CHAPTER VII

THE CHÓLAS OF NIDUGAL

The Midugal Chólas are yet another branch of the Telugu Chólas who held sway over a portion of southern Andhra. They were probably an offshoot of the Réndu Chólas who went to these parts from the east. Midugal after which they are called is a town near Henjéri, i.e. Hémavati. Indeed these Chólas are Telugu Chólas because they ruled over the Telugu region. But interestingly all their inscriptions with a single exception are in Kannada. The exceptional one is in Tamil. The reason is obvious. Firstly, the territory over which these chiefs ruled, namely, western Andhra adjacent to the Karnataka orders was predominantly a Kannada area and secondly, they were the subordinates of the Chálukyas of Kalyāna who were preeminently Kannada rulers. It is also to be noted that most of the titles of these chiefs are also in Kannada. Like other Telugu Chólas they also claimed their descent from Karikála.
Territory of the Mdugal Chōlas

A study of the inscriptions of these chiefs indicates that the following administrative divisions came under the rule of the Mdugal Chōlas. They were Rodda 300, Kāneyakallu 300, Sīre 300, Haruve 300 and Sindavādi 1000. It is clear that all these areas correspond to the present day taluks in western Andhra and the adjoining Karnataka area. Further all these inscriptions are found in the same area.

Rodda-three hundred, Kāneyakallu-three hundred, Sīre-three hundred, Haruve-three hundred and Sindavādi-thousand were, with the exception of the last, seem to have been held by the Mdugal Chōlas for a long period afterwards. Rodda-three hundred, evidently called after the village of the same name, correspond to Penugamala taluk of Anantapur district. Kāneyakallu or Kāṇyesa- allu-three hundred represent the present Racyadurg taluk of the same district, for both Kāneyakallu, the village after which the division was named, and Gōvindavādi, its capital, are situated in that taluk. Sīre-three hundred derived its name from Sīra, the headquarters of a taluk of the same name in Tumkur district of Karnataka State. Haruva or
Haruhe is identical with Parigi in Hindupur taluk of Anantapur district, and Haruva-three hundred roughly correspond to Hindupur taluk. Sindavadi was a major province of thousand villages with its capital at Tumbalam in Adoni taluk of Kurnool district. It extended from Gooty in Anantapur district in a north-westerly direction to Adoni on the banks of the Tungabhadra in Kurnool district.

It indicates that the Nidugal Cholas were holding sway over the western taluks of Anantapur district besides the southern, eastern and northern portions of Bellary, Chitravurga and Tumkur districts respectively of Karnataka State. All these areas are in a contiguous belt.

Headquarters of the Nidugal Cholas

The Nidugal Cholas ruled their principality from different places at different periods of time. Gövindavâdi, Heñjeru and Nidugal are mentioned in this regard. All these places are in Anantapur district. Gövindavâdi, variously called as Gondavâdi and Goydavâdi, is mentioned for the first time in 1106 A.D., and referred to frequently
thereafter. Where it occurs for the first time i- is partly damaged and the portion that is visible reads 'vinda māli'. Gövindasvāḷi is identical with Gövindavāḷa in Rayadurg taluk of Anantapur district. After forty-four years, i.e., in 1150 A.D., Henjeru is heard of as the nālevīḍu of the Niḻugal Chōlas. It occurs in a number of inscriptions and some legends as Penjeru, Penchera, Heňjera and Heňjre. In Tamil it was called Perunjeru and Peruncheera. It enjoyed the status of a capital till 1225 A.D., i.e., for about 75 years. Henjeru is identified with the modern Hēmavati in Madakasira taluk of Anantapur district by B. Lewis Rice.

Niḻugal, after which these Telugu Chōlas were called, is referred to for the first time in 1226 A.D. It was also known as Niṉu. Its name is made up of niṉu and kal, which mean a long or high cliff. This Niḻugal is the modern place of the same name in Dharmavaram taluk of Anantapur district. It is to be pointed out here that though Niḻugal figures as a capital of these chiefs quite late in their history they are called Niḻugal Chōlas by Robert Sewell and the successive generation of scholars. For the sake of convenience we have retained the same
nomenclature though they can more precisely be called Telugu Chōlas of south-western Andhra.

**Genealogy of the Nidugal Chōlas**

The inscriptions of these Chōlas mention the names of these chiefs sometimes singly and some other times in the genealogical order for two or three generations. There are, however, three inscriptions which give the genealogy of the family for nine generations and more. These three genealogical lists can be shown as below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nidugallubetta 7</th>
<th>Nidugallubetta 8</th>
<th>Nidugallubetta 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inscription-I</td>
<td>Inscription-II</td>
<td>Inscription-III</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Jatā Chōla
2. Brahma Bhōgēnīra
3. Mangī Nripa
4. Bābhi Nripa
5. Gōvinda Mahīpa
6. Irungūla
7. Bhōga Nripa
8. Bṛhma Bhūpāla (m. Bāchala-dēvi)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3 Mangī</th>
<th>4 Bīchi</th>
<th>5 Gōvinda Mahīpa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 Irungūla</td>
<td>7 Priya Bhōga</td>
<td>8 Bṛhma Nripāla</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8 Brahma Nripa (m. Bāchala-dēvi) or Bṛmma Nripati (m. Bāchala)
The names given in other inscriptions either singly or in the genealogical order can be coordinated with the names given in the lists above. On the basis of all these details the following genealogy can be tentatively constructed. The second inscription from Nidugallubetta gives a fairly long list of the chiefs of this family for nine generations. According to this inscription, Jatā Chōla was the first member of the family. His son was Brahma Bhōgendra. Brahma Bhōgendra’s son was Mangi. Now this Mangi is obviously the same as Mangi figuring in two other inscriptions, also from Nidugallubetta. The next chief, the son of Mangi, is called Bīchi in this inscription. But in the other two Nidugallubetta inscriptions Mangi’s son is mentioned as Babbi Nripa and Babbedēva. Though there is apparent discrepancy in these three names, i.e., Babbi Nripa, Bīchi and Babbedēva, all of them can be identified as the name of one chief only. This discrepancy appears to be due to the error of the engraver or even the modern transcriber of the record. Babbedēva’s son and grandson were Gōvinda variously called
Govindarasa and Govinda Mahipa, and Irungola respectively. This is corroborated by all the three lists given above and also by other inscriptions such as those from Obalapura,10 Nidugallubetta and Siddhapura. The Nidugallubetta inscription also mentions Govinda’s queen as Mahadevi. An epigraph each at Malayana13 and Kottamivaram14 give the names of Irungola’s two queens Bammaladevi and Alpadévi. There is some difficulty with the next chief, the son and successor of Irungola. No.1 and 2 of the lists given above name him as Bhoganripa and Priya Bhoga respectively, while No. 3 calls him Mallideva. Inscriptions from Obalapura, Nidugallubetta and Malayana call him variously as Jagadekamalla Malladévi, Jagadéka- malla Mallanripala and Tribhuvanamalla Mallidévi. Tribhuvanamalla Mallidévi of the Hemavati15 inscription is also the same chief. The Obalapura, Hemavati, Malayana and Siddhapura inscriptions give the names of his queens as Bammidévi, Sittadévi, Lakmadévi and Bijjaladévi respectively. The inscription from Amarapuram16 in Anantapur district mentions Bammidévi and his son Irungola. It also refers to Bøchaladévi, the queen of Bammideva. Obviously these chiefs are identical with the above. An inscription from Roppa17 in Molakalmuru taluk of Hítra-
durga district in Karnataka State speaks of a Bammadéva
and his four sons, Irungola being one of them. Obviously, on the basis of this, B. Lewis Rice, who edited this inscription, assigns them to the midugal Chola family.\(^{18}\) It is not unlikely that these two chiefs can be identified with the chiefs of the same name under Nos. 8 and 9 of the three lists above. If this surmise is correct, we learn that Irungola had three brothers, Bijjanadéva, Balranda and Bavantigadéva. List No. 3 above carries the genealogy further by two generations. It mentions Viara Bomma and Ganśā as son and grandson. An inscription from Gundlahallí\(^{19}\) in Pavagada taluk of Tumkur district in Karnataka State mentions Perumaladéva and his son Tirungunadeva. Establishing the identity of these chiefs with the known ones above is indeed difficult. If Perumaladéva is taken to be a mistake for Jammidéva they may be identified with Nos. 8 and 9 of the above lists. Now an inscription from Amaraśura\(^{20}\) in Sira taluk of Tumkur district in Karnataka State mentions Irungopadéva and his son Tripurántakadéva. Tripurántakadéva is not known from any other inscription. At best he may be placed as the second son of Irungola II of No. 9 of the above lists. An inscription at Amaraśura in Anantapur district dated 1226 A.D. mentions Irungola’s daughter as Mangavve.\(^{21}\) There is an inscription from Mopur\(^{22}\) in Cuddapah district which mentions three
generations of these chiefs, namely, Bhrammideva, his
unnamed son and the latter's son Bhrammideva. Though the
names are similar, these chiefs cannot be identified with
the chiefs under Nos. 8, 9 and 10 of the above list
because of chronological difficulties. Because Bhrammideva
of this inscription has a date in 1309 A.D. But
Bomba's son Ganësa, as per the third list above, has a
date in 1292 A.D.23 Thus Bhrammideva of the Mopur
inscription of 1309 A.D. must be placed after Janësa. If
this surmise is correct, Bhrammideva of the Mopur inscrip-
tion is to be identified with Bhrammideva, the son of
Irungöla II, his unnamed son with Ganësa and the son of
this unnamed son Bhrammideva will be placed after Janësa
as his son. Thus the Mopur inscription carries forward the
genealogy by one more generation. It also mentions the name
of his queen as Bhogaladévi.

In suggesting these placements and identifications,
we have taken into consideration the dates given in the
inscriptions, on the basis of which the chronology of these
chiefs is discussed below.
Chronology of the Midugal Chōlas

The earliest chief of the family for whom we have a date is Mangi or Mangarasa. He figures in two inscriptions dated 1079 A.D., and 1082-83 A.D. The next chief who has the dates is Irungōla I. We have for him dates ranging from 1116 to 1143 A.D. Presuming that Irungōla commenced his rule in 1115 A.D., and that Mangi's period ended in 1085 A.D., we will have to assign the in between thirty years to Babbedēva and Gövima. Tentatively we might say that the former ruled between 1085 to 1100 A.D., and the latter between 1100 and 1115 A.D. In the absence of exact dates we might presume that Mangi ruled between 1060 and 1085 A.D. His two predecessors Brahma Bhōgendra and Jata Chōla may be assigned a rule of twenty-five years each between 1035 and 1060, and between 1010 and 1035 respectively. As noted just now the latest known date for Irungōla is 1143 A.D., which is the date of the Eradukera inscription in Anantapur district. For his son Tribhuvanamalla Mallidēva alias Bhōgadēva we have dates ranging between roughly 1145 and 1196 A.D. Since we have a date in 1143 A.D., for Irungōla I, we might fix his period as between 1115 and 1145 A.D. Mallidēva's inscriptions might be said to commence from
1145 A.D. The only next dates available to us are 1226, 1232, 1247, 1248, 1249, 1260, 1278 and 1290 for Irungūla II. There is no inscription belonging to his predecessor Brahma or Bamma. Since the latest known inscription for Mallidēva is 1196 A.D., we might surmise that he ruled till about 1200 A.D. Thus his period will be from 1145 to 1200 A.D. Since Irungūla II's earliest inscription is 1226 A.D., we might ascribe the commencement of his rule to 1225 A.D. Thus the period of the rule of his predecessor Brahma or Bamma will be 1200 to 1225 A.D. We have an inscription assignable to Bamma. It comes from Siddhapura in Molakalur taluk of Chitradurga district. It gives the genealogy of these chiefs from Gudindia to Bomma as noted above and refers to Bomma as the ruling chief. This inscription is not dated. But B. Lewis Rice assigns it to 1278 A.D. We do not know on what grounds the assignment is made. There is no clue in the inscription since it does not refer to any overlord. Nor can it be examined palaeographically. At any rate the assignment of the date as 1278 A.D., does not seem to be correct. We, therefore, take it as falling within the reigning period of Bamma assigned by us, namely, 1200 and 1225 A.D.

As seen above, the earliest known inscription of
Irungōla II is dated 1226 A.D., and the latest known date for him is 1290 A.D., which comes from an inscription from Roppa. For his grandson Ganēśa we have a date in 1292 A.D. This indicates that Irungōla II ruled for about 1290 A.D., which is a fairly long rule of about sixty-five years. It also indicates that his son Bemma did not rule at all and this can very well be explained by the long rule of his father. So thus the period of Irungōla II will be between 1225 and 1290 A.D.

As noted just now, for Ganēśa we have only one date, namely, 1292 A.D., and for his successor also only one date, namely, 1309 A.D. Tentatively we may suggest that Ganēśa ruled between 1290 and 1300 and his successor Brahmindēva between 1300 and 1325 A.D. All this discussion can be condensed in this chart as below.
Rule of the Nidugal Cholas

Jata Chola and His Successors

Nothing is known about the first ruler Jata Chola or his successor Brahma Bhogendra I. Mangi the next chief is the earliest on whom we have some recorded evidence. He was variously called Mahamandalasvaramangarasa36 and AhavamanadalasvaramIriva Mangarasa37 in his inscriptions dated Chalukya-Vikrama years 4 and 7 at Havaligi and Undabadga in Anantapur district. In the Havaligi record he is stated to have ruled over Redia 300 and Kaniyakallu 300. He had sikhi-sikhavahaja and simha lanchchana. These, especially the latter, reveal his link with the Renadu Cholas who also had lion as their emblem. According to an epigraph38 of 1292 A.D., he is stated to have acquired the name 'Destroyer of the Matangas' by destroying the elephants - his enemies. But nothing is known about his enemies. About Bichi or Babbe, the next ruler, the inscription describes him in a general way saying that the world became the mantapa for the dance of his fame and that in the blazing fire of his valour an enemy of Hosagrama was sacrificed so that he obtained happiness in svarga. Here, though Hosagrama
gives the impression of being a historical place, it is not possible to identify either the place of the enemy of that place. About his son Gōvinda also nothing is known.

Irungōla I

Irungōla I succeeded Gōvinda. He was the first powerful chief of the family and he came to power in 1115 A.D. He figures in as many as fifteen inscriptions spread over Anantapur and Kurnool districts of Andhra Pradesh, and Chitradurga and Tumkur districts of Karnataka State. He was a subordinate of the Chālukyas of Kalyāna, Vikramaśītya VI, Śomēśvara III and Jagadākāmalla II. Irungōla came into conflict with another Telugu Chōla subordinate of Vikramaśītya VI, namely, Ballēva Chōla Mahārāja and also the Hoysala ruler Vishnuvardhana early in his career. In the battle with Ballēva at Kaniyakallu a certain Masavi Mayinadayya fell by the sword of Irungōla. Kaniyakallu, where the battle was fought, is situated on the Hāgari river in Rayadurg taluk of Anantapur district. In 1117 A.D., Hoysala Vishnuvardhana claimed to have broken the power of Irungōla. In 1125 A.D., Irungōla was ruling over
Kaniyakallu 300 from Govindavadi. He rose to prominence subsequent to the death of Chalukya Vikramaditya VI, for two years later, i.e., in 1128 A.D., he was not only called Mahamandalesvara Vira Pandya Irungoladeva but was ruling over Rodda 300, Sire 300, Haruve 300 and Sindavadi 1000, besides Kaniyakallu 300. By about this time, he came into conflict with Hoysala Vishnuvardhana again war is said to have captured a fort belonging to him. In 1131 A.D., the latter boasted of overpowering Henjeru and of having been a terror to Govindavadi. It probably refers to the conflict that took place in 1128 A.D. A record adds Rodda to the list of territories conquered by Vishnuvardhana. After this Irungola's power seems to have been confined to Hambulige where he made a gift of land.

An epigraph of 1143 A.D., at Eradukera, in which Irungola figures, registers the death of a certain Ganganavergade and his follower in a dāli (invasion). It does not disclose the identity of the invader or the circumstances in which he invaded Irungola's dominion. Irungola's rule probably lasted till 1145 A.D.
Irungöla had a queen by name Ālpadēvi. She is mentioned in two records, one at Kamagondanahalli in Tumkur district and another at Kottasivaram in Anantapur district. In the former she is referred to as Ālpadēvi. Her name was, in all probability, Ālpadēvi. This Ālpadēvi was the sister or daughter of Kavi Ālupēdra.\textsuperscript{51}

Mallidēva

Mallidēva followed Irungöla on the throne. At first he assumed the title Jagadekamalla probably as a mark of his loyalty to Chālukya Jagadekamalla, but later he adopted the title Tribhuvanamalla, for which he showed marked preference as almost all his later records mention it. He was also known as Priya Bhōga. An inscription of his descendant Ganesa states that he was called Bhōgi because he performed the duties of Bhōgīndra (king of serpents) by bearing the burden of the whole earth.\textsuperscript{52} In about 1147 A.D., he was governing Rodda-nādu, Sīre-nādu, Haruve-nādu and Kaniyakal-nādu.\textsuperscript{53} It seems to be the earliest reference to his rule.

It is to be noted here that serious political changes were taking place during this period in the
Chalukya kingdom. Right from the days of Jagadeksmalla II, the Kalachuri chief Bijjala was trying to consolidate his power and assert independence. Subsequently he succeeded in his designs and overthrew Chalukya Taila II and established himself as the ruler at Kalyāna. In this troubled days the living Chalukya princes ran away from the capital and settled in Chitradurga, Bellary and Anantapur regions. They were obviously supported by the subordinate chiefs such as these Cholas of Nidugal and others. The present chief Mallideva continued to be loyal to the Chalukyas though they had lost their power. This explains his bearing the title Tribhuvanamalla and claiming to have ruled as a subordinate of Chalukya Chakravarti. This also shows that the Seunas contributed that Mallideva became independent consequent to the fall of the Chalukyas is not correct. Yet the connection of Chola Mallideva seems to be indicated by the name of one of his queens Bijjalaśevi, Bijjala being a typical Kalachuri name, but what type of relations he maintained it is not possible to ascertain. The names of his other queens mentioned in the inscriptions are Ballidevi, Sītādevi and Lakṣmīdevi.

Interestingly Mallideva figures as a subordinate of Tribhuvanachakravartin Kulottunga Chola in an
inscription dated in the latter’s second regnal year equated with 1166 A.D. K.A. Nilakanta Sastri has tried to explain that this Kulottunga was Kulottunga III who perhaps was set up on the throne as early as this date but being ousted by Rājarāja II took shelter under the subordinates like Mallideva until he could assume power in 1179 A.D. But this surmise is not supported by evidences. There are Chalukya epigraphical evidences to show that the Chalukya princes fled to this region of the Nidugal Cholas and were claiming authority through the support of these Cholas who acknowledged the Chalukya authority. There are many inscriptions of such Chalukya princes like Tribhuvatamalla, Jagadēkamalla and Bhulōkamalla who were in this area in the period of Kālačhūri occupation, namely, between 1150 and 1180 A.D. However, mention of Kulottunga’s name in the inscription of Mallideva is an enigma.

The rule of Mallideva appears to have been peaceful. There is hardly any mention of war or other military exploits of his. In seven out of eight inscriptions, he is stated to have been ruling from Henjeru and in one from Gōvindavādi. Nidugal figures in an epigraph of 1150 A.D. His great minister, sēnādhipati and hiriyas tantrapīla Nāmana was established at Nidugal by his father Irurgōla.
Namana's elder brother Baramana was the Mahapradhana or chief minister of Mallideva. They were the sons of Echimayya and Muddabbe, and grandsons of Ayyappayya. Ayyappayya hailed from Kottitone which, the poet of the epigraph claims, surpassed the three towns, Suraraja-pura (Amarāvati) which is the town of the lord of the suras (Indra), Alakapura (the town of Kubera) and Dharaśhtrapura in splendour. Kottitone was also known as Kārttikeyapuram and it was the ancient name of the present Kudatiri.

We may take note here of an inscription from Nagenahalli in Anantapur district. It is dated in 1196 A.D., and it speaks of Tribhuvanamalla Bhogadeva, i.e., Mallideva as making some grants. The inscription proceeds to name the historicity of Kuntaladesa calling it Kuntala saptā-dha-lakṣa. It states that this country was ruled by the Guptas, the Mauryas, the Rattas and the Chālukyas, and then it was taken over by Kālachurī Bijjala and was ruled over by his successors. Unfortunately, this inscription is broken and the narration is lost. It seems to indicate that the Kālachurīs began Vikramakīla which obviously stands for the period of the Chālukyas. Thus the inscription indicates the revival of the Chālukya power which was achieved by Chālukya Sōmeśvara IV around 1180 A.D. But
on the date of the record, namely, 1196 A.D., the Chālukya power was already extinct and the country was divided between the Śeunas and Hoysalas. The area concerned had been under the Śeuna rule already, though the fact is not mentioned in the inscription. It only indicates that the impact of the Chālukya rule still lingered on though they had ceased to be the rulers.

Brahma II

Brahma II, the son of Mallidēva, succeeded to the throne in about 1200 A.D. He was also known as Bāmideva, Bamma and Barma. We have no details about this king except that he had a son Irungōla, i.e., Irungōla II through his queen Bāchaladēvi. In a vague way an inscription of a later period claims victory for him on various regions around, which do not seem to have any historical value. This was a period when the Śeunas and the Hoysalas were coming into conflict with each other to establish their authority in this region. Thus we find Hoysala Ballāla II camping at Nidugal in 1218 A.D. We know from other sources, however, that in course of time this area ultimately went under the rule of Śeuna Singhana II (1199/1200-1247 A.D.).
Irungōla II

Brahma II was succeeded by his son Irungōla II. His inscriptions range from 1226 to 1290 A.D., and they do not acknowledge the overlordship of any of the imperial dynasties. He is stated to have ruled from Hidugal to which place he probably shifted the capital which probably had better defence facilities because of the surrounding mountains.

Irungōla II was constantly at war with his enemies. An epigraph of 1249 A.D., at Kambaduru in Anantapur district mentions that he destroyed the Ishtikadurga. It is not possible to ascertain where this durga was situated. In 1269 A.D., he attacked the Hoysala kingdom probably on behalf of his overlord the Sūna king Mahēḍava (1251-1271 A.D.). In 1276 A.D., again he is stated to have joined the Sūna army in its march on the Hoysala capital Dorasamudra obviously on behalf of his overlord the Sūna king Rāmachandra (1271-1312 A.D.). There were a number of skirmishes during these days between the Sūnas and the Hoysalas and both the parties claimed victories to their sides. Though it resulted in great slaughter of the
Hoysala forces, the Yadavas were forced to raise the siege.

Irungola’s Successors

Irungola II had at least two sons and a daughter. Tripurantakadēva, who was at Hāniyadurga in 1262 A.D., is called his dear son. Vīra Bomma (Bhrammideva III) was his yet another son. Nangavve was his daughter and an inscription of 1226 A.D., at Amarapura in Anantapur district records certain grants at the time of her marriage.

About the next two chiefs, Gaṇēsa and his son Bhrammideva IV we have no details at all. They were in power at a time when a political chaos had set in the west of the Deccan due to the invasions of Ala-ud-dīn Khilji and his general Malik Kafur in which all the powers including the smaller ones like the Telugu Cholas were swept away.
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