr made a grant of five gulas of rice land and five of wasteland (pâlu). The social composition of this corporate group cannot be discerned from available evidence but it is interesting to note that they had the authority to alienate waste lands. The inscriptions also brings out the steady whittling down of common rights in the waste lands. A similar grant of waste lands is recorded in the Tinnilli inscription [Sûnivâspur taluk, Kôlår district] of C 880 AD which registers the death of Pottalâgâ in a rescue of cattle for which he received one kanduga of rice land (kalani) and five gulas of waste land. In this case however it is unclear who the donor(s) was.

Another instance of a grant to a hero made by a corporate group comes from an inscription at Bâgalî assignable on palaeographic grounds to the tenth century. This records the death of Pemmapaṇṇa, the son of Benniyamma seṭṭi of Bâînallî in an attack against Dêsînga. The samaya thereupon made a grant received by his younger brothers Vâli and Mâpi of which the details are lost. A samaya has been explained inter alia as an assemblage, congregation or company.
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Its composition is unknown in this case. It was possibly a mercantile body given that the deceased hero was the son of a \textit{etti}. In any case the record brings out the possibility that corporate groups had their own militias * 352. This possibility is supported by the Dévaraha\text{\textbar}li inscription of the eighth century [Gun\text{\textbar}lup\textbar t taluk, Mysore district] which records the valour of the Seventy of Upag\text{\textbar}la, N\text{\textbar}manda and others in the battle of Kosaru\text{\textbar}l\text{\textbar}t. They received lands at Pu\text{\textbar}n\text{\textbar}s\text{\textbar}r free of all imposts probably from Durvini\text{\textbar}t E\text{\textbar}r\text{\textbar}y\text{\textbar}appa * 353. Evidently this was a corporate group of land owners who had joined Durvini\text{\textbar}t E\text{\textbar}r\text{\textbar}y\text{\textbar}appa, the son of Šripuru\text{\textbar}ša in his military exertions either personally or by sending their retainers. The land grant's extent is not specified nor is it clear how the lands would be distributed among the members of the group. It is interesting to note moreover that the lands granted were in another settlement thus giving this corporate group from Upag\text{\textbar}la control over agrarian resources in another village as well.

It was not merely the mercantile and landowning groups which had militias of their own. The Nukkanaha\text{\textbar}li \textit{virgal} of the mid ninth century [Kōlār taluk, district] states that Bān\text{\textbar}aras was at war with the Mahājana\textspades{[}s the corporate groups of brāhma\text{\textbar}nas\textspades{]} of Nekkundi presumably since his army was sent to invade that īnḍu. In the war that ensued at Pulikurukki, Nāgaguttarasa evidently fighting on behalf of Bān\text{\textbar}aras slew many and then died. He received the bāl\text{\textbar}alu grant of Bellampa\text{\textbar}ravi village * 354 with all exemptions (sarvapādā-parihāra). The issue of the war is not stated unfortunately. But is is interesting that the King should be at conflict with Mahājanas. Usually as we have noted, Kings supported brāhmadevas with lavish grants. Here, the army of the Mahājana\textspades{s} appears to be on par with that of the Bān\text{\textbar}a chieftain. It is also not clear whether the Mahājana\textspades{s} fought themselves or hire mercenaries for their army. In this connection we may recollect the armed groups of brāhma\text{\textbar}nas associated with ṣalais and ghatikas in the Tamil country. *355
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We do not have similar evidence for such institutions in Karnāṭaka but it is possible that the brahmādēyas had associated groups of militant brāhmaṇas. Mayūrasārman Kadamba started his career as a soldier while a student at the famed ghatikā at Kānci *356. Other brāhmaṇas from Karnāṭaka may have been similarly associated with that ghatikā.

Apart from possessing fighting forces of their own and granting land for the support of the dependents of deceased heroes belonging to the local community corporate groups also acted as witnesses to such grants * 357. Thus the fragmentary Hegganūru inscription [Heggaṇedēvanakōṭe taluk, Mysore district] lists the pērvānas [same as Pērbārvas * 358 the Kannada version of Mahājanas?] and vāṇigas from Kundattūru, Mādamangaḷa, Veḷattūr, Mattūr, Pasūr and Komtamangaḷa among the witnesses to a Nettaru-vari [blood grant] * 359. The details of the donor, donee and the grant per se are lost since the record is fragmentary.

Grants to heroes who fell in purely local skirmishes were usually small in scale. A few gulas of paddy land or a few khandugas at most. Usually such heroes came from humble backgrounds. But even gavundas occasionally received similar small scale grants. A tenth century virgal from Kūrgal [Piriyapaṭṭana] taluk Mysore district] records the death of two gavundas of Kūrgallu in a cattle raid. They received 3 khandugas of land as Kalnāḍu from Ereyapparasas, the ruler of Kongalnāḍu-8000, and not, interestingly, from Paramabbe who is said to be ruling Kūrgallu at this time* 360. It is unclear whether the grant of 3 khandugas was made individually to the two heroes or jointly. In contrast, the Mangala inscription [Chāmrajnagar taluk, Mysore district] of AD 965 records the grant of twelve hamlets (pallis) to the gavundā of Mangala for defeating Gariya apparently on behalf of Mārasinghadeva (II) * 361. The criterion for the magnitude of the grants apparently is the scale of the conflict, purely local skirmishes apparently merited only small grants.

*356 EC VII (old ed) SK 176
*357 EC III (new ed) Hg 112, of the close of the 9th century
*358 K V Ramesh, op cit, p 108; fn 1
*359 Ibid. p 110; fn 1
*360 EC IV (new ed) Pp 28
*361 EC IV (new ed) Ch 138
Death in battle on behalf of the regional overlord entitled heroes to larger grants. Grants were made by local notables, the local corporate groups and occasionally by rulers of the **nādu**. Defence of the village its cattle and women apparently was a responsibility of every able-bodied man in the village. In return the local authorities supported the dependents of the deceased, which was the main purpose of these grants. G.R. Kuppuswamy, however is of the opinion that in most cases these grants were merely token and it is doubtful whether they were sufficient to maintain the surviving family. In view of the fact that we have no information on the cost of living and productivity of land in those times it is very difficult to come to a conclusion about the adequacy of these grants but they do seem to be very limited in size in most cases.

As mentioned earlier, a large number of hero stones are purely commemorative and do not seem to include grants to the deceased hero. Most of these heroes had perished in local skirmishes in defence of their village or in cattle raids. Thus the Kalguṇḍi virgāl records the death of Pergaṇe Nāyaka in the **ur-alivu** (destruction of village) and **turugol** (cattle raid) on Kalguṇḍipura. It is not quite clear whether he was a raider or a defender. But at all events there is no grant recorded herein. Likewise an inscription from Niḍuvanī commemorates the death of Keṇca, younger brother (tamma) of Eca gāvunḍa of Bidirhāka in a cattle raid on Niḍuvanī, but appears not to include a grant. The Kittūr virgāl of AD 1008 [Piriyapatna Taluk, Mysore district] similarly records the death of Cannayya, grandson of Kittūr’s Bijaya gāvunḍa in a cattle raid. But again we do not have a record of a grant made for the hero. The hero's younger brother is said to have set up the memorial stone after the funeral obsequies [paroksha kriyā].

---

*362* S Settar & M M Kalaburgi, "The Hero Cult: A Study of Kannada Literature from the 9th to the 13th century" in S Settar & G D Sonthermer (ed) Memorial Stones; p 28


*364* ASMAR 1937 No.21, p146 of the 9th century

*365* EC VIII (new ed) HN 130 of AD 970 [Hassan District]

*366* EC IV (new ed) Pp 144
We do not even have a grant for sustaining the rites of the memorial. A similar instance is provided by the Siddaiyapura virga of the close of the 9th century [Gundlupet taluk, Mysore district] which records the death of Kavaḍodega the son of Terareliya in a cattle raid. The stone was set up by the hero’s daughter Tātabbe. There was no grant whether for his dependents or for maintenance of the memorial stone and associated rituals *367

A slightly different story is recorded in the Ālattūr virgas of the 9th century*368. These record the death of merchants in a cattle raid at Aṭti in Cōlanal where they had gone to trade (paradu pōgi). It is not quite clear whether these merchants were aggressors or defenders. It is possible that these merchants were cattle traders given the vigorous pastoral and cattle breeding tradition of the Southern Karnataka region. In that case, the two heroes commemorated here, Tippaṇa and the (unnamed) son of Bappa ṣetti, died in defence of their merchandise. If on the other hand they were aggressors as the word tuṇugol would indicate the inscription would bring out the ambiguous nature of trade in the early medieval period with merchants indulging in cattle raids during the course of their mercantile activities. The heroes of the Ālattūr virgas were honoured with memorial stones by members of their family. Tippaṇa’s brother-in-law and Bappa ṣetti’s younger son set up the two stones. There is no grant for their maintenance.

A tenth century record from Bāṇḍalli [Kollegāl taluk, Mysore district] records the death of another long distance trader, apparently from Tamil Nadu. ttayyan Keṭṭan alias Tiśai Māṇikka Čeṭṭi in an encounter with a tiger which he killed before dying of wounds sustained in the conflict. The stone was set up by his son Keṭṭan Maṣaṇan. *369 To judge from the deceased hero’s alias of Tiśai Māṇikka Čeṭṭi he would appear to be an itinerant trader dealing in rubies and precious stones. Trade in exotic and luxury items was handled through itinerant guilds in this period.*370 The alias of this particular trader recalls the famous guild of Nānādesiya Tiśai Āyirattu Ainurruvar whose activities can be dated back at least to the ninth century * 371.

*367 EC III (new ed) Gu 206  *368 EC III (new ed) Gu 36,37
*369 EC V (new ed) Ko 69
*370 R Champakalakshmi "Urbanisation in Medieval Tamil Nadu" in R Thapar & S Bhattacharya (ed) Situating Indian History , p38
*371 Ibid, p51, also vide Table VI appended thereto.
It is possible that Keṭṭan belonged to this organization and while in transit through Southern Karnataka in the course of trade, possibly, had this encounter with a tiger which is commemorated in the Bāṇḍallī hero stone. Keṭṭan and his son do not appear to have any roots in the locality where this record was found. Keṭṭan Maṇanān's putting up of the memorial stone in his father's memory was a private act and it is therefore not surprising to find that the record does not include a grant. But in the other cases mentioned above it is not clear why no grant was made. The criteria which determined which local heroes would be honoured with a grant and which would not be so rewarded cannot be discerned. The social background of these heroes are as varied as those whose exploits were crowned with grants of land howsoever small. As we shall see below some hero stones recording services rendered to an overlord also fail to incorporate grants. The same problem of distinguishing criteria for making grants appears there too.

(II) Grants to heroes who perished in Inter-nadu or inter-dynastic conflicts:

In contrast to local heroes who fell in defence of their village or its cattle or in an attack on a neighbouring settlement, heroes, particularly chieftains, who fell in the service of their overlord received large tracts of land, hamlets or villages and occasionally even whole units of villages. Vēlevālis who followed their lord in death were another set of individuals to receive munificent grants in recognition of their devotion. Occasionally dependents and family members of the deceased heroes were honoured with titles and positions of influence such as that of nād-gāvundas. Very often these titles had been held by the deceased hero and was vested with their nearest relative.

Among the early instances of large land grants are the Araḷukōṭe inscriptions of the close of the eighth century. The first record registers the grant of Mādegula to the descendants of Vīramahāmēru who died fighting Kāḍuvaṭṭi's force at the orders of Bāṇa Vidyādhara Prabhumēru *372. The second registers the grant of Kulanellūr with all exemptions (sarva pariha) as bālgacu to Viyala Viyādhara, the son of Mānasurarāḷī Kaype the hero (ganda) of Prabhukaye Tulige Vasantan who died fighting the Dāmarigas on the command of his lord (ālva) Prabhumēru *373.

*372 EC X (old ed) Sp 6 of C 780 AD  *373 EC X (old ed) Sp 5 of C 780 AD
The Nukkanahalli virga of the mid-ninth century which has been cited earlier *374 constitutes another instance of extensive land grants to heroes of exalted status. This herostone registers the grant with all exemptions (sarva-pada-parihara) to Nāgaguttarasa who fell fighting the Mahājanas of Nekkundi nāḍ. Likewise the Iggali inscription [Nanjangūḍ taluk, Mysore district] of AD 892-93 records the invasion on Uttarillaga Kōte in the course of a battle against Nōlamma [Nōlamba?] in which Rāceya Ganga died. The deceased hero was given the villages of Iggali and Dudugeśe as Kalnāḍ. *375 His Ganga descent was probably the reason for the munificent grant. A tenth century hero-stone from Chikka Hanasoge [Krishnārajana gar taluk, Mysore district] records a yet more munificent Kalnāḍ grant to an individual who was probably a Ganga vamsaja. This inscription registers the gift of Kongunāḍ-70. The donors were a certain Govindara and a corporate group, the Thousand (sāśīrvaru)*376. The identity of Gōvindara is unclear nor is the composition of the Thousand specified in this fragmentary record. It is therefore unclear whence they derived their authority to alienate an entire politico-geographical unit. It is possible that Gōvindara was one of the claimants to the Ganga throne who were eliminated by Cāmunḍārāya to clear the way for the accession of Rācamalla IV *377 after the death of Mārasimha II. In that case the Chikka Hanasoge inscription records an episode in the war of succession following the death of Mārasimha II and possibly represents an effort by Gōvindara to win support for himself among members of the Ganga lineage by granting entire units to his partisans.

A series of hero-stones from the Hassan district register grants of villages to heroes who were either Velevaḷi of various Ganga monarchs or their consorts or had perished in inter-dynastic conflicts. The Marṝru inscription of the early tenth century [Arkalgud taluk, Hassan district] records the grant of...nnanūr with abhyantara siddhi to Bābiyamma who entered fire on the death of Nītimārṇa *378

*374 EC X (old ed) Kl200 of c 850 AD, vide supra p130; fn354
*375 EC III (new ed) Nj204
*376 EC V (new ed) Kn41
*378 EC VIII (new ed) Ag 26
Likewise the Muttige inscription [Arkalgud taluk] registers the gift of Muttige to Bedante Raceya who entered fire on the death of Racamalla (II?). The grant was received by Dhora whose relation to Bedante Raceya is not specified in the epigraph *379. Yet another instance of a village granted to a velevali is encountered in the Belgali inscription of the mid- tenth century [Arkalgud taluk] *380.

Unlike the Maruru and Muttige inscriptions the Belgali epigraph specifically includes the term vele but the act of following the lord in death is left out therein. The inscription registers the donation of Belgali to Ankada Katayya, the vele of Ganga Mahadevi Revakanimma, and his successors in perpetuity. The record specifically states that Belgali was not be entered by nalgavandas and nadbovas for collection of taxes such as kunudere and attadere. The grant included the right of abhyantara siddhi. In other words it was a tax-free grant which vested in Ankada Katayya and his successors complete control over the resources of Belgali. Royal and local officials were specifically precluded from entry. Thus the royal domain of the Gangas was steadily eroded by the grants of villages as estates to service assignees.

Apart from these velevalis other beneficiaries were heroes who perished in interdynastic conflicts of the period. The Arakere virgal [Arsikere taluk, Hassan district] for instance registers the grant of Arakere as Kanhad to Sri Muttara who died in the battle of Kalikaṭṭi against the Nolambas *381. Sri Muttara was probably the ruler of Asandi nad. If so, this would bear out the suggestion that grants of villages were made to heroes of high social status. But the status of deceased heroes cannot always be determined from available evidence. This is the case with the Masaganahalli hero stone of AD 971 [Channarayapatna taluk, Hassan district] which records the grant of Neṭṭur in Kalkali nad as Kanhad to Erigari who died in the war with Rājāditya Calkya of Uccangi *382.

*379 Ibid, Ag 24
*380 Ibid, Ag 41
*381 EC XVI (revised ed) Ak 215
*382 EC V (old ed) Cn 262
Likewise the Neralige inscription [Arsikere taluk] registers the gift of Nerilage to Annavasayya's son. Annavasayya had fallen in the battle against the Nōjambas. His social status is as indeterminate as Erigāri's. On the other hand Bāsagāvunda, whose death in the course of the battle with Rājāditya for the fort of Uccangi is recorded in the Karagacā virgal [Belur taluk, Hössan district] received only a grant of five khanḍugas of land. Apart from social standing it is possible that another criterion for awarding grants was the actual gallantry displayed by the hero. It is noteworthy that the Hössan area should yield so many hero-stones relating to the inter-dynastic conflicts of the period. Was it a recruiting ground for the Ganga army? In any case this region was to constitute the core of the Höysala Kingdom in the late eleventh century.

Heroes were also rewarded by the conferring of positions of authority, most often the nālgāvundu of politico-geographic units. Since these grants were posthumous, the actual beneficiaries were members of the heroes' families. The Kaṭṭemanuganaḥalli virgal of the close of the ninth century [Heggaṇēvanakōte taluk, Mysore district] records the death of Rāma, the son of Permanadī gāvunda of Kuruvendūr in Pērvāyal in a cattle raid by the people of Bayal nāḍ on Kottamangala. Thereupon Permanadī [Satyavākya Rācamalla II] and Ereyappa granted the nālgāvunda, probably of Pervāyal to Permanadī gāvunda in addition to the village of Kurusuvūr as Kalnāḍ. Similarly, the Ganganūru hero stone of AD 907 [Arkalgūḍ taluk, Hössan district] records the grant of a nālgāvundu to Jinaṇāḍega who died in a battle. The donors were Permanadīgal and Ereyapparasa. However, the inscription does not specify the nāḍ nor the actual recipient of the grant since it was made posthumously. The Bandaljike inscription [Shikāṇipur taluk, Shimoga district] of AD 919-20 provides us with an interesting instance of the conferring of a nālgāvundu on the family member of a deceased hero. Its epigraph records the death of Sattarara Nāgarjuna who was holding the nālgāvundu of Nāgarakhanda - 70 in pursuance of the orders of his overlord Kalivītarasa, the ruler of Banavasi-12,000.

*383 EC XV (revised ed) Ak 237 *384 Ibid, Bl 308
*386 EC III (new ed) Hg 5 *387 EC VIII (new ed) Ag 105
*388 EC VII (old ed) S k 219
Thereupon the nālgāvundu was bestowed upon his wife, the gāvundi Jākiyabbe. After seven years in office, enjoying prabhusakti, she decided to renounce the world probably owing to bodily illness and accepted the vow [probably of sanyasana]. She appears to have been succeeded by her daughter, a succession which apparently was without validation by her feudal superiors. Unlike the Kaṭṭenamuganahaljī and Ganganūru virgals which record fresh grants of nālgāvundu to families which had apparently not held such a position before, the Bandālikē inscription concerns a family which already enjoyed power. The novelty lies in the succession of the wife and later the daughter to the office. Was this done in the absence of male heirs? It is not possible for us to come to a definite conclusion in the absence of specific information.

Besides gifts of land, entire villages and nāds, as well as of offices, cash gifts are also known, though they are rare, perhaps reflecting the essentially autarkic economy of the period. One such instance of a cash gift comes from the Hecche inscription [Sorab Taluk, Shimoga district] of c 991 AD. This record registers the grant of twenty-four puradrammas by Śrī Sāntivarma, the Mātūravaṇī subordinate of Kakkaladeva, to Akaṭega, the vēle of queen Gundadabbe. Akṣṭega had vowed to sacrifice his head if the queen were to become pregnant and the king were to have an heir. Accordingly he gave up his head to the warriors (bhatar). The grant was entrusted to the Mahājanas of Elase.* 389 The dependents of Vēle Akṣaṭega possibly enjoyed the interest on the sum though the record does not specifically state so. Alternatively, the Mahājanas ensured the performance of rites at the funerary shine. An earlier instance of a cash gift comes from the Muḍigere inscription [Tarikere taluk, Chikmagalūr district] of the close of the eighth century.* 390 However it is not clear whether this grant was made as a reward for the valour of the donee. This record of the reign of Mahāśāmantādhīpati Prabhūtavārṣa Śrī Gōyindarasar [Rāstrakūṭa Gōvinda III] records the conferment of the honour Prabhutunga Maryāde.* 391 on Prabhutunga Māla. A cash gift of six gadyānas from the queen (Rāṇīde) and twelve gadyānas from Dāṇḍamattapa was made in addition to a sarvaparīhāra grant of land, the details of which are not given.

*389 EC VIII (old ed) Sb 479  *390 ASMAR 1942, Inscription no 47, p 175-76
*391 F Kittel, A Kannada-English Dictionary, q.v. Maryāde, to show respect, civility.
It is possible that the conferment of the honour, with the title of Prabhutunga implied some kind of feudal tie between Govinda III and Prabhutunga Māla. The practice of bearing the overlord's title was a widespread one in the early medieval period and was to be particularly marked under the Coḷas * 376.

As mentioned earlier not all heroes were fortunate enough to receive munificent grants. The criteria which determined the bestowal of grants cannot be discerned from available evidence. Thus for instance, the Tatalkallu virgal [Mūlagal taluk, Kōlar district] of the mid-ninth century records the death of a Pallava who killed Ningarāya in an obscure battle. No grant was made apparently by the reigning Bāna King.*393 Likewise, the Bhairāpura hero stone [Channarāyapaṭaṇa taluk, Hāsann district] of the eighth century records the death of Mālvapāṭṭoḍeya, the servant (ālu) of Nīrṛgunda-arasa in a battle against Kuḍī Muddan at the boundary (mēre) No grant was made in appreciation of his valour * 394. Similarly the Kūgalūru inscription [Nanjanagūḍu taluk, Mysore district] of the tenth century praises the valour of Kēśavavyya who secured the bracelet of Indamarasa and handed it over to the king before dying himself. His services do not appear to have been rewarded * 395. The most surprising instance of the failure to reward a hero comes from the tenth century Jinnahlī record which chronicles the death of Maśīga the son of Eṛṇyangappa of Ganga vanīṣa who fought at the order of Guttia Ganga in the battle against Nōlambāḍhiraja * 396. The reigning king as Marasimha II in all probability * 397. Why this scion of the Ganga race was not awarded a grant remains a mystery, particularly when we recollect grants of lands and villages made to heroes of unknown pedigree who fought in the battles waged by Marasimha II * 398. The grant of Kongunāḍu-70 to an unnamed Gangavāraṇīṣaṇa by Gōvindara may also be recollected in this context * 399.

*393 EB X (old ed), Mb 26
*395 EB III (new ed) Nj 371
*397 Vide supra, p 170 , fn 34 - 36
*399 Vide supra, p 526, fn 377.

*394 EB V (old ed) Cn 208
*396 Ibid, Hg 26
*398 Vide supra, p 367-7, fn 382-384
In some other cases the inscription being fragmentary it becomes difficult to determine whether Kalnād grants were made or whether the epigraph is merely commemorative in nature. Such is the case with the Husukūru inscription of AD 870-71 [Nanjanagūdu taluk, Mysore district] which records the invasion by Būtarasa I, on some fort by the order of Permādi [Satyavākya Rācamalla II]. The epigraph praises the valour of Candiyāṇa *400, but since it is incomplete we cannot determine whether a grant was made or not. Similarly the eighth century of Karmmāga Rāca Irmāḍi Bīra and Maṅalēra of Kuṅungil *401. Once again, the epigraph being incomplete we cannot determine whether a grant was made or not.

To conclude, while heroes who perished in minor inter village skirmishes received token grants of land, those who participated in the endemic interdynastic conflicts of the period usually received more generous grants of villages or even entire units. Thus Iruga, the son of Nāgattara was given the division of Bēmpūr-12 in addition to the bestowal of the Nāgattara vāṭa as a reward for his father’s valour in the battle against Bīra Mahēndra at the end of the ninth century.*402 But we also have examples of high born heroes whose prowess went unrewarded. But it is possible that grants for heroes’ dependents were made separately in some cases and were recorded in inscriptions which have not survived. This might explain instances. The reasons and criteria which determined the magnitude of the grants cannot be discerned. The dependents of such heroes then constituted another section of the variegated ranks of the secular intermediaries between the ruler and the tiller, another group of claimants to a share in the produce of the land. That they enjoyed powers analogous to the brāhmaṇa donees of brahmadeśa grants is made clear by the inclusion of the terms sarvabādhā parihāra and abhyantara siddhi. In one case, the inscription specifies that royal and local officials were not to enter the village to collect taxes *403. Thus the donees could appropriate the major share of the produce. While some of the donees were of high birth, many others were new entrants to the class of feudatories. In the case of the former, Kalnād grants confirmed their earlier titles and possessions with an occasional augmentation of power and property. In the case of the latter, the titles were freshly bestowed.

*400 EC III (new ed) Nj 385  *401 EC VII (new ed) Mu 36
*402 Supra, Section B-V, p.190 , fn 166.  *403 Vide supra, p.36 ; fn 380
They were mostly velevaśī or ordinary soldiers who laid down their lives in service of their lord and were rewarded for their meritorious service. In local skirmishes, the local corporate groups, such as the Mahājanas, the Samaya or the Ļṛ who often possessed militias of their own, undertook to reward heroes who perished in defence of the interests of the local community.
(I) BRAHMĀNAS : As we have seen earlier, the majority of the first phase inscriptions were copper plates registering brahmadeya grants. Such grants of villages and lands to srotriya brahmaṇas continued to be made in the second phase also, but their proportion in relation to the total declined markedly. The majority of the second phase records, whether copper plate or lithic epigraphs register grants to temples or purely secular grants to heroes or secular transactions such as the grant of the bituvāṭa* 404 of a tank or remission of taxes. Most of the surviving brahmadeya grants of the second phase belong to the reign of Śrīpuruṣa (AD 725 - 788) and may be taken as representing the continuation of earlier trends. Śrīpuruṣa in fact emerges as a staunch supporter of Brahmanical Hinduism. His Agaḷi Grant charter states that his palace echoed to the sounds of the religious ceremonies accompanying the mahādānas made by him everyday *405. No other Ganga monarch after him claims to have performed these rites.

Among the srotriya brahmaṇas who benefitted from Śrīpuruṣa’s bounty were Bāṇaśarma of Vatsa gōtra and Taṭṭtriya caṇaṇa who received Bāradūr grāma in Tegaṭṭuṛ viṣaya in Śrīpuruṣa’s first regnal year,*406 Tīvaraśarma of Hāritāyana gōtra and Chāndoṛa Kalpa, resident of Tuṛugalūr, who received house sites, garden lands, fields and forest lands in the third regnal year,*407 Nandīśvara ʿsarman and his adoptive sons Mādhava and Mārasarman of the Kāśyapa gōtra who were granted Agaḷi village on the southern bank of Toḷle river at Eṇedīṇḍe in Marugare viṣaya in the twenty second regnal year;*408 120 brahmaṇas (unnamed) who were well-versed in the four branches of learning, who were given Bēlpūr village on the eastern bank of the Peṇqe river in Maṇale-ālke-300 of Sinda viṣaya in Śrīpuruṣa’s twenty-fifth regnal year,*409 Mādhava ʿsarma of Kāśyapa gōtra

*404 Bittu vāṭa was a portion of the produce derived from lands irrigated by tanks or the land itself which was granted to the person who built the tank or repaired it. Supra, Chap II., Section C (v)

*405 Chapter III, Section C, fn 267
*406 EC V (new ed) Kn 48 of AD 725-26
*407 K.V.Ramesh,op.cit.,No.41, the Nandi plates.
*408 Ibid,No 42, the Agali grant charter of AD 748.
well-versed in the Vājasaneyā vēda and resident of Tōlūr who received lands, gardens, forest land and house-sites in the four villages of Eḻangūḍalūr, Maṇiyācigūḍalūr, Paṇūvi and Śrīpuram in the thirty-seventh regnal year;*410 and Nīlakanṭha śārma of Hārīta gōtra who was given Kōmāramangala village in the Pudukanda viṣaya at the request of Duggamāra Eṛeyappa and his queen Kānciyabbā for the spiritual benefit of Kānciyabbā's deceased brother Indrarāja.*411. Duggamāra and Kānciyabbā were probably also associated with a grant of wet lands and a garden to Vellasārma of Maduregill recorded in the Mēḻāgani lithic inscription of AD 767-68.*412. The donor in this record is not clearly specified but since Duggamāra the ruler of Kovalā nadu-300 and Ganga-6000 and his Mahādevī, Kānciyabbē, the ruler of Agaḷi are mentioned just before the grant they may have been the donors or at least the sanctioning authority for the gift which appears to have been of a purely local character. The Hūllēnāhalī copper plates of Śrīpuruṇa also record a brahmadēya grant at the request of Dīṇḍigarar of Bāṇa lineage, who was ruling Oḷṇūlu in Kārstappu nādu. The beneficiaries were Janārdana of Gārgya gōtra, Kesāva bhaṭṭa of Kauśika gōtra and Nāgaśarma of Kāṣyapa gōtra, each of whom received a portion of Kovalaveṭṭu village. This epigraph is undated.*413

Most of the above grants were made in copper plate charters, and with the exception of the Salem and the Hūllēnāhalī copper plates were made by the king on his own initiative. This would support the suggestion made above that the king was a staunch supporter of Vedic Brahmanism. In addition dēvadāna grants and secular gifts were also made in his reign. But in most cases such dēvadāna grants were made by the king at the request of a subordinate as in the case of the Dēvarahalī plates (Nāgamangala taluk, Mandya district)

*409 EC VI (old ed) Mg 36 of AD 750-51.
*410 EC X (old ed) Gd 47 of AD 762-63,
*411 K. V. Ramesh, op. cit., No. 47 the Salem plates of AD 771.
*412 EC X (old ed) Mb 80.
which record grants to a Jaina temple called Lōkatilaka at Śripuram at the request (viñāpti) of Prthivi Nirgundarāja *414.

Alternatively, such grants may be made directly by the subordinate after a nominal reference to his overlord. Such was the case with the Narasimharājapura plates of Śripuruṣa which records the grant of Maḻavalli village by Nāgarvarma Gangarāja of the Pāsinḍi Ganga family and his brother-in-law (śvālah) Tuḻuga-aḍi of the Kadamba family to the caitya at Tōlla village. A subsidiary grant of a field, Dharma Kṣētra by Maṇali Mane-oḍeya is also registered in the same inscription.*415 Apart from these copper plate charters we have numerous lithic records from Śripurusa's reign registering dēvadāna *416 or secular grants *417. Most of these lithic records were made by local notables or rulers and the king was not usually connected with these gifts.

Two brahmādeva grants of Yuvarāja Mārasimha have come down to us. The first is the Koṭṭimba grant charter of his third year which records the grant of Koṭṭimba village in Māṇya visaya and Ālūr with its hamlet Vāydeūt in Kuṇvāle visaya to Śrīdhara of Bhārādvāja gotra, a performer of sacrifices*418. These grants were apparently made by the Yuvarāja himself. The Gaṅjam copper plates on the other hand record the grant of Tipperūr as brahmādeva to Ponnaḍi of Kauśika gotra, the oḍeya of Ārppola by Kolliyarasa Kali Nōjambāḍhirāja of Pallavaṇvaya and his son, Nijarāma Nayadhira with Mārasimha's permission.*419

The Perjjarangi grant charter of Rācamalla I of his first regnal year grants the village Perjjarangi in Eđediniče- 70 in Marugare visaya to

*414 EC VII (new ed) Ng 149 of AD 776-77.
*415 K.V.Ramesh, op.cit., No.71, undated of the eighth century.
*416 EC IV (new ed) Ch 147, EC III (new ed) Hg 156, Gu 43, 67, etc.
*418 K.V.Ramesh, op cit., No.50 of AD 799.
*419 EC VI (new ed) Sr 66.
Nāgadēva bhāṭṭa of Bhāradvāja kula. The grant was made for the spiritual benefit of his parents and for his fame.*420 Another grant of Rācamalla’s reign of which a brāhmaṇa was a beneficiary was the Maṇne copper plates of AD 828. This charter registers the donation of Doḍḍavāḍi village in Mānya visaya for the bali, dhūpa, and dīpa of the temple of the goddess Kīṭṭāḷeretibhaṭṭāri established at Doḍḍavāḍi by a Ganga prince Mahēndra. The grant was made at Mahēndra’s behest and was entrusted to Dēvaśarma of Kāśyapa gotra, a Vaikhāṇasa who is said to be honoured in royal courts and favoured by the goddess.*421 Thus a dēvadāna grant was in this case held by a brāhmaṇa trustee. In the Keregoḍi Rangāpura plates of Rācamalla II, however, the village Keḍasūr in Nirguna viṣaya was given for the repairs and renovation of theĪśvara temple at Ālūr and entrusted to Netraśivācārya, “a sun in the firmament of pure Śaivism”.*422 The caste affiliation of this acārya is not clearly stated. But since the title of acārya is applied, he was a brāhmaṇa since such titles were used only by them.

An interesting variation on this theme of caste affiliation of sectarian preceptors is provided by the Kūḍlūr plates of Mārasimha II of AD 962-63. This inscription records the grant of Bāgiyūr village in Baḍagare nāḍu of Punnāṭu-6000 in Gangapāti to Vādighangala Bhāṭṭa of Parāśara gotra and Cālukivaḍa caṇa*423. The donee however was a Jaina preceptor and is described as “an ardent worshipper of Jīněśvara” and an advisor to Kṛṣṇa III. He is said to have won the esteem of all Kṛṣṇa’s mandalikas and sāṃantas. His ancestors had migrated to the south from Pippala agrahāra of the Vārāṭadēśa in the North.*424 Vādighanghala bhāṭṭa is in many ways similar to Pampa in that he is proud both of his brāhmaṇa ancestry and his Jaina faith. Pampa’s ancestors were Vādika brāhamaṇas.

*420 K.V.Ramesh, op.cit.,No.90
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His forefather, Mādhava Sōmayājī had performed numerous sacrifices, notably the sarvakratu.*425 Pampa's father Abhimānadevāraya is said to have rendered his high birth in the vipra kula higher still by adopting the Jaina faith with its emphasis on compassion to all creatures.*426 Pampa too received an agrahāra named Dharmapura in Bācche-nāḍ - 1000 in return for having established his patron, Arikēsari's fame by composing the Vikramārjunavijayam.*427 Although both Vādighanghala bhaṭṭa and Pampa were devout Jainas they certainly took pride in their brāhmaṇa descent as well. This shows that the caste system pervaded Jainism.

Vādighanghala bhaṭṭa was not merely a preceptor but an advisor to Emperor Kṛṣṇa-III Raṣṭrakūṭa and possibly Mārasimha II Ganga as well. His father was apparently a warrior since he is described as having "a delighter of the lord of the Vārāṇa country with his fierce valour".*428 The tradition of brāhmaṇa participation in administration and war was an ancient one as we have seen earlier. Such participation was to eventually lead to the adoption of brahmakṣatrāya status by such brāhmaṇa families.

Among the prominent brāhmaṇas employed by the Gangas in the second phase we may mention Sivārya of Kauśika gotra. He is described in the Gaṭṭavāḍi plates as the skilful pilot*429 in steering the ship, the Ganga kingdom. The fragmentary Kerehāḷi plates of Nītimārga Ereyappa II too refer to one Śivārya, probably identifiable with the donee of the Gaṭṭavāḍi plates, who appears to have maintained one thousand elephants in Konga nāḍu viṣaya for his lord Nītimārga Ereyappa II.*430 The Gaṭṭavāḍi plates state that Śivārya's forbears had migrated from Ahicchatra in the north to Tānagundūr agrahāra in Vanavāsa viṣaya (Banavāsi - 12000).*431 Like many other members of the ruling class, Śivārya constructed a tank by gathering the waters of three small rivulets.
A new village named Śivayyamaṅgaḷa after him was established around this tank and was granted by the king to Śivārya himself.Śivārya's brāhmaṇa identity is stressed by referring to his gōtra affiliation and by tracing his descent from immigrant northern brāhmaṇas. Such immigrant groups were generally ascribed higher status and were courted by chieftains and rulers in order to create a class of loyal intermediaries. Inspite of his political and possibly military services to his overlord, Śivārya does not appear to have adopted any kṣatriya attributes.

On the other hand, Cāvundaṛāya, the loyal vassal of Mārasimha II and Rācamallar asserted that he belonged to the sacred brahmakṣatra varṇa. His eulogy inscribed on the Tyāgada Brahmadeva pillar at Sravaṇabelgola praises him as "a sun in the shape of a jewel adorning the crest of the Eastern mountain, the brahmakṣatra race, a moon in the shape of the splendour of his fame causing to swell the ocean, the brahmakṣatra race; a central gem to the pearl necklace of Lākṣmi procured from the Rōhaṇa mountain, the brahmakṣatra race; a strong wind to the fire, the brahmakṣatra race". Apart from the assertion that Cāvundaṛāya belonged to the brahmakṣatra race neither source specifies his ancestry. However, a fragmentary inscription from Ālgōḍu (T.Narsipur taluk, Mysore district) of the tenth century gives us the genealogy of one Cāvunda who was the grandson of a vipra named Govindamayya, who is praised for his knowledge of dharma (dharmajña) and the son of Mabālayya, a subordinate of Noḷambakulāntakadēva (Mārasimha II). Mabālayya and his brother Īśrayya are lauded for their prowess. Would this indicate the appropriation of kṣatriya attributes by this brāhmaṇa family?
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An inscription from Āraṇi (Nāgamangala taluk, Māṇḍya district) mentions one Mābalayya as the Mahāmātya of Nolambakulāntakadeva Permaṇaḍi (Mārasimha II)*437. B.R. Gopal et al. are inclined to identify this Mābalayya with the father of Cāvunda referred to in the Ālgoḍu epigraph who in turn was probably the same as Cāvunḍarāya, the author of the Mahāpurāṇa *438. However, neither the Ālgoḍu nor the Āraṇi inscription refers to the brahmaksatra status of the protagonists which figures so prominently in the Sravaṇabēlgōla prasasti. But the Ālgoḍu record clearly brings out the brāhmaṇa status of the founder of this family. It is possible that their political position under Mārasimha II led to the gradual adoption of Kṣatriya traits and which in turn might have induced Cāvunḍarāya to settle for brahmaksatriya status.

Several records from the Sorab taluk of Shimoga district mention scions of the brahmaksatriya Māṭūra vanīsī *439. They are described as Trikundapuravareśvara, as possessing the Nandanavana chatra (parasol), and the haya lāñchana and darpāna dhvaja (banner).*440 Thus this lineage had adopted all the royal insignia while there is a conspicuous absence of reference to brāhmaṇa ancestry or gotra affiliation. R.N. Nandi has suggested that the Māṭūra vanīsīs were possibly a group of tribal sorcerers who had settled down as a village community.*441 Such shamanistic origins might have inclined them to opt for brahmaksatriya status when they rose to power *442.
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Another family of brahmaṇa feudatories is mentioned in the *Ajita Purāṇa tilakam* of Ranna. The progenitor of this family was Nagamayya of Punganūr in Kemmedēsa of Vengi manḍala *443 who belonged to the Kaundinya kula. His two sons Mallapa and Ponnamayya are described as Kaundinya-kula-pradīpa*444 and Mallapa in particular is praised as being well-versed in both śāstra and sāstra.*445 Mallapa's courage is also fulsomely praised. He is described as being the cause of his lord Āhavamalla (Tailapa II) Cālukya's rising prosperity.*446 Interestingly, his daughters Attimabbe and Gūḍamabbe were married to Nāgadeva, son of Dallapa the excellent counsellor (sacivōttama) of Emperor Āhavamalla, holding the rank of Mahāmantri. He is said to belong to the Uttamajati but his gōtra is not specified.*447 Nāgadēva is praised for his valour only unlike his father-in-law. By the dint of his prowess and his faithful service in the battles of Kūmara and Karahaṭa, he gained successively the titles and rank of camūpati and sēnādhipati.*448 If Nagadeva was not in fact a brahmaṇa, this would represent an interesting case of a pratilōma marriage. It would also mean that Nāgadeva's political and social position - he was the son of an important feudatory of the emperor - was considered sufficient by Mallapa.

The inscriptions cited above clearly reveal that brahmaṇas had come to possess large landed estates which made them a significant section of the aristocracy. Many of them, such as Śivāya, Mābalayya, Cāvuṇḍarāya and Mallapa played an active role in the administration and politics of the day.

Apart from these high ranking brahmaṇa feudatories we have several references to brahmaṇas who held the position of ṛ-odeya.

*447 Ibid, I.38 Vacana.
*448 Ibid, I.42, 45.
In the context of Tamil Nadu, Subbarayalu associates the title of ur-odeya with non-brahmana landholders belonging to the particular village mentioned in the prefix component.*449 In other words such a person was the possessor of either the entire village or a portion of land therein. The evidence from southern Karnātaka indicates that ur-odeyas were often brahmanas. The eighth century Saragūru copper plates for instance refer to the odeya of Keśuṅa who received Dhannagavāḍi as a brahmadeya grant from Śrīpuruṣa.*450 The very fact that the grant was termed as brahmadeya implies that the donee was a brahmaṇa. Similarly, the Gaṇjam copper plates of Yuvarāja Mārasimha Eṛeyappa record the grant of Tipperūr as brahmadeya to Ponnaḍi, the odeya of Ārppoḷa who belonged to the Kauśika gotra.*451 The brahmaṇa identity of this odeya could not have been clearer. The Meḍutambaiḥalī inscription of Śivamāra II (Kōḷār taluk,district), records the grant of some land as brahmadeya, by Śivamāramma, the odeya of Puttur to Duṇḍugēr, the Nālattūr odeya.*452 While Śivamāramma's caste affiliation is indeterminable, the Nālattūr odeya was apparently a brahmaṇa. The Tāgarī agrahāra inscription of AD 1027 (Shikāripur taluk, Shimoga district), mentions Tāgaracce's ur-odeya Arasimayya, whose son, Pērbārva Mādhavayya constructed a temple and received a dēvadāna grant.*453 Pērbārva has been explained by K.V.Ramesh as the Kannāda equivalent of Mahājana or Mahābrāhmaṇa (pēr=big, pārva=brāhmaṇa)*454. Thus Arasimayya too was a brahmaṇa.

But the caste identity of ur-odeyas cannot always be discerned. In the case of the Sivārapatṭaṇa inscription (Kōḷār taluk,district) of the eighth century, which records that there was no debt outstanding between the odeya of Kūḍalur-pāḍi and
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Eramaga,*455, the caste affiliation of both protagonists cannot be determined. Likewise the Devalapura inscription *456 (Mysore taluk, district) of Śrīpuruṣa mentions Gottemadī odeva as the donor of Nokki-ur, a vytti of Kūḍalūr and of a retainer's field (pērāvina key)*457 to Arattiga talaṇa (perfect of the city police)*458. Here Gottemadī odeva is clearly a landholder of considerable importance but it is not possible to detect his caste identity.

(II) RELIGIOUS PRECEPTORS AND TEMPLE TRUSTEES:

Another category of the religieux who received grants of land were the sectarian preceptors and representatives of monastic orders who were entrusted with the dēvadāna grants. As the Mappe plates of Rācamalla I show *459 such trustees could be brāhmaṇas. But the caste affiliation of sectarian leaders is generally not specified. Their asceticism is stressed instead.*460 This is not to say that they were non-brāhmaṇas. We do not have any reference to sectarian preceptors of non-brāhmaṇa extraction. But the caste affiliation of these individuals was not as important for their identity as membership of the sect. Some of these monks and sectarian preceptors exercised lordship over villages and religious centres (sthāna). Such leaders are seen performing administrative functions analogous to those more usually undertaken by lay chieftains and kings. Thus, the Rāmapura inscription (Shirangapattana taluk, Mandya district) of the thirty-fourth regnal year of Satyavākya (Rācamalla II)? Permanądi (AD 904-5 ?) refers to one Matisagara paṇḍita bhaṭāra who is described as the "abode of all learning and wealth (Vidya-Laksmi-pradhāna-nivāsa), possessing the multitude of prostrating feudatories, (prabhava-praṇīta-sakala-sāmanta-samūha)"
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and lord of Belgōla which is attached to the Kalbappu hill (Kalbappu giri - sanātha Belgōladhipati).*461 At his instance, in the presence of Annayya Dēvakōmāra and Dōra, a grant was made to Kēṣiga for the construction of a tank at Taḷanēri. *462. Thus Matisāgara paṇḍita bhaṭṭāra was the lord of Śravaṇabēlgōla and evidently enjoyed the revenues of the villages donated for its upkeep. He could evidently dispose of the revenues, at least, at will. He is even depicted as a conventional overlord receiving the obeisances of feudatories. The Kyāṭanahalli inscription (Pāṇḍavapura taluk, Maṇḍya district) also mentions a Kalbappu-ūrthasanātha and Bēlōgālanivāsa.*463 The name of this lord of Kalbappu is lost since the record is broken. However, he is said to belong to the Śravaṇa sangaḥ and is probably identical with Kōmārasēna bhaṭṭāraka who received the grant of a sallage of white rice, ghee and free labour (bitti) given to the Kalla haḍadi built by Cāgi Permanādi.*464 This grant was made jointly by Rācamalla II and his nephew Eṛeyapparasa and is probably only a little later than the Rāmpura record cited above.

The Mallisēṭṭipura vīrgal (Sidlaghaṭṭa taluk, Kōḷār district) refers to Brahmaśiva bhaṭṭār who was ruling Pasugūr while Śrī Nōḷamba was ruling the kingdom (arasu geyyvu)*465. Another preceptor Brahmaśivācārya made a grant of one kulā of rice land (okkulā kalāṇi) to a hero, Bidiyēta who repulsed an invasion or Perbaṭṭa.*466 Another inscription from Hebbṭa (Śrīnīvāspūr taluk, Kōḷār district) mentions the Ācārya’s sthāna. Clearly, Hebbṭa was the centre of a line of Śaivite preceptors. Someone from the ācārya’s establishment seems to have died in a skirmish and a grant was made for him.*467
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The most interesting set of inscriptions in this regard come from the Ávari hobli (Mülbagal taluk, Kolar district). These refer to the rule of Tribhuvana kartāra bhāṭāra over the sthāna of Ávari in the mid-tenth century. A rock inscription from Ávari itself states that Tribhuvana kartāra bhāṭāra obtained Rudraloka after having ruled for forty years over the sthāna of Ávari, constructed fifty temples (āyvattu dēgulam māḍi) and several large tanks (piriyaveradu kēreyam kāṭī).*468 Inscriptions from Balla and Šringēri Sadumanahalli in the Ávari hobli refer to this priest's rule over the sthāna which apparently meant Ávari.*469

As the editor of the Archaeological Survey of Mysore - Annual Report of 1927 says it is evident that Tribhuvana kartāra pāṇḍita was a powerful priest entrusted with the management of temples in the district of Ávana, or in Ávari itself.*470 But the third virgal at Šringēri Sadumanahalli clearly indicates that Tribhuvana kartāra pāṇḍita's jurisdiction extended beyond the mere management of temples. This epigraph registers the death of a hero in an ur-alivu (destruction of a village) and the grant of five kōlas of wet land by Dēva.*471 Dēva clearly refers to this priest since the virgal mentions the rule of Āṭṭaṇa dēvar over Ávana. According to the editor, Āṭṭaṇadēvar was a mistake for pāṇḍitadēvar, the title of Tribhuvana kartāra pāṇḍita.*472 Similarly, a virgal from Balla village records a grant in appreciation of the valour of Dammeya the son of Basalvēra in defence of cattle by the bhāṭāra who clearly is Tribhuvana kartāra pāṇḍita, who is said to be ruling the sthāna in this inscription.*473 Obviously, then, this Śaiva preceptor ruled over Ávari and its neighbouring villages, performing functions that a lay administrator would in similar circumstances. Surprisingly, however, two records from the Satrughna temple at Ávari, datable on palaeographic grounds to the mid-tenth century do not mention him but merely record the grant or remission of certain taxes to the (temple of) Mahādēva by Dilipayya Nōlamba.*474
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An inscription from Mōgēnahallī (Channapaṭṭa taluk, Bangalore district) datable to the close of the ninth century or the beginning of the tenth, mentions Mūvāḍī Cilluka dēvar, the ruler (ālva) of the temples of Śivanārēśvara, Nītimārgēśvara and Jagdhara Nagharēśvara. The record registers the grant of the bituvattā of the big and small tanks within the limits of these temples by the ālva.*475 The precise location of these temples is unclear although the inscription states that they were situated within a fort. Mūvāḍī Cilluka dēva was apparently a Śaiva religious preceptor and like Matisagara pāṇḍita bhaṭāra and Tribhuvana kartāra bhaṭāra is seen performing purely secular administrative functions. His influence does not seem to extend beyond the limits of the temples.

Thus the virtual monopoly held by the brāhmaṇas over the eleemosynary grants in the first phase was eroded in the second phase. Although vaidika brāhmaṇas continued to be recipients of land grants in the second phase (and the instances cited above are far from exhaustive), monastic orders and sectarian preceptors vied with them for royal and chiefly patronage. Such preceptors were brāhmaṇas but they derived their influence from their leadership of the monastic order and sect rather than from being brāhmaṇas. They emerged as a significant section of the landed magnates and exercised considerable political and administrative power. In fact the influence wielded by these sectarian leaders appears to be far greater than that of the brāhmaṇa beneficiaries and feudatories. While Mābaḷayya could only claim that he was charged with the full responsibility of the kingdom as the Mahāmātya, ("samasta-rāja-bhāra -nirūpita-mahāmātya-pada-sampannam")*476 Matisāgara pāṇḍita could claim that he was sovereign over a host of feudatories,*477 while Tribhuvana kartāra pāṇḍita is said to be ruling the kingdom of tapas analogous in position to the king Dilīpaya Nōlamba who was ruling the kingdom of earth.*478 This trend was clearly connected with the rise in the popularity of the cults of Viṣṇu, Śiva and the Jaina Tīrthankaras. Rulers attempted to harness both the older brahmanical religion and its
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representatives as well as the new bhakti cults and its leaders for the validation of their power.*479 Since such leaders received generous grants of land for the support of temples of which they were the trustees and managers they gained great political power and became landed aristocrats.

In the first phase we have few references to women. These generally occur in terms of their relation to the reigning King and their names are not mentioned. This changes in the second phase, we find women referred to as rulers of specific units or settlements. As we have seen the Gangas and the Nōjambas distributed the lineage territory not only amongst the sons but the queens as well. Apart from this, an inscription from Kuntūru [Kollegal taluk, Mysore district] of the tenth century mentions Parabbayarasi of Kundattūru as the ruler of that place. Evidently she was of local extraction.

The emergence of women to limelight may perhaps be traced to the revival of matriarchal elements in society. We have seen that with growing acculturation and spread of literacy, the emergent tribal elite began to appropriate royal symbols and modes of political control. It was perhaps under the influence of these new groups of the ruling class that women came to the forefront as rulers and administrators. Traces of matriarchy are visible even today among the lower castes and tribes of this region. Among the Kurubas, Bēdas and Vaddas daughter’s children inherit family property in the absence of sons. This is done after the dedication of the daughter to a deity as Basavi. The affiliation of the son-in-law is also widely prevalent among the Hooleyas, Bēdas, Vaddas, the Gangādikāra Vokkaligas, the Morasu Vokkaligas, the Goḷās and a section of the Gāṇigas. They inherited a share of the father-in-law’s property together with their brothers-in-law. The inheritance of daughters is perhaps illustrated by the Bandalike inscription of AD 919-20. As we have seen earlier, this epigraph records the bestowal of a nālgavundu on gavundi Jākiyabbe as a reward for her husband’s gallantry. It goes on to register the succession of her daughter to that post after Jākiyabbe adopted Jaina vows of ritual death.

---
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It is not clear whether this succession of the daughter was in the absence of a male heir and whether the daughter had been dedicated as a Basavi. There is no information on this score. But the fact that Vokkaligas even today bequeath a share of their property to sons-in-law would indicate that the succession of daughters was a common practice in all probability even in the medieval period.

The association of sons-in-law is attested by several other records as well. The Yelaburige inscription of Mayindamarasa records the death of the brother-in-law (hāya, wife's brother) of Jeṭṭayya gāvūnda of Maragal in a raid on that place *486. Similarly, the Āsandi inscription of Mārasimha II refers to Naraga's death together with his son-in-law (āliya) and children.*487 An inscription from Śravaṇabēlgōḷa indicates that the position of Mahāmātya in the Ganga Kingdom under Ereyappa II was inherited by the son-in-law of the previous incumbent *488.

Thus, practices of modern matriarchal castes and tribes are attested to even in the early medieval period. The increased visibility of women in epigraphs may thus indicate the resurgence of matriarchal elements in society. In the previous phase the patriarchal Dharmāṣṭrac norms had been pervasive.